

**DRAFT AIR TRAFFIC PROCEDURES ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
(ATPAC)**

**SUBJECT:** Minutes of the ATPAC 144<sup>th</sup> Meeting

**SUMMARY:** The 144<sup>th</sup> meeting of ATPAC was held on June 4-8, 2012, at Holiday Inn, ATCA Sponsored Navy/Marine Corps ATC Symposium. Representatives were present from FAA, NATCA, ALPA, PWC, IPA, U.S. Navy, Bonanza Pilot Group, SWAPA, NTSB, UAL, and NASA.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, at 12:00 p.m. on Tuesday, June 5, 2012.

Recurring Agenda Items, IOUs, and applicable AOCs were reviewed and discussed; and the next meeting date and location were established. All business finished, the meeting was adjourned after tour at 5:30 PM on June 7, 2012.

**AGENDA:**

- Call to Order/Roll Call
- Recognition of Attendees
- Executive Director's Report
- Chair Report
- Call for Safety Items
- Review of Agenda Items, Recurring Agenda items
- Introduction of New AOCs/Miscellaneous
- IOUs, Status updates to Areas of concern, (AOCs)
- Locations/Dates for Future Meetings
- Adjournment

**TUESDAY,** June 5, 2012

**CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:** The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. The Chairperson introduced herself and conducted introductions around the room.

**RECONGITION OF ATTENDEES: 31**

Gary Norek, Acting Executive Director  
Danny Aguerre, ATPAC Chair, NATCA  
Marc Gittleman, ALPA  
Scott Casoni, AJS-22  
Patricia Bynum, PWC  
Carolyn Moran, AJT-24  
Tony Corpus, USN  
Bruce McGray, AFS-410  
Philip Saenger, AFS-410  
Mike Hambrick, AFS-410  
Harvey Hartmann, NASA, ASRS  
Jeff Woods, NATCA, Terminal  
Bob Lamond, NBAA

Valerie Setzer, AJT-2A4  
John Collins, Bonanza Pilot Assoc.  
Scott Swain, OPNAV  
Sydney Tutein, USA  
Mike Hilbert, AJV-14  
Wesley Bomyea, OPNAV  
Brian Soper, NTSB  
Gail Swider, TEK-PHL  
Don Chapman, TEK-PHL, NATCA  
Tom Bowman, TCA-SAT  
Bill Scott, AJT-2A  
Cyndi Deyoe, JVS, AJV-11

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** 8 AOCs Closed @ #143, 1 New AOC 143-1 Phraseology Descend Via Maintain, 7 AOCs -2 AOCs Open, 3 AOCs Re-occurring- no work due, 1 PHL Waiver Safety Item moved to re-occurring agenda, 1 AOC deferred for Publication

**NEW IN FAA:**

GA Safety Seminar News Goes Online: Beginning June 1, the only way for general aviation pilots, flight instructors, and mechanics to learn about and register for FAA safety seminars will be online at

FAASafety.gov. The FAA will no longer send postcards. If you have not already done so, the FAA Safety Team encourages you to register online using your airman certificate number

- Northeast Airspace Redesign: The FAA continues to make progress on a collaborative effort to move planes more efficiently through the crowded skies over the northeast. Early data show that the implementation of Stage 2a of the New York/New Jersey/ Philadelphia Airspace Redesign is increasing the efficiency of the region's airspace. Stage 2b is scheduled to be implemented soon. And FAA managers and National Air Traffic Controllers Association representatives are busy designing Stages 3 and 4 of the project. Because airports are located so near each other and so many airplanes travel through such a small section of sky, the design work is challenging and complex. Airspace handled by one facility can't be changed without impacting airspace handled by other facilities.
- JPAMS: Joint Procedures Automation Management System (JPAMS) briefing will be provided to ATPAC at the Oct meeting at the Gaylord in conjunction with ATCA. The system includes automation of procedures processes, searchable historical libraries, dynamic delivery of automated ATC directives, training and information, and the delivery of automated databases such as aircraft characteristics. Benefits for pilots is knowing when a change to the directives will come out, and what that change is.
- NSAAP: National Special Activity Airspace Program (NSAAP): Established the first successful cooperative venture between the FAA; the Department of Defense (DoD), and civil aviation. Concept of operations for SAA scheduling and management as it pertains to current/future demands on airspace use within the NAS and the NAS's response to the requirements of the NextGen 2025 vision. Will use input from SAMS/MADE scheduling to give real time SAA use data to controllers and aircraft users to better utilize SAA. Briefing will be provided at the Oct ATPAC meeting at the Gaylord hotel.
- FAA General Aviation Airport Study: The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) released a study called General Aviation Airports: A National Asset. The FAA conducted the 18-month study to capture the many diverse functions of general aviation (GA) airports. As a result, the general public will have a better understanding of GA airports in the community and within the national air transportation system. The categories reflect the current aviation activity at the airport, such as the number and type of based aircraft, number of passenger boardings, and the type of flights.
- FAA UAS Activities: The agency has been working to ensure the safe integration of unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) in the NAS. The FAA's sole mission and authority as it focuses on the integration of unmanned aircraft systems is safety. Already, the agency has achieved the first unmanned aircraft systems milestone included in the 2012 FAA reauthorization – streamlining the process for public agencies to safely fly UAS in the nation's airspace.

Federal, state and local government entities must obtain an FAA Certificate of Waiver or Authorization (COA) before flying UAS in the NAS. Now, under the FAA Reauthorization bill, the agency must find a way to expedite that COA process within 90 days of enactment, which was May 14, 2012. Starting on March 29, 2012 the FAA introduced another improvement by changing the length of authorization from a 12-month period to 24 months. The FAA continues to move aggressively toward the safe, timely and efficient integration of UAS into the nation's air transportation system. In March 2012, the agency created a new UAS Integration office, headed by a single executive, which brings together specialists from the aviation safety and air traffic organizations. The office serves as the FAA's one-stop portal for all matters related to civil and public use of unmanned aircraft systems in U.S. airspace. Upcoming UAS Activities: Work for several other important milestones is underway in 2012. The FAA received more than 200 comments after asking for public input on the process for selecting six UAS test sites mandated by Congress. In July, the agency expects to request proposals to manage the test sites in order to make the selections in December. These sites are important because they will provide valuable data to us safely integrate UAS into the nation's airspace by 2015 as required by the 2012 FAA reauthorization. Later this year, the FAA expects to release a proposed rule that will establish policies, procedures and standards for a wide spectrum of users in the small UAS community. This class of UAS will likely experience the greatest near-term growth in civil and commercial operations because of their versatility and relatively low initial cost and operating expenses.

**APPROVAL OF MEETING #143 MINUTES:** The minutes from Meeting #143 were completed approximately 1 week after the close of the meeting, sent out for comment and approved via email following the approved process.

**CHAIR REPORT:** GAO report was positive in support of the continuance of ATPAC. David Boone, AJI has not responded to any of Danny's emails or calls on Time to Climb" AOC. MITRE reported no studies were initialized on this subject. Danny contacted Rick Durcharme. Rick said he would investigate and get back to Danny. Kim Cardosi reported that the issue was still being worked and would like to brief ATPAC at October meeting on problems occurring with 4 digit express carrier call signs. Danny will keep ATPAC advised.

**CALL FOR SAFETY ITEMS:** No new items. AOC 141-1 voted in as a safety item.

**SAFETY ITEM:** PHL Waiver was moved by NATCA and seconded by ALPA to be removed as a safety item and accepted as an AOC on the reoccurring agenda.

**OTHER ITEMS:** Pat Bynum briefed ATPAC on the New Surface Operations Group. Consistent recommendations from industry to the FAA to *improve surface traffic flow management*, i.e. *RTCA Task Force 5 (2009)*, Letter from ATA to Administrator Babbitt (2011), NextGen Advisory Committee ICWG Findings (2012) etc. 'Task Force 5', recommended consolidation of all surface management activity within the FAA under one office to jointly develop process, procedures, and policies with industry. The FAA COO established the 'Surface Operations Office' in 2011 to provide oversight of all surface related initiatives. FAA further agreed that industry stakeholders, including flight operators, airport operators, and members of the Surface CDM Team (SCT), would be included in the development of the Surface plan and implementation plans at initial operating experience (IOE) sites. Surface CDM ('SCDM') Concept Development Phase 1 CONOPS Validation (7/2011 – 4/2012) started. Six key sites chosen LAS, ORD, ATL, PHL, LGA, BOS to be completed by 2015. PPT attached.

**RECURRING AGENDA ITEMS:**

**Wake Turbulence (Jeffrey Tittsworth) ATPAC #144 Status Update:**

The Wake Turbulence Program's focus is safely improving capacity in the NAS. The program is built around three solution sets. The first set is data driven procedural changes, with some of the changes requiring a controller display aid. Measured data are used to build the safety cases that support these simply changes to air traffic operational procedures, without the need of new meteorological sensors or other technology based solutions. The second set is procedural changes supported by real time data measuring specific meteorological conditions and simple technology solutions supporting those data measurements. The third set includes the most complex solutions requiring significant meteorological and or technology inputs to achieve the capacity gains.

1<sup>st</sup> Solution Set – 7110.308 - The Wake Turbulence Program along with the Terminal Services Unit developed and, received regulatory approval of a rule change, to allow simultaneous dependent staggered 1.5nm ILS approaches to runways separated by less than 2500 feet. There are currently 7 airports approved for the procedure; BOS, CLE, EWR, MEM, PHL, STL and SEA. Discussions with EWR, TRACON, Continental and airport have resulted in a modification to the lead/trail runways for 7110.308 and the additional approval process needed for the required 3.1 degree glide slope on 4L and 2.95 degree glide slope on 4R. Based on Aviation Stakeholder input, the ATO also submitted a safety case for SFO. Based on input from NCT, the completed analysis supports the leader/follower runway pair with a 2.85 degree glide slope for 28L as the leader runway. SFO and the revised EWR safety cases are currently under review by AOV as well as the Procedure Review Board for the modification from the standard 3.0 degree glide slope.

2<sup>nd</sup> Solution Set – WTMD (Wake Turbulence Mitigation for Departures) WTMD, another Closely Spaced Parallel Runways (CSPR) project incorporates existing meteorological data and a simple technology solution to achieve additional departure capacity at 10 departure capacity constrained airports. A WTMD Operational Demonstration Prototype system is being developed by AJT-14 (Terminal field Operational Support) for 1

year operational trails at IAH, MEM and SFO. WTMD use by IAH was scheduled to begin in the 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter of CY2011, with MEM and SFO starting at six month intervals following IAH. After the 1 year trails, a decision will be made whether to continue fielding the WTMD capability. While delays have occurred, IAH is close to implementation. The WTMD installation is almost completed, with the ATCT displays to be installed upon AOV approval of WTMD. The Flight Standards review of WTMD Safety Risk Management Document (SRMD) is completed. AOV review and approval is almost completed, potentially pushing implementation to June 2012.

2<sup>nd</sup> Solution Set – WTMA (Wake Turbulence Mitigation for Arrivals) is another project being developed in the 2nd Solution Set. The project is collecting data and developing the concept definition for WTMA. This effort expands on the procedures-only solutions to include more types of aircraft and the number of CSPRs that can realize increased arrival capacity in less than visual conditions. This project expands on the technology and meteorological data used by WTMD to address the longer planning horizons and larger airspace with reduced separation that is necessary for the arrival solution. During CY10, the Automated Terminal Proximity Alert (ATPA) capability was expanded using prototype coding to address controller situational awareness needs for dependent instrument approaches to CSRP. ATPA will likely be the controller decision support tool to be used in connection with WTMA arrival operations.

3<sup>rd</sup> Solution Set - Additionally the Wake Turbulence program is supporting a R&D project for single runway departures called CREDOS (Crosswind-Reduced Separation for Departure Operations) with the European community. CREDOS involves longer term research and development activities. Also included in this third set is a single runway arrival solution. European development continues with safety and benefit assessments being developed.

**RECAT** The Wake Re-categorization project (RECAT) is an international effort undertaking a re-categorization of current wake categories. This is a multi-phased effort which is seeking capacity gains in each phase and has application in all three solution sets. A matrix of the new categories was delivered to ICAO and then briefed in November 2010 to a wake standards working group formed by ICAO. Subsequent meetings with the ICAO wake standards working group have worked to resolve safety case questions and clarify documentation. The work group focus has changed over time to a more European centric and no longer represents a joint FAA/EUROCONTROL effort to harmonize standards. In addition, there is an effort to tie RECAT Phase I to the International effort of modifying the separation standards for the Airbus A380. A representative of Airbus sits on the working group and it has become evident that the Airbus agenda is affecting the agenda of the ICAO WTSG. As a result, the FAA was forced to withdraw the RECAT proposal to ICAO and is currently working to implement the RECAT proposal in the US. It is hoped that this lead-by-example effort will provide the impetus for the work group to refocus, and early indications are that the work group will now look toward working with the FAA on RECAT Phase II. The FAA is pursuing the internal process for approval and has drafted an SRMD and is developing proposed procedural changes to support the Re-categorization proposal within the FAA. The package of procedure changes and SRMD are scheduled to be delivered to AOV in August 2012. The FAA is pursuing an aggressive schedule to implement RECAT Phase I at the first key site, Memphis, in November 2012.

**Aircraft Standards** During CY2010, the FAA approved and implemented a revision to its current wake separation standards that places all Boeing 757 aircraft in the same wake separation category. Work is continuing by international groups in reviewing the wake separations associated with the Airbus 380 and recently concluded an assessment of the new Boeing 747-8 series aircraft through flight tests conducted in a manner similar to that used for the A380. During 1<sup>st</sup> quarter CY2011, the Wake Program, working with AVS, Boeing, and ATO-Terminal developed a Safety Risk Management Document (SRMD) for the introduction of the new B787 series 8 and 9 aircraft into commercial service. As a result of those efforts, the assessments for both the B787 and B748 aircraft were completed prior to EIS and both been categorized as Heavy aircraft. The separation standards were placed into the 7110.65 for use by Air Traffic.

- **Runway Safety (Scott Casoni): Runway Safety Call-to-Action Recommendations:**

**ATPAC #144 Status Update: Safety has had no response from NTSB on request to close the last two safety items. No other update.**

**Recommendation A-00-71:** Amend Federal Aviation Administration Order 7110.65, "Air Traffic Control," to require the use of standard International Civil Aviation Organization phraseology (excluding conditional phraseology) for airport surface operations, and periodically emphasize to controllers the need to use this phraseology and to speak at reasonable rates when communicating with all flight crews, especially those whose primary language is not English.

**Response:** We believe the FAA has effectively addressed this safety recommendation and requested closure.

**NTSB Safety Recommendation A-00-070:** Adopt the landing clearance procedure recommended by International Civil Aviation Organization Document 4444-RAC/501, "Procedures for Air Navigation Services-Rules of the Air and Air Traffic Services," Part V, "Aerodrome Control Service," paragraph 15.2. Neither MITRE nor the FAA support requested changes.

**Response:** FAA requested closure on this recommendation.

- **AOC-126-2 Procedures for Use of Time to Climb/Meet Restrictions.** D. Boone contacted Gary Norek and requested all AJV and ATPAC historical records. He stated he was directing Miter to do a study and collect data for a new Safety Panel to review DCP. ATPAC Chair stated she would contact D. Boone at end of month to get status. **ATPAC #144 Status Update:** David Boone, AJI had not responded to any of Danny's emails or calls on Time to Climb" AOC and MITRE reported no studies were initialized on this subject. Danny contacted Rick Durcharme. Rick said he would investigate and get back to Danny.
- **AOC 123-7 Four Digit Express Carrier Call Signs** - Kim Cardousi reported to ATPAC chair issues continue. **ATPAC #144 Status Update:** ATPAC chair stated issue discussed at PFS. She will get a full report for ATPAC #145.
- **AOC 123-2 Aircraft Vertical Performance Data – (AJV-11 -J Garver) ATPAC #144 Status Update:** Due to FAA reorganization NASE can't host the website. AJV looking for other methods to get web information hosted; may have to wait for JPAMS system. There was a DCP published for the 7110.65 App A and C for some of new aircraft characteristics information and was shared with ATPAC members.

#### **AOCs Reviewed:**

- **AOC 141-1 Runway Guard Lights (RGL)** Doug Thoman, IPA presented new AOC example at SDF. Bruce McGray, AFS-410 spoke of the inconsistent use of equipment. Bruce McGray discussed some other issues such as Detroit re-wiring and stated some 80 plus airports have issues with inconsistent markings. **ATPAC #144 Status Update:** Bruce presented power point briefing and through this demonstrated how large this problem on confusion of hold lines is becoming in the NAS. He stated there is no common agreement in the FAA. He showed where RWSL DCP does not answer the problem and used examples from the 7110.65, AIM and 7110.118 to show need for plain language. He questioned how we can elevate the problem and expedite the changes. Airport representation must be part of the solution and stated that AAS-1 needs to be briefed. Bob Lamond and Marc Gittleman second that this become a Safety Item. Harvey and ATSAP will see if they can gather data on this issue and draw up a list of airports. Gary will email Herb King and get status of his work group and see if they are addressing this issue. PPT attached.

**AOC 143-1 Use of 'Descend Via [STAR] and maintain [altitude]' phraseology in Nav Canada Bulletin.** Nav Canada issued an ATC Information Bulletin on the important North American differences regarding SID and STAR altitude restrictions for new Canadian procedures that are to go into effect 9 February 2012. In the bulletin NAV Canada provides several exemplar clearances with their associated requirements. The area of concern is the second FAA example shown below: DESCEND VIA {STAR designator} AND MAINTAIN\ altitudes, **Discussion:** FAA contends that this was not written by FAA and not in accordance with FAA directives. Nav Canada mistake, however other ATPAC members, NATCA and ALPA contended that CPCs may use this phraseology in error and need to be trained on new phraseology. ALPA moved to accept AOC

and was seconded by NATCA. **ATPAC #144 UPDATE: John Dutton/Mike Hilbert** The attached documents address document change proposals (approved) made to FAAO JO 7110.65 related to Climb via/Descend via/ speed, effective August 15, 2012 delay due to PARC request for pilot training. ICAO IGIA response is led by Jim Arrighi, RNAV/RNP. See attached documents. AOC will remain open to see how these changes affect the NAS. Harvey will pull reports after change is implemented for the ATPAC #145.

**Discussion** brought up by John Collins on AOC 141-3 and 141-4 closures. He wanted to know why. ATPAC administrative stated she would research and bring information to June 6<sup>th</sup> meeting.

Discussion was that 1/3 FAA controllers have less than 5 years 'experience; they have no aircraft performance knowledge and don't know how to read and approach plate. Bruce, AFS-410 state it took a B757 pilot e minutes to explain to a controller that with one engine out he only had one engine left. Wesley stated Navy was bringing back simulators to help train CPCs on aircraft and approach plates. Bruce stated that pilots need to be aware of lack of CPC knowledge especially GA and talk back to controllers stating they could not comply.

Jeff Woods and John Collins discussed writing a new AOC on this issue.

**Chairman Nominations: Danny Aguerre, NATCA was nominated and re-elected.**

Members moved to start Wed, June 6, meeting at 7:00 am.

## Wednesday June 7, 2012

- Call to Order

**Discussion:** ATPAC Admin read from ATPAC #142 and #143 minutes the information John Collins requested on AOC 141-3 and 141-4 closures which were closed as it was determined that these AOC's were more of isolated issue. Tom Kramer, AOPA stated he would address issues in out reach and educational programs to the pilots. There was discussion at the ATPAC #141 for CPC training but it was not motioned for a vote. At ATPAC #143 Harvey Hartman said he would get with John Collins and collect information from the NASA database. Which he did. Information was presented to ATPAC members: between 2002 thru 2011 there were 4 incidents per year occurred. Jeff Woods said he would meet with John to discuss issue further. ATPAC Executive Director agreed to contact AOPA about the training.

### **Safety Item - PHL Waiver /presentation and Class B Summit feedback discussion/presentation by AJT: PPTs attached**

As always, ATPAC #144 was published in the Federal Register with meeting information, and specifically designated as a public venue to propose and discuss Class B airspace.

Valerie Setzer, Manager, Airspace, Terminal Operations presented a briefing on ATC NOTIFICATION COMPLIANCE. She stated the purpose of Class B airspace is to reduce the potential for midair collisions in the airspace surrounding airports with high density air traffic operations, and it is intended to protect the approach and departure paths from aircraft not under air traffic control. JO 7110.65 Air Traffic Control, para. 7-9-3(b) cites: Vector aircraft to remain in Class B airspace after entry. Inform the aircraft when leaving and reentering Class B airspace for spacing. Compliance with this requirement has been inconsistent (around 8%), as noted by AJS and AOV since 2007. Many factors have influenced this lack of compliance: "The demand for air traffic control services has substantially increased since introduction of this requirement over 30 years ago. Surrounding airspace did not substantially change to contain all traffic within Class B. In some cases, verbal instruction can distract and place additional workload on Air Traffic Controllers while performing their primary functions of maintaining safe separation between aircraft. Regulations mandating the equipage and use of Traffic Alert and Collision Avoidance Systems (TCAS) and transponders with altitude encoding functions have afforded some users with automated independent awareness."

A Class B Summit was conducted on February 21-24, 2012. Attendees included 45 representatives from: ATO-Safety, System Operations, Flight Standards, NATCA, Quality Assurance, Quality Control, Airspace, Operations and Procedures. To address the identified issues, three subgroups were formed: Rules and Compliance, Airspace Redesign, and Communications. The three primary issues identified are: Class B Airspace Redesign and Containment, ATCS Class B Notification Procedures, and User Perspective.

Outdated Class B designs have evolved due to a variety of factors:

- RNAV/RNP procedures have been developed that extend beyond Class B boundaries.

- Optimization of Airspace and Procedures within a Metroplex (OAPM).

- Operational requirements due to increased operations have resulted in longer down winds.

- New, larger aircraft necessitate greater separation requirements.

There is a requirement for Class B airspace to be reviewed regularly to ensure it meets operational requirements; however, a Class B Airspace redesign process may take three to five years.

Confusion exists regarding notification requirements in FAA Order 7110.65, and a current interpretation of the requirements. User input is being gathered regarding alternative methods of "informing" pilots of Class B exit/re-entry. Efforts are ongoing to determine whether the notification is still required due to advances in aircraft equipment technology. Other options are being explored such as that currently in a trial status in PHL, PHL has a waiver for 2 years during which time, an alternate method of "informing" pilots of areas where aircraft frequently exit and re-enter Class B airspace. They define the areas on their ATIS, and also issue a NOTAM describing the areas that is in place until the Airport Facility Directory is published containing the information., The Class B subgroups have developed *DRAFT* DCPs to clarify intent and

clearly define compliance requirements. Additionally, a Corrective Action Plan (CAP) has been developed to monitor compliance with FAA Order 7110.65 until other means are validated.

**Short Term Goals: Rules and Compliance:** Service areas coordinate with FAA HQ to develop a national corrective action plan. Status: Corrective plan submitted to AOV for approval. **Airspace Redesign:** A Class B status database has been developed to monitor and track Class B biennial reviews and NPRM redesign efforts. Facilities and Operations Support Groups in the Service Centers are conducting Class B airspace reviews and initiating redesign efforts when required. Status: Service areas have completed and submitted biennial reviews. Monthly Class B status updates are provided by Airspace Rules and Regulations (AJV-11). **Communications:** Data gathering regarding Philadelphia notification waiver is ongoing. Status: Ongoing. Requested facility Class B representative to gather use feedback

**Mid Term Goals: Rules and Compliance:** Begin DCP process for FAAO 7-9-3 (b) to clarify intent and define alternative means of notification. Status: Draft DCP developed and routed to Terminal Ops managers for comment with a suspense date of 5/25/12. **Airspace Redesign:** Service areas standardize the Class B biennial review process. Status: Ongoing. Coordinating with Service areas, Airspace POC's to develop requirements for review ECD: July 2012. **Airspace Redesign:** Establish comprehensive Class B biennial review checklist for FAAO 7400.2.

Status: Ongoing. Coordinating with Service areas will draft the requirements checklist for inclusion in the DCP. ECD: July 2012.

**Long Term Goals: Airspace Redesign:** Seek methods to reduce NPRM airspace redesign timeframe. Status: Ongoing, Subgroup reviewing NPRM process. **Rules and Compliance:** SRM Panel for DCP to FAAO 7-9-3 (b) to determine and mitigate risks. Status: Ongoing. Contingent upon approval of draft DCP. **Rules and Compliance:** Continue to track and ensure compliance as redesign efforts progress. Status: Ongoing. Contingent upon approval of draft DCP. In summary, although issues are complex and many-faceted, our first and foremost consideration must be ensuring safety for aviation users, and providing realistic procedural expectations for our air traffic work force. Feedback from users is a vital component in addressing these issues.

**Discussion:** Bob Lamond commented that a GA high speed aircraft answer might be in corridors. Bill Scott mentioned Peachtree Dekalb issues with environmental concerns, and IOPA/AOPA finding it very hard to address all the issues. ATPAC members thought the FAA needs to continue to work Class B issues. ATPAC should continue as a forum to discuss Class B issues. Gary said he would provide a list of ongoing Airspace Actions to ATPAC members.

#### **PHL Presentation by Gail Swider, PHL, OM and Don Chapman, PHL, NATCA**

- FAA Level 12 facility
- Primary International HUB for US Airways
- United Parcel Service (UPS) HUB
- Surrounded by 8 terminal facilities (including N90 and PCT) and 2 ARTCC (ZNY and ZDC)
- Primary equipment STARS and ADS-B Fusion

PHL is the 9<sup>th</sup> busiest airport in the NAS. Class B Issues and PHL Air Traffic Safety Action Program (ATSAP) Report results:

- The PHL Arrival and Final Vector controller positions are responsible for the verbal exit/re-entry notifications.
- Timing is a critical part of vectoring aircraft to the final approach course, and issuance of exit/entry notifications may disrupt the controller's focus on essential position priorities.
- Current Class B design has not kept up with operational needs.
- Changes in aircraft size/type/speed, and instrument approach procedures have caused traffic to routinely leave Class B airspace after entry.
- Frequency congestion and pilot/controller workload may become a concern.

Briefing slide of the Class B Mode C Veil brought discussion from members to clarify how the Class B design was developed and why. There was discussion on the specific problems of PHL Class B and where aircraft enter and exit Class B continually. Did they get dumped down into Class B prior to approach? The FAA JO 7110.65

paragraph 7-9-3b requirement to advise pilots was implemented in the late 1970's based on non-radar areas and existing technology. A current interpretation implies that informing an aircraft when leaving and re-entering Class B airspace is issued verbally.

ATSAP Reports highlighted unacceptable levels of additional workload for controllers. Unsafe levels of frequency congestion during critical phases of flight may result in confusion on the pilot's part as to what this phraseology means and what the expectations of them are.

The PHL SRM Panel was composed of representatives from: Philadelphia Tower, the Flight Standards District Office, US Airline Pilots Association, United Parcel Service and Comcast Corporation. The panel offered that exit/re-entry notifications:

- May cause alarm or concern in the cockpit.
- Increased the potential for a loss of situational awareness.
- Didn't change their "modus operandi".
- Did not affect the function of the flight crew with regard to their responsibility to "see and avoid".
- Would rather controllers concentrate on providing traffic advisories?
- Would prefer not receiving verbal Class B notifications.
- Believe there is a disconnect regarding the importance of this issue between the FAA and flight crews.
- The panel brainstormed to find an alternative method of informing pilots of the exit/re-entry notification requirement, without contributing to frequency congestion.
- Publication of this information in material such as Jeppesen Manuals and Airport/Facility Directory would be beneficial.
- After much deliberation, it was agreed upon by all that providing this information via the ATIS, NOTAMS and AFD would be satisfactory forms of advisories.

Marc, ALPA took issue with this, and indicated most aircraft don't read the Airport Facility Directory (AFD). The initial NOTAM disappears once it is published in the AFD. He stated the ATIS was too long, and most ATPAC members agreed that ATISs in general are too long. A new AOC was proposed to address these issues. Another AOC was proposed by AFS-410, and seconded by NATCA on Weather information. When asked what pilots want, Marc, ALPA, stated he would rather stay in Class B. Bruce, AFS-410, stated that aircrews are required to read this, and Jeppesen prepared a tailored read (smart pac) for pilots. He would call Jeppesen and insure that this was part of the package. Marc will bring one of these in for Oct meeting. Bob Lamond for NBAA discussed equal access to the NAS in response to non-participants being stopped from flying below the Class B for specific airports. John Collins spoke for GA and stated the AFD is hard to find information. Bob Lamond agreed that the AFD is less than accurate. Danny asked which would the pilots rather have, traffic or Class B in/out? Alan, SWAPA stated pilots have concerns over the potential to exceed the mandated speed below Class B, which would be a pilot error. The agreement to authorize a PHL waiver was because of the airspace issues. One of the requirements of the waiver is that the Class B will be redesigned in the future.

PHL's waiver was effective May 1, 2011 and required that:

- The exit and re-entry points for the runway(s) in use must be broadcast on the ATIS.
- The exit and re-entry points must be defined in a Flight Data Center (FDC) NOTAM until published in the AFD.
- A modification to the Class B airspace must be initiated through the normal rulemaking process.
- This waiver is issued on the basis that the procedure continues to provide an equivalent level of safety and ensures the safe and efficient control of aircraft.

Group stated that 12 airports are requesting waivers. The briefing concluded that there have been no reported incidents based on notification procedures since the waiver was implemented. The controller is able to focus on the separation of aircraft. Frequency congestion is drastically reduced. Controller and pilot concerns have halted.

Questions that were not answered:

- Do controllers issue exit and entry to aircraft in the PHL Class B other than the points broadcasted on the ATIS as identified in the PHL Waiver?

- Could pilots get a graphic of the expected entry and exit points of the PHL Class B for quick reference?  
Note: Aircraft do not know when they are leaving or entering Class B unless they are informed.
- The PHL waiver does not waive the FAR speed requirements for the pilots. The PHL controllers at the ATPAC meeting stated that most aircraft were already reduced to 190 knots and were in compliance with the FAR. Marc was asked to talk to US Airways to see how they deal with the speed requirements?
- Wesley asked if GA had been impacted?
- Question was asked if AJI is going to train controllers on the pilot issue brought up in this discussion?

**New AOC's:**

**Deferred AOC's**

**1. AOC 116-3 - Glide Slope Critical Area Advisory**

**Action:** Group of PDG to look through AOC, consolidate all the recommendations and come up with changes for 7110.65, AIM and AIP to run by ATPAC.

**Status:** ATPAC #143 116-3, I sent the draft DCPs to distribute among the ATPAC members. Robert James Law had no feedback from ATPAC members. DEFERRED ATPAC #145 Pub 2/2013. Robert James Law email sent out requesting input on all DCPs. **Deferred to ATPAC #145 2/2013**

**2. AOC 102-2 Instrument Approach Clearances to Other than IAF**

Status: Part 1 – AJT is heading up the Approach Clearance Update ATPAC #141 Moved to reoccurring agenda. (Mike Hilbert/John Dutton) Status Update: 7110.65U due out Feb 2012 deferred. Robert James Law ATPAC #143 Status Update Kevin Martin and Gary Fiske have been working with AOV on 102-2 should be published by 2/2013. **ATAPC #144 Moved to deferred AOC list until published.**

Status: Part 2 & Part 3 – The issue is with the statement in the example that states ATC must say "Cleared for straight in" if ATC does not want aircraft to do a hold in lieu of procedure turn. This was only listed in an example and is now in the paragraph and the example. Part 2 & 3 **closed ATPAC #141.**

10:30 **Future Meetings Date/Site:**

ATPAC #145:  
30 Sept – 3 Oct, 2012  
(Coincides with ATCA Conference)  
Site: Gaylord Hotel & Resort  
National Harbor, MD

ATPAC #146:  
Feb 2013  
MIA, FL (IATA to host??)

**ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned on Wednesday, June 7, 2011 after tour of Carl Lewis at 5:30pm

**Areas of Concern**

**Table of Contents**

<b>AREA OF CONCERN 102-2.....</b>	<b><u>1213</u></b>
<b>AREA OF CONCERN 116-3.....</b>	<b><u>1748</u></b>
<b>AREA OF CONCERN 123-2.....</b>	<b><u>2223</u></b>
<b>AREA OF CONCERN 123-7.....</b>	<b><u>2425</u></b>
<b>AREA OF CONCERN 126-2.....</b>	<b><u>2829</u></b>
<b>AREA OF CONCERN 141-1.....</b>	<b><u>3132</u></b>
<b>AREA OF CONCERN 143-1.....</b>	<b>48</b>

## **AREA OF CONCERN 102-2**

**01/24/2001**

**SAFETY: No**

**SUBJECT: Instrument Approach Clearances to Other than IAF**

**DISCUSSION:** ALPA is still receiving reports that ATC is clearing aircraft direct to intermediate or final approach fixes, and then expecting aircraft to execute a straight-in instrument approach procedure (“IAP”). In fact, with the proliferation of RNAV/GPS IAPs this practice appears to be on the increase.

The instrument approach procedure design criteria do not account for descent gradient or course change factors that occur when aircraft begin an instrument approach procedure on an ad hoc basis. The only exception to beginning an IAP at an IAF is where vectors to the “final approach course” (in accordance with 7110.65, 5-9-1) place the aircraft in the proper position to do a straight-in approach.

When an aircraft is not vectored in accordance with 5-9-1, the aircraft must be cleared over an IAF (or simply “cleared approach” to leave the pilot free at remote locations to do the procedure as required by AIM directives, etc.). Controllers need to be reminded that arrival over an IAF that is not approved on the face of the procedure for “NoPT” requires the pilot to do a course reversal.

The requirements set for in 7110.65, 4-8-1, are intended to apply to all IAP clearances, except for those conducted specifically under the provisions of 5-9-1. In recent discussions with ATP-100 staff, ALPA has learned that some quarters within Air Traffic Services consider Chapter 4 of 7110.65 to apply only to non-radar operations, rather than being the chapter that is the foundation for all IFR operations. Either this needs to be cleared up, or the language of 4-8-1 needs to be restated in Chapter 5.

Further, the language in 4-8-1 that refers to the intermediate fix is confusing, ambiguous, leads to endless speculation, and serves no valid operational purpose.

As protected airspace areas are reduced in RNAV and emerging RNP IAPs, bypassing a designated IAF increases the risk of an aircraft leaving protected airspace and colliding with an obstacle, in addition to the risks of violating turning and descent gradient requirements.

Also, ALPA understands that some controllers believe that the intent of 5-9-1 is satisfied by a clearance direct to an intermediate or final approach fix, followed by a “radar monitor.” This is incorrect as it negates the requirement to intercept final at not more than a 20-30 degree angle, and at the appropriate minimum distance from the approach gate.

**SUGGESTED ATPAC ACTION:** A training bulletin should be issued to all controllers reviewing the intended requirements of 7110-65, 4-8-1. This would include a reminder that this paragraph applies to all IAP clearances except for vectors provided in accordance with 5-9-1. Further, a reminder that the “intent” of 5-9-1 is not satisfied by simply clearing an aircraft directly to an intermediate or final approach fix, then merely observing the aircraft on radar. Finally, a reminder that a clearance for an IAP over an IAF that is not approved for “NoPT” on the face of the chart will require the pilot to execute the prescribed course reversal, thus ATC separation services should be provided with that expectation in mind.

In 4-8-1 the present language “Standard Instrument Approach Procedures shall commence at an Initial Approach Fix or an Intermediate Approach Fix if there is not an Initial Approach Fix...” should be amended to delete reference to the phrase “Intermediate Approach Fix.” The only time an approach should begin at an intermediate approach fix is where vectors in accordance with 5-9-1 have been onto the approach course outside of the intermediate fix on a “radar required” IAP that has no IAF’s.

(See related agenda item “Vectors to the IAP Course Prior to a Published Segment”). Finally, 4-8-1 should have language that makes it absolutely clear that the provisions of this paragraph apply in both a radar and non-radar environment, excepting only radar vectors provided in accordance with 5-9-1.

**102** - Wally Roberts, ALPA, presented the AOC including a November 2000 letter from ALPA to the FAA, which expressed the concern. Executive Director reported that the FAA has drafted a response to the letter and that it is currently in coordination. The committee opted to wait for the FAA's response.

**103** - Deferred for discussion at next meeting.

**104** - Wally Roberts provided an update to the committee. Concerns were raised regarding the confusion of mixing procedural notes and system requirement (equipment) notes. Additional wording was suggested to distinguish equipment vs. procedure note. ATP and AFS need to jointly work the issue.

**RECOMMENDATION #1:** Form a FAA workgroup comprised of AFS, AVN, AAT, NATCA, and ALPA to work the issue and provide solutions to the problem.

Flight Standards will take the lead to make this happen.

The Flight Standards representative provided a brief overview of the issue. This is not a site-specific issue and controllers are doing the best with what they have. AVN and AFS will work together with the controllers to determine criteria for TERPS and the impact. A specific fix should not be targeted. Flight Standards takes the responsibility and commitment to work and explore the issue.

**105** - Meeting with Wally and AFS to discuss issues has not yet occurred. After the meeting occurs, there will be a decision as to whether or not a workgroup should be formed. Request to review list of attendees and ensure that the proper attendees are there to obtain the desired results/outcome. He will try to have meeting in conjunction with the charting forum.

**106**—This did not get discussed at the past charting forum. AFS will try to get the parties together before the April meeting.

**107** - The Flight Standards representative was unable to attend meeting 107. The AOC will be updated at the July meeting.

**108** - FAA has had some internal discussions, but has had some difficulty getting all parties on the phone. Don Porter and Bruce Tarbert, ATP-104, briefed the committee on this AOC. DCP and CBI training are being edited to address GPS equipment and T approach issues. CBI training is targeted for release in September. Product will be presented for review in January and possible implementation in June/July 2003 timeframe.

**109** - Bruce Tarbert, ATP-104, briefed the committee. DCPs have been finalized and signed. Training is expected to be out in April 2003, which will include TAA's. Consideration was given to distances from IAF and intercept angle. AVN is looking to see if additional guidance regarding speed is required.

**110** - A Draft DCP was submitted to committee for review. A question was raised regarding the "IF (IAF)" notation on the diagram. A briefing will be provided at the next meeting to clarify the concerns.

**111** - Some work has been done within Flight Standards, but there has not been a meeting of all the appropriate parties.

**112** - AFS-420 workgroup has been formed to write-up a plan and proposed guidance. Development of a controller and pilot training initiative will be addressed. Workgroup's progress will be reported at the next meeting.

**113** - AFS representative was unable to attend the meeting and provide an update. Question was raised whether the charting forum was working this issue.

**114** - AFS representative was unable to attend the meeting and provide an update.

**115** - AFS representative was unable to attend the meeting and provide an update.

**116** - AFS representative was unable to attend the meeting and provide an update.

**117** - New AFS representative at this meeting. Draft DCP for the AOC has been written. An update will be provided in January.

**118** - AFS was unable to attend the meeting, but indicated to the committee that a reenergized effort will be made on this AOC. The committee wanted to emphasize that there had been considerable work done on this AOC by AFS and that there should not be a need to start over again.

Committee wanted to reiterate its recommendations to AFS.

**119** - AFS brought up the issue before the Technical Review Board. A review of the ATO-W DCP for vectoring has been completed and was concurred with.

The committee requested for AFS to look at RNAV aircraft on the conventional side.

**120** - DCPs are scheduled for publication in February 2006. Question: Would it have application to conventional procedures? ATO-T would have to provide feedback.

**RECOMMENDATION #2:** Determine/implement this type approach if it can be used by conventional aircraft.

**121** - Clarify of Recommendation #2 was discussed and approved. It now reads:

**RECOMMENDATION #2 (Revised):** Determine/implement this type approach if it can be used by RNAV aircraft on a conventional approach.

ATO-T is still researching this issue with the RNAV office.

**122** – RNAV's have ability to go to other than designated IAF. It is published for RNAV on RNAV approach. Our AOC asks whether it can also be for conventional approach. Can the aircraft also meet altitude of IAF? It is there for RNAV. It should also be there for conventional approach. Operationally, this gives the controller more flexibility, less workload, streamlines operations.

This should be presented to RNAV office. ATO-T will draft a DCP.

**123** - ATO-T will research and put out appropriate on the recommendation.

**124** - ATO-T (Madison) will follow-up on DCP to present to RNAV/RNP Office.

**125** - Dave Madison advised that AFS-400 is looking into this AOC and is working the group's concerns. After group discussion, Harry Hodges, Flight Standards, agreed to follow-up and advise ATPAC of status.

**126** - Jeff Williams, RNAV/RNP Office, provided an explanation. Discussion at 127 will determine if this is sufficient to satisfy the AOC.

**127** - Harry Hodges gave his opinion that RNAV equipped aircraft may proceed to conventional intermediate fixes. Also discussed were the various levels of RNAV capabilities so that all RNAV's are not compatible to accomplish successful navigation during a conventional approach. Jeff Williams was non-committal as to the answer to the AOC but will look into the applications, as was AFS-100. The consensus was that Jeff and David Madison should discuss and resolve.

**128** - Discussions centered on the particular equipage of the aircraft. Ben Grimes concurred and will coordinate with RNAV Office to accomplish without SMS.

**129** - Don Frenya/Kerry Rose will determine the status of SRMD action and Joe McCarthy will address the issue with ATO-T for reports at 130.

**130** - Joe McCarthy will work with ATO-T regarding the SRMD and DCP will check status of DCP.

**131** - Agreed that further coordination be done between the RNAV and ATO-T offices to ensure no duplication of effort.

**132** - Mr. Jehlen suggested that this AOC should be removed from the minutes and tracked separately to be returned when a resolution is available. This and other items will be removed from the minutes and returned on action dates submitted by the responding office.

**133** – Not discussed at this meeting.

**134** - Not discussed at this meeting.

**135** – There was significant discussion about perceived problem of controllers expecting aircraft to fly straight in but not clearing an aircraft for a straight in approach where a hold in lieu of procedure turn holding pattern is depicted. This is an editorial change since the information is already in an example. Pilot groups want the ability to clear an advanced RNAV aircraft to the intermediate fix on a conventional approach procedure. Currently this can only be done on an RNAV approach. Pilot groups want controllers to only clear aircraft direct to the intermediate fix if the fix is identified on approach charts with the letters "IF." We are also reorganizing the paragraphs in 4-8-2 to make the section less confusing. There are also other questions and items that need to be addressed. These items will be identified but will not be addressed in this AOC. Mike Frank took the action to open a DCP in order to create a definition of "established."

**136** – Changes to the manuals have been done by both FAA terminal and RNAV groups. A meeting has been scheduled for Oct 25<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> with representatives from pertinent FAA lines of business including ATO Safety, as well as representatives from various industry user groups to discuss this. The outcome of that meeting should resolve AOC 102-2. The meeting is being hosted by the Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF) - Instrument Procedures Group (IPG). An invitation was extended to any ATPAC member who would like to attend.

**137** – No discussion. Status provided in Pre-Read Briefing: A meeting was held on October 26 between industry stakeholders, Terminal, En Route, and the RNAV office in advance of the Aeronautical Charting Forum meeting. The content of the two different iterations of the DCP was discussed. The content of both DCPs are for all intents and purposes the same, the differences lie with the format of the DCP. FAA personnel agreed to meet again to work out the issues of the DCP so it could be forwarded to the field for comment. That meeting was held on November 12 between Terminal, EnRoute and RNAV. The DCP has been finished and will be circulated for comment. Incorporation into FAA Order JO 7110.65 is expected in Change 2 planned for March 2011.

**138 - Part 1:** The DCPs for JO 7110.65, Paragraph 4-8-1, Approach Clearance, and the associated AIM and AIP went out for initial coordination on April 19, 2010, and comments are due back by June 4, 2010. There have been mixed responses from the field as it provides more robust instructions than the current 4-8-1.

**Parts 2 & 3:** A request was sent out to AJR and AJT as to whether the new DCP moved information on SI approach clearance to a more prominent place as originally requested. AJR replied that the issue is the wording in the example that states that if ATC does not want aircraft to do a hold in lieu of procedure turn they must say "Cleared for straight in." This was only shown in the example. The DCP will put this information in both the paragraph and the example.

**139** - No discussion

**140- Part 1** – Open, Reorganization and clean up of Order 7110.65, Para 4-8-1, Approach Clearance, and the associated AIM and AIP paragraphs. **Parts 2 & 3** – Recommend Closure

**141 - AOC 102-2 Instrument Approach Clearances to Other than IAF**

**Part 1** – 7110.65U due out 02/09/12 **deferred until ATPAC #143** Members requested that the draft DCP to be sent out for review. **Part 2 & Part 3** – Recommend closure on Part 2 & 3. (M. Hilbert/ M Frank) **AOC Closed.** **NOTE: Instrument Approach Clearances to Other than IAF** will be moved to recurring agenda for new issues surrounding it.

**142 - No new issues.**

**143 - AOC 102-2 Instrument Approach Clearances to Other than IAF**

**Status: Part 1** – AJT is heading up the Approach Clearance Update ATPAC #141 Moved to reoccurring agenda. (Mike Hilbert/John Dutton) Status Update: 7110.65U due out Feb 2012 deferred. Robert James Law ATPAC #143 Status Update Kevin Martin and Gary Fiske have been working with AOV on 102-2 should be **published by 2/2013.**

**Status: Part 2 & Part 3** – The issue is with the statement in the example that states ATC must say "Cleared for straight in" if ATC does not want aircraft to do a hold in lieu of procedure turn. This was only listed in an example and is now in the paragraph and the example. **Part 2 & 3 ATPAC #141. CLOSED**

**144 - AOC 102-2 Instrument Approach Clearances to Other than IAF**

**Status: Part 1** – AJT is heading up the Approach Clearance Update ATPAC #141 Moved to reoccurring agenda. (Mike Hilbert/John Dutton) Status Update: 7110.65U due out Feb 2012 deferred. Robert James Law ATPAC #143 Status Update Kevin Martin and Gary Fiske have been working with AOV on 102-2 should be **published by 2/2013**.

**Status: Part 2 & Part 3** – The issue is with the statement in the example that states ATC must say "Cleared for straight in" if ATC does not want aircraft to do a hold in lieu of procedure turn. This was only listed in an example and is now in the paragraph and the example. Part 2 & 3 ATPAC #141. **CLOSED**

**AREA OF CONCERN 116-3**

**07/14/04**

**SAFETY: No**

**SUBJECT: ILS Glide Slope Critical Area Advisory**

**REFERENCE: AIM 1-1-9k2(b)(2)**

**DISCUSSION:** The above referenced paragraph in the AIM does not accurately reflect what terminology pilots should use when advising ATC they will conduct a coupled/autoland approach when the weather is above 800-2. The example used in the paragraph “*Glide slope signal not protected*” is an advisory that would be issued by the control tower in response to pilot notification of a coupled approach.

Another issue contained in this paragraph that ATPAC needs to discuss is that the ILS critical areas are only protected when the aircraft is inside the middle marker (MM). Considering the fact that MM’s are located approximately 3500ft from the runway threshold, which is entirely too short a distance to be useful for such approaches, and they are being removed at the majority of locations, it appears necessary to replace the term MM in this paragraph with “Final Approach Fix (FAF).” This would be in line with the Glide Slope Critical Area comments contained in AIM paragraph 1-1-9k2.

The use of coupled/autoland approaches has become more common with the fleet of highly automated aircraft operating in the inventory, and the ILS critical area requirements need to be updated to reflect this fact.

**SUGGESTED ATPAC ACTION:** That ATPAC discuss this issue and recommend the following:

1. That the pilot advisory example contained in the above referenced AIM paragraph be replaced with the following sample advisory:

***PHRASEOLOGY-***

*[Name of tower] [Call sign] [coupled/autoland] APPROACH*

2. That the term MM contained in the above referenced AIM paragraph be replaced with the term **FAF** or **OM**, whichever is the most appropriate.

**116 -** MSP has a glideslope critical area issue with a certain taxiway. Many aircraft use the coupled approach most of the time. Comment that when issuing ILS procedures it should be known that the aircraft is coupled without having to broadcast it on the frequency. This will be a capacity issue because aircraft must be certified to “autoland.” If not certified, they can’t fly CATIII. AFS needs to be involved in this issue.

**RECOMMENDATION #1:**

1. That the pilot advisory example contained in the above referenced AIM paragraph be replaced with the following sample advisory:

***PHRASEOLOGY-***

*[Name of tower] [Call sign] [coupled/autoland] APPROACH*

2. That the term MM contained in the above referenced AIM paragraph be replaced with the term **FAF** or **OM**, whichever is the most appropriate.

**117 -** Office of Primary Interest (OPI) has been contacted. Committee will be provided status when available.

**118 -** There was concern that the OPI would understand the issues being addressed and would make the proper handbook changes. The OPI will be contacted and a discussion will be held at the next meeting.

119 - 800&2 and below is protected, not above. If there is no compelling evidence then policy should not be changed. Possibly change 7210.3 to designate a runway for autoland approaches to CAT II/III runways. Alternate is maintenance recertification.

**RECOMMENDATION #2:** That the FAA ATO develop guidance to achieve the following: FAA Order 7210.3, Facility Operation and Administration, should be changed to have terminal facilities with CAT II or CAT III approaches include procedures to accommodate “coupled” or “autoland” operations per FAA Order 7110.65, 3-7-5b to include protecting the critical area. This should include controller awareness of the need to accommodate these operators and may include designating a preferred runway and arrival procedures for these operations.

120 - Several ideas were provided on this AOC:

- Consider designating autoland/coupled approach runways as per Recommendation #2.
- Provide more education to controllers.
- Obtain development help from Anchorage office (Mutzko).
- Certification could relax the 90 day requirement for autoland/coupled approaches.
- Determine which airports could dedicate a runway for these approaches.

AT and AF will work on the dedicated runway issue.

**RECOMMENDATION #3:** Synchronize the AIM to the 7110.65/PCG definition of ILS Critical Area.

121 - Instruction issued to controllers to issue and protect the approaches when able. ATO-T said there is no need for having airports dedicate runways for this purpose. Airports need to be aware of the need and accommodate as much as possible.

122 - Article in ATB regarding facility’s handling coupled/autoland approaches. There are 2 issues. Autopilot cert. issues and flying coupled because ops. Specs. /company require it. If the critical are is unprotected the pilot is out on a limb. There is a disconnect between certification, AFS, AT, and the POIs.

**RECOMMENDATION #1 (Revised Part 1):** That the pilot advisory example contained in the above referenced AIM paragraph be replaced with the following sample advisory:

**PHRASEOLOGY-**

*[Call sign] AUTOLAND or COUPLED APPROACH.*

Add: The tower will advise if the ILS critical areas are not protected with the following sample advisory: *ILS critical areas not protected.*

123 - Comment that ATC is not aware of the requirements for autoland/coupled approaches. Would an ATB article help address this issue? AFS could look at the requirements because they are the ones that impose them.

ATO-T will work Recommendation #1 and the chair will provide draft language for Recommendation #3. As previously reported, Recommendation #2 will not be implemented.

124 - Common language was defined by the group and will be submitted. Mark Cato will write an article for pilots and Flight Standards highlighting the committee’s new thinking on the coupled/autoland issue and Harry will consider that as a starting point for coordination for an HBAT item. Also, Dave and John will develop a DCP to reflect the following ATPAC recommendations:

**Recommended changes included deleting references to Autoland in Coupled Definition and Coupled in Autoland Definition.**

AUTOLAND APPROACH - An autoland approach is a precision instrument approach to touchdown and, in some cases, through the landing rollout. An autoland approach is performed by the aircraft autopilot which is receiving position information and/or steering commands from onboard navigation equipment.

**NOTE-**

*Autoland approaches are flown in VFR and IFR. . It is common for carriers to require their crews to fly autoland approaches (if certified) when the weather conditions are less than approximately 4,000 RVR.*

COUPLED APPROACH - A coupled approach is an instrument approach performed by the aircraft autopilot which is receiving position information and/or steering commands from onboard navigation equipment. In general, coupled nonprecision approaches must be discontinued and flown manually at altitudes lower than 50 feet below the minimum descent altitude, and coupled precision approaches must be flown manually below 50 feet AGL.

**NOTE-**

*Coupled approaches are flown in VFR and IFR. . It is common for carriers to require their crews to fly coupled approaches (if certified) when the weather conditions are less than approximately 4,000 RVR.*

**7110.65 Recommended change**

**3-7-5. PRECISION APPROACH CRITICAL AREA**

b. Air carriers commonly conduct "autoland" operations to satisfy maintenance, training, or reliability program requirements. Promptly issue an advisory if the critical area will not be protected when an arriving aircraft advises that an "autoland" approach will be conducted and the weather is reported ceiling of 800 feet or more, and the visibility is 2 miles or more.

**Recommended change includes flight crew notification to Approach Control**

**AIM 1-1-9k2**

**k. ILS Course Distortion**

1. All pilots should be aware that disturbances to ILS localizer and glide slope courses may occur when surface vehicles or aircraft are operated near the localizer or glide slope antennas. Most ILS installations are subject to signal interference by surface vehicles, aircraft or both. ILS CRITICAL AREAS are established near each localizer and glide slope antenna.

2. ATC issues control instructions to avoid interfering operations within ILS critical areas at controlled airports during the hours the Airport Traffic Control Tower (ATCT) is in operation as follows:

(a) Weather Conditions. Less than ceiling 800 feet and/or visibility 2 miles.

(1) Localizer Critical Area. Except for aircraft that land, exit a runway, depart or miss approach, vehicles and aircraft are not authorized in or over the critical area when an arriving aircraft is between the ILS final approach fix and the airport. Additionally, when the ceiling is less than 200 feet and/or the visibility is RVR 2,000 or less, vehicle and aircraft operations in or over the area are not authorized when an arriving aircraft is inside the ILS MM.

(2) Glide Slope Critical Area. Vehicles and aircraft are not authorized in the area when an arriving aircraft is between the ILS final approach fix and the airport unless the aircraft has reported the airport in sight and is circling or side stepping to land on a runway other than the ILS runway.

(b) Weather Conditions. At or above ceiling 800 feet and/or visibility 2 miles.

(1) No critical area protective action is provided under these conditions.

(2) A flight crew, under these conditions, should advise the approach control, “(Call sign), autoland approach.” to request that the ILS critical areas are protected.

**EXAMPLE-**

*Glide slope signal not protected.*

(Note added)

**NOTE-**

*Aircrews navigating a precision or non-precision approach other than autoland by engaging the autopilot should not expect critical area protection if the weather is at or above ceiling 800 feet and/or visibility 2 miles.*

3. Aircraft holding below 5,000 feet between the outer marker and the airport may cause localizer signal variations for aircraft conducting the ILS approach. Accordingly, such holding is not authorized when weather or visibility conditions are less than ceiling 800 feet and/or visibility 2 miles.

4. Pilots are cautioned that vehicular traffic not subject to ATC may cause momentary deviation to ILS course or glide slope signals. Also, critical areas are not protected at uncontrolled airports or at airports with an operating control tower when weather or visibility conditions are above those requiring protective measures. Aircraft conducting coupled or autoland operations should be especially alert in monitoring automatic flight control systems. (See FIG 1-1-7.)

**NOTE-**

*Unless otherwise coordinated through Flight Standards, ILS signals to Category I runways are not flight inspected below 100 feet AGL. Guidance signal anomalies may be encountered below this altitude.*

**125** - The ATPAC recommendation was validated and will be forwarded for action by ATO-R.

**126** - Dave Madison was unable to attend this meeting for ATO-T.

**127** - Ben Grimes will check into the status of this recommendation and report at 128.

**128** - Ben Grimes advised the committee that ATO-T non-concurred with the recommendation.

**129** - Discussions were centered on the committee’s desire to resolve what they perceived to be a critical flight issue that should be addressed.

**130** - Wilson Riggan will provide a memorandum for submission to ATO-T through Kerry Rose.

**131** - It was determined that FAAO 7110.65 had been changed to reflect the ATPAC recommendation leaving only the AIM to be addressed by this proposed change in Para 1-1-9k2.

**132** - Flight Standards controls AIM information and will be asked to match the 7110.65 entries.

**133** - Kerry Rose asked if this is still valid or is it an interpretation request? Kerry Rose talked about the future members coming to the PDG that would resolve this issue. *AJR-53 for action upon arrival of newly assigned personnel.*

**134** - Scott Casoni reported that this change was in process. No further discussion.

**135** - Some of the recommended changes have been made in FAA Order JO 7110.65 but not all. Corresponding changes in the AIM and AIP were never made. It was determined that we would work this through the Procedures Development Group (PDG), and after reading all the recommendations, the group would draft the changes for all three publications and run them through ATPAC for agreement via email or a telcon. If it is agreed on, we would write up the corresponding DCPs and make the changes.

**136** – APA member requested that a DCP be written to change FAA Order JO 7110.65 to include notification to the tower by the pilot about why they are requesting ILS Critical Area be protected. The reason is that pilots need to stay current and it is a very long, costly process to accomplish this on the ground. APA requested that positive phraseology be added to indicate approval request.

**137** – Not discussed at this meeting.

**138 – Part 1:** Not discussed at this meeting. DCP to consolidate all the recommendations and come up with changes for 7110.65, AIM, and AIP will be coordinated by ATPAC. DCP request is in discussion with Terminal due to multiple requests from different Change Proponents concerning the same paragraph. **Part 2:** No information received from APA on their action item to provide educational packet.

**139 – Part 1:** Not discussed at this meeting. DCPs are out for initial coordination. Projected incorporation is August 25, 2011. **Part 2:** APA advised that there is no support for moving this forward; recommends closure.

**140 - Part 1:** Open, Deferred to meeting #142. **Part 2** – Item closed.

**141** – Part 1 publication pushed back 2/9/2012. Deferred to meeting #143 **Part 2** – Item closed.

**142** - FAA will contact Terry Perschall AFS-200 hand flown approach and get DCP from Bob Law

**143 - AOC 116-3 - Glide Slope Critical Area Advisory** Action: Group of PDG to look through AOC, consolidate all the recommendations and come up with changes for 7110.65, AIM and AIP to run by ATPAC. Status: Deferred to ATPAC #142 12/29/10 – 5/2011 AJT-24 made some "major" changes when F12 was here. I need to get with AFS-200 and vet these changes before we can put back into the coordination system here at HQ (Final clearance). This was dropped inadvertently - I will bring this issue back to life next week and hopefully get the change into final coordination ASAP! Robert James Law. Status Update ATPAC #143 116-3, I sent the draft DCPs to distribute among the ATPAC members. Robert James Law no feedback from ATPAC members. DEFERRED ATPAC #145 Pub 2/2013

**144 - AOC 116-3 - Glide Slope Critical Area Advisory** Action: Group of PDG to look through AOC, consolidate all the recommendations and come up with changes for 7110.65, AIM and AIP to run by ATPAC. Status: Deferred to ATPAC #142 12/29/10 – 5/2011 AJT-24 made some "major" changes when F12 was here. I need to get with AFS-200 and vet these changes before we can put back into the coordination system here at HQ (Final clearance). This was dropped inadvertently - I will bring this issue back to life next week and hopefully get the change into final coordination ASAP! Robert James Law. Status Update ATPAC #143 116-3, I sent the draft DCPs to distribute among the ATPAC members. Robert James Law no feedback from ATPAC members. DEFERRED ATPAC #145 Pub 2/2013

**AREA OF CONCERN 123-2**

**04/19/06**

**SAFETY: No**

**SUBJECT: Aircraft Vertical Performance Data**

**DISCUSSION:** Paragraph 4-4-9d of the AIM contains broad guidance for pilots relating to aircraft descent and climb rates. Specifically; the second sentence of the paragraph begins with the words “*Descend or climb at an optimum rate consistent with the operating characteristics of the aircraft.....*” This phrase is all encompassing and does adequately recognize that specific climb and descent performance criteria is largely controlled by flight management system vertical guidance programs, aircraft type, and specific operator procedures. Therefore, specific performance criteria are not included in the paragraph, nor are there any regulatory requirements relating to this subject. Most pilot operations manuals only contain information extracted from paragraph 4-4-9 relating to a requirement to notify ATC if a climb or descent of at least 500ft per minute cannot be sustained.

However, Appendix A of FAA Order 7110.65 contains climb and descent figures for most aircraft operating in the ATC system. If the purpose of this information is to provide controllers guidance on what performance they may expect from aircraft they are controlling, they may be working with erroneous data. Also, Note 2 of paragraph 4-5-7e of FAA Order 7110.65, refers to descent rates contained in the AIM: “*Controllers need to be aware that the descent rates in the AIM are only suggested and aircraft will not always descend at those rates.*” ALPA believes that this paragraph was originally intended to refer to the performance figures contained in Appendix A of 7110.65, as there does not appear to be any correlation to what is contained in the AIM.

**SUGGESTED ATPAC ACTION:** That ATPAC review this information and recommend that Note 2 of paragraph 4-5-7e, FAAO 7110.65 either be deleted or changed to pertain to the data contained in Appendix A of the Order, and, that the data contained in Appendix A be reviewed to insure it reflects the most accurate and complete performance information for controller guidance.

**123** - Chart needs to be updated or removed. Each chart is based on certification. How pilots fly it can be different. Appendix redone when LAHSO was being worked. ATO-T will coordinate with Certification, then evaluate whether chart should remain.

**124** - ATO-T will coordinate with Certification then evaluate whether chart should remain.

**125** - Due to insufficient time for the appropriate discussions this AOC will be further deferred until 126.

**126** - The current status of this item is unknown and should be worked by ATO-T.

**127** - This item’s status remains unreported.

**128** - Ben Grimes reported that this item will be discussed at an August meeting and a determination will be made to revise, eliminate climb characteristics, and/or eliminate the table.

**129** - This item was again discussed as needing updating or cancellation because it is not current with aircraft performance.

**130** - A report received via email advised that a panel has been convened to discuss this item as it relates to ICAO directives.

**131** - Various groups are being polled with the intent to determine their use of the .65 appendix with a goal to determine if the chart is valid enough to continually update or eliminate for controller use.

**RECOMMENDATION: Chart needs to be updated or removed.**

**132** - AJR-53 now taking this on as action. Remains open (deferred for two meetings) and placed in a side template showing due date of Mtg #135. Mr. Jehlen suggested that this AOC should be removed from the minutes and tracked separately to be returned when a resolution is available. This and other items will be removed from the minutes and returned on action dates submitted by the responding office.

**133** - Not discussed at this meeting. Mr. Jehlen suggested that this AOC should be removed from the minutes and tracked separately to be returned when a resolution is available. This and other items will be removed from the minutes and returned on action dates submitted by the responding office.

**134** - Not discussed at this meeting.

**135** - There are two parts to the AOC. Part 1 involves incorrect, outdated information in the climb tables. Bruce McGray, AFS, has taken action to identify correct information so that it may be put into the tables. Part 1a - Proper information, when received, will then be incorporated into appropriate area. Part 2 involves personnel being erroneously directed from FAA Order JO 7110.65 (paragraph 4-5-7e Note 2) to the AIM (paragraph 4-4-10d) for guidance; this error is planned to be changed in the next update in February. **(Note: Original paragraph mentioned in AIM 4-4-9d is now 4-4-10d)**

**136** – FAA AJT- 22 will write changes and submit to PDG. The Safety study and AFS-400 documents will be part of package.

**137** – Discussion determined that on the job training from carrier to carrier is more crucial than populating a table. However, AFS has sent a memo to the PDG providing direction on which aircraft performance characteristic is useable for general ATC purposes.

**138 – Part 2:** AFS has provided Janes as the resource. It will be incorporated into the proper area. Projected implementation is late summer 2010.

**Part 3:** No discussion. Editorial memo sent to Publications from PDG for editorial changes. Changes will be in Change 1, August 26, 2010.

**139 – Part 2:** Web developers are working on incorporating the information to a website. There is no estimated time for completing this. Executive Director recommended closure as the group’s task of finding a source has been completed; move to Recurring Agenda Item for status updates only.

**Part 3:** Editorial memo sent to Publications from PDG for editorial changes. Changes will be in Change 1, August 26, 2010.

**140** – Looking for host of website.

**141** – Web site will be hosted by NASE, ATPAC members provide with website information. Members requested update when website is complete. Deferred until website is complete.

**142** - Status: The database will be hosted by the NASE in NJ. They are completing a technical refresh on their website and hope to have it completed by November. Committee members deferred item until published.

**143** - Status Update: Technology refresh was moved back to March and then FAA reorganization NASE may not be able to host.

**144** - Status Update: Due to FAA reorganization NASE can’t host the website. AJV looking for other methods to get web information hosted; may have to wait for JPAMS system. There was a DCP published for the 7110.65 App A and C for some of new aircraft characteristics information and was shared with ATPAC members.

## AREA OF CONCERN 123-7

04/19/06

**SAFETY:** Yes

**SUBJECT:** Four Digit Express Carrier Call signs

**DISCUSSION:** Moderate to busy terminal facilities and en route sectors are experiencing an increasing problem with very similar sounding, 4-digit call signs with express carrier companies. Some carriers have been able to drop the first digit of the call sign when every flight number begins with the same first digit, but those carriers that use different banks of flight numbers cannot. The problem with these high concentrations of 4-digit call signs is frequent miscommunications due to the fact that all of the call signs look and sound somewhat alike. Example: SKY6845, SKW8845, SKW6885, SKW6485. Example: LOF8036, LOF8026, LOF8040, LFO8044. Example: TCF7744, TCF7444, TCF7774, TCF7770. Too often pilots reply to clearances intended for other aircraft due to the similar sounding call signs.

**SUGGESTED ATPAC ACTION:** There needs to be some encouragement by the FAA or the RAA/ATA to take into consideration the difficulties with communications with the concentration of similar sounding call signs nationwide. For the express carriers that have all of their flight numbers in the same "1,000 bank" of numbers, they should be required to drop the first digit for ATC purposes. This could be done in coordination with flight dispatchers. For those express carriers that have flight numbers in different banks or series of numbers, an option would be to replace the first 2 digits with a single letter at the end of the call sign. Example: SKW6845 would be SKW45G, SKW6485 would be SKW85H, SKW8885 would be SKW85G, etc. Assign a single letter to the first 2 number combinations in a flight number so that it is consistent nationwide. SKW6845 would be SKW45G just as COM6845 would be COM45G. Inconsistency between different carriers would be very difficult to manage.

**123** - Can a working group in the PARC address this? The DCP (Pilot Controller Phraseology) subgroup may have human factors information or other input. (Contact is RNAV shop). CDM may also be another possibility for working the issue with AFS involvement.

**124** - ATO-S will be queried to determine if sufficient human factors studies exist to warrant a recommendation through appropriate channels to request 3-digit call signs be utilized vice 4-digit. NASA also expressed concurrence with the AOC and the need for action. The committee will consider asking the CDM group to address this item.

**125** - Due to insufficient time for the appropriate discussions this AOC will be further deferred until 126.

**126** - This item was discussed and decided that further information gathering was appropriate.

**127** - A memo will be written outlining this AOC and presented to ATO-T.

**128** - The ATPAC recommendation memo was approved by consensus and will be submitted to ATO-T with Wilson's signature.

**129** - A written recommendation was presented to Rich Jehlen for consideration of ATPAC's recommendations.

**130** - A formal request will be made to ATO-T for action.

**131** - The memorandum below was presented to ATO-T for their action that represented ATPAC's position.

*The Air Traffic Procedures Advisory Committee (ATPAC) has identified a potential problem in the use of four-digit call signs used primarily by Air Taxi operators at busy hub airports. These operators are generally in support of legacy carriers and therefore, in order to maintain schedule delivery integrity, operate in close time proximity and with air carrier peak times. This actual and increasing potential for error, in the committee's consensus, should be corrected to protect both aircraft and controllers.*

*ATPAC requests you initiate action to ensure this potential problem area is addressed. The committee recommends that this may be accomplished through coordination with the appropriate airlines and supported by an MBI in the form of Computer Based Instruction or an Air Traffic Bulletin to emphasize to ATC personnel.*

**RECOMMENDATION #1:** FAA investigates solutions through appropriate channels.

**RECOMMENDATION #2:** Action should be initiated to investigate and remedy.

**132** – ATO-T does not agree that this item is an issue. The Chairperson will write to ATA and RAA explaining the problem and invite their comment and participation in Mtg #133. Mr. Hartmann will check his database on call-sign confusion and email results to Ms. Rose

**133** - Disagreement on this issue whether to pursue (from an ATO standpoint) or cancel the AOC because it is the opinion stated by Terminal that sufficient safeguards are currently in place to mitigate. Mr. Scott Foose spoke on his background and the issue.

Four Digit numbers are more common today. Anecdotally, confusion between controllers/pilots exists. He suggested ATPAC continue to raise awareness. He asked for recommendations to return to his members. Scott Casoni restated that Terminal does not need to change anything. Sabra Morgan asked for more quantifiable data prior to changing anything. Danny Aguerre-Bennett says this kind of data is not recordable. Sabra Morgan asked if this is systemic and not local. Larry Newman asked if the FAA could research this? Rich Jehlen asked “how can I capture this data?” *Harvey Hartmann will check his database on call sign-confusion and email results to Kerry Rose (search on “hear-back/read-back) (ASIAS, Aviation Safety Information Analysis and Sharing). Scott Casoni to check with Safety and ADS for data.*

**134** - No change in status from Terminal. Harvey went through his database and mentioned some examples. EUROCONTROL is working with this issue presently. Harvey Hartmann (NASA) to send soft copy of *Similar Sounding Call Signs Report*. Kerry Rose (PDG) to find out from Human Factors on cognitive similarity.

**135** - It was decided that Wilson Riggan would lead a group of ATPAC volunteers to include Bob Lamond in determining questions/study areas and/or issues that Human Factors would look at. These issues, questions would then be presented to the Agency’s’ Human Factors group to do a study.

**136** – NASA and APA members stated Runway Safety has enlisted a Human Factors (HF) study on this issue and they will work on setting up a brief to ATPAC next meeting on the findings. This issue can be closed once the HF study is completed.

**137** – NASA provided a status at the meeting. Nothing has been written at this point. The situation creates an annoyance and a difficulty, but there have been no formal reports of problems. The Executive Director stated that the issue with dealing with the problem is that no one can articulate/define the problem and requested that NASA do so.

**138** – Dr. Kim Cardosi provided a briefing to the members. Group discussed several options: dropping the first digit to make it a 3-digit call sign; adding a letter; and harmonizing with ICAO by reading digits singly. The group discussed if assisting in this matter is within the scope of the committee; the result was possibly closing this AOC and making it a recurring agenda item.

**139** – (Information provided in Pre-Brief). Letter mailed to ATO COO in July and requests sent to AJE and AJT for the status of training development. It was suggested that AJL be responsible for this development. AJL advised that this is a concern of the Partnership for Safety effort Randy Babbitt launched on July 1, 2010. The ATPAC Chairman and attended the meeting on August 17th. Several possible resolutions were discussed, including changing to an alpha-numeric system and/or forcing the air carriers/regional’s to change the marketing strategy to prevent confusion. It was also suggest that controllers state all call sign digits in individual form. This was well received by all in attendance since it’s the ICAO format, but Dr. Kim Cardosi stated that she would not like to see the ability to use group form taken away from the controllers and that while doing this will help, it would bring new issues of transposing numbers. Training was also a suggestion and made the final cut. From AJL - The communications subgroup met again today and this issue is one that they are addressing. We (AJL) are on the hook to develop controller training around such items as hear back/read back and like call signs. We will stress the option to read call signs in single digits when there is any cause for confusion. The safety group will continue to look at feasibility of adapting ICAO standards for this issue but there is spotty support at this time. Also, safety is about to release the last DVD in the back to basics curriculum entitled "Back to Basics -- Clear Communications" ...this series has been very successful and this last release addresses this issue well.

(At meeting) Chairman advised again about the Partnership for Safety; her understanding that the group was to come up with solutions, but they weren't implementing anything as an entity—the members were to take back the information to their respective organizations. Executive Director asked what the group would like to do—go forward with a long-term solution? Drop the issue and let others take care of it? He stated that it is an industry-wide problem requiring a long-term solution (vs short-term solutions that have come out of the Partnership for Safety). The Delta representative recommended writing a letter to the Administrator advising him that this cannot be solved from an air traffic or pilot perspective—the airlines need to be involved as they are the ones that created the issue. The ATCA representative reminded group that ATPAC is the Administrator's advisory committee, so it is our duty to facilitate the change. The Chairman suggests waiting to see what comes of the Partnership for Safety's efforts before deciding on a course of action.

**CURRENT STATUS:** Open

**ACTION ITEM:** Group to think of 2 top action items to be done concerning this issue; NASA will reach out to NTSB; Chair will clarify with VP of Safety what the ultimate objective of the Partnership for Safety is. Link to be sent to members for Eurocontrol Callsign similarity website.

**140** - This is a concern of the Partnership for Safety effort Randy Babbitt launched on July 1, 2010.

**Action:** AJL is developing controller training around the “hear back/read back” and like call signs. They will stress the option to read call signs in single digits when there is any cause for confusion.

Action complete.

**Action:** The safety group will continue to look at feasibility of adapting ICAO standards for this issue. Safety is getting ready to release the last DVD in the back to basics curriculum entitled “Back to Basics – Clear Communications”. **Status Update:** The Back to Basics DVD should be out to the field by the beginning of March. It is in final review now. Action complete

**Action:** The Chairman suggested waiting to see what comes of the Partnership for Safety's efforts before deciding on a course of action. The ATPAC group was also tasked to come up with 2 top action items to be done concerning this issue. NASA will reach out to NTSB, Chair will clarify with Bob Tarter what the ultimate objective of Partnership for Safety is. **Status Update:** *Chair sent letter out and got no response as of yet. Danny to get copy of letter to Kerry, to give to Dennis to follow up with upper management. Danny to follow up with Kim re: status of initiative with partnership for safety*

**Action:** Link was sent to members for Eurocontrol Callsign similarity website.

**Status Update:** More information about the EUROCONTROL Call Sign Similarity service can be found at: [http://www.cfm.eurocontrol.int/cfm/public/standard\\_page/cfm\\_programmes\\_css.html](http://www.cfm.eurocontrol.int/cfm/public/standard_page/cfm_programmes_css.html) **This item will be closed.**

**141 – All Actions complete. AOC Closed.** Kim Cardosi will be asked to brief at ATPAC #142 on human factor study.

**142** - Kim Cardosi Report Human factors Study - working with UAL but with merger they have been set back to square one and further set back with changes to safety office. ATSA reports have increased on this – industry has to make changes. FAA going to AJE Tiger Team to develop plan of action – **Moved to Re occurring Agenda.**

**143 - AOC 123-7 Four Digit Express Carrier Call Signs** - Kim Cardosi reported to ATPAC chair issues continue. ATPAC chair stated issue discussed at PFS. She will get a full report for ATPAC #144.

**144 - AOC 123-7 Four Digit Express Carrier Call Signs** - Kim Cardosi reported to ATPAC chair issues continue. **ATPAC #144 Status Update:** ATPAC chair stated issue discussed at PFS. She will get a full report for ATPAC #145.



## AREA OF CONCERN 126-2

01/09/07

**SAFETY:** No

**SUBJECT:** Procedures for Use of Time to Meet Restrictions

**DISCUSSION:** The committee looked at current regulations that mandate the controller must issue the clock time to the restricted aircraft and the time the aircraft must comply with the given restriction.

**128 -** The committee discussed the AOC with its submitter, Mr. Bill Holtzman from ZDC. The discussion centered around the need for a time hack when issuing a time based restriction. It was agreed that no change would be appropriate in the oceanic or non-radar environs but that omission of the additional verbiage in a radar environment would reduce controller transmissions, pilot misunderstandings, and add clarity.

**129 -** David Young advised that several versions of proposed DCPs have been presented to his management for their consideration.

**130 -** David Young's organization would not concur on ATPAC recommendation based on what may have been incomplete information. David Young will re-address the issue based on ATPAC feedback and report at #131.

**131 -** A memo will be written and addressed to ATO-E for their review that outlines the committee's recommendation.

**RECOMMENDATION:** ATPAC opined that giving the aircraft a time to reach/leave an altitude followed by the minutes needed to achieve would suffice and not complicating the issue with clock time.

ATPAC RECOMMENDATION TO ATO-E REGARDING PROCEDURES FOR USE OF TIME TO MEET RESTRICTIONS. ATPAC AREA OF CONCERN (AOC) 126-2.

First, the committee would like to address some of the misconceptions about this proposal. Arguments have been heard about whether or not it is reliable control technique to use computer-generated, predictive "vector lines" to evaluate the time till routes cross. Similarly, arguments have been heard about whether it is employing "positive control" at all to issue an altitude crossing restriction which might in any way seem close to the capability of the aircraft. While we think of those situations more in a climb situation than a descent, similar risks exist in both. The Committee makes no effort to insert itself into the evaluation of how one might "ensure" positive control in such a situation. It is a moot point to consider those issues anyway, based on the fact that there is already such a clearance provided for in the 7110.65.

Also, it is important to note that the above arguments exist without regard to the verbiage one uses with which to refer to the clearance limit time by which we instruct the aircraft to achieve the required altitude. Those arguments apply as surely with our current phraseology as they would with that which is proposed. There is no additional control inherent in one description of a time event over that inherent in any other way of describing that same time.

Separately and distinct from the above issues, the Committee chooses to address the situation of how to describe it once the decision has been made to clear an aircraft to achieve an altitude by a particular moment in time. Such a moment can be described in a number of ways, two of which are: referring to a specific time on the controller's clock on the one hand ("Climb to reach FL350 by 1525Z; time now 1522 and three quarters"), and on the other hand, referring to the passage of a specific period of time after a radio transmission ("Climb to reach FL 350 in two minutes").

The Committee believes that the benefits of the proposed version of a time description include: eliminating the need for UTC references, eliminating the excess verbiage created by the time check, and eliminating the mental math required on the part of the controller in order to compute the time limit and on the part of the pilot in order to evaluate, then record and/or remember the difference between the airplane's clock and the controller's clock and to continue to apply that difference for the length of time it takes to achieve the altitude. The proposed phraseology would provide additional accuracy by replacing the relatively coarse units

of a quarter minute with the accuracy with which one can read a sweep second hand (which is required equipment on all IFR aircraft).

The Committee also wishes to note that the proposed time description is already in relatively common use in the field, despite its variance from the currently-prescribed phraseology. Thus the proposed phraseology is, much to the chagrin of some, well-tested. While never valid as a reason to approve an idea, the fact that it has been in use already for a long time has provided an opportunity to uncover unanticipated problems. The Committee was not able to identify any.

**Committee Recommendation:** ATPAC recommends that the phraseology change in this proposal would be a positive one which would improve the precision of a control clearance, reduce the verbiage necessary to issue the clearance, make it easier for the controller to describe to the pilot, and make compliance easier for the pilot, both in understanding and in its accomplishment.

**132** - ATO-R will be invited to brief at Mtg #133

**133** - This issue will be addressed pending staffing increases in the PDG.

**134** - The following was provided by En Route prior to the meeting: "The initial DCP for this should be written in the next two weeks." Kerry Rose (PDG) to provide completed DCP or update.

**135** - Not discussed at this meeting. Update provided by Don Kemp prior to meeting and sent out in Pre-read – Preliminary DCPs have been written to change FAAO JO 7110.65 paragraph 4-5-7, AIM Paragraph 4-4-10, Adherence to Clearance, and AIP Paragraph ENR 1.1- 31, Adherence to Clearance. These changes have been sent to En Route SOS for review and approval before being sent out for comment. Research is also being done on the ICAO differences in Document 4444. Estimated publication change in the FAAO JO 7110.65, AIM, and AIP is February 11, 2010.

**136** - Not discussed at this meeting. Update provided by AJR before meeting and sent out in Pre-read briefing – En Route SOS (AJE-31) is still making revisions to the proposed change. Estimated publication of change in FAA Order JO 7110.65, AIM, and AIP has been pushed back until July 29, 2010.

**137** - Not discussed at this meeting. Estimated publication of change in FAA Order JO 7110.65, AIM, and AIP has been pushed back until March 10, 2011. Copy of initial DCP given out at meeting for members' review.

**138** - Not discussed at this meeting. Publication anticipated in Change 2, March 10, 2011.

**139** - Not discussed at this meeting. Publication anticipated August 25, 2011.

**140** - Deferred to Meeting #142

**141** - DCP is to change phraseology in 7110.65, The current phraseology is cumbersome. All LOB's signed off. David Boone, AJS non-concurred he wanted a new SRMD panel to be held. He said the DCP dealt with separation issues and needed a full SRMD not a SRMDM. He stated he had QA data to back up his statement.

**142** - Time to Climb Safety Panel meeting was less than successful. Danny Augerre, ATPAC Chairman; Andy Brand Alpha, Senior UAL Pilot and Ben Rich, Senior Pilot attended for ATPAC at their companies expense. En Route sent Larry Green who wrote the original SRMDM to rewrite the SRMD. David Boone did not attend. His representative, Mike Faltsek, did not have any data and was not prepared to address the issue. Since 1983 they have been trying to change the phraseology for Time to Climb. Safety's statement of an increase risk was not proven. Danny will email D. Boone.

**143 - AOC-126-2 Procedures for Use of Time to Climb/Meet Restrictions.** D. Boone contacted Gary Norek and requested all AJV and ATPAC historical records. He stated he was directing Miter to do a study and collect data for a new Safety Panel to review DCP. ATPAC Chair stated she would contact D. Boone at end of month to get status.

**144 - AOC-126-2 Procedures for Use of Time to Climb/Meet Restrictions.** D. Boone contacted Gary Norek and requested all AJV and ATPAC historical records. He stated he was directing Miter to do a study and collect data for a new Safety Panel to review DCP. ATPAC Chair stated she would contact D. Boone at

end of month to get status. **ATPAC #144 Status Update:** David Boone, AJI had not responded to any of Danny's emails or calls on "Time to Climb" AOC and MITRE reported no studies were initialized on this subject. Danny contacted Rick Durcharme. Rick said he would investigate and get back to Danny.

## **AREA OF CONCERN 141-1**

**06/21/11**

**SAFETY: No**

**SUBJECT: Runway Guard Lights (RGL)**

**DISCUSSION: 141** –Doug Thomas, IPA presented new AOC. Bruce McGray, AFS-410 spoke of the inconsistent use of equipment. AFS-410 wants more specific feedback. Bruce will coordinate with Airports group to come to next meeting, Danny will extend invitation. All groups request feedback from membership. There was a motion to accept and seconded. ATPAC will request information from their member groups on this issue. Status: Airport Rep invited. Power point presentation

AIM does not have A380 only runway markings ALPHA set to AFS-420 SFO, IAD, SEA Bruce McGray asked Airports about these issues and provided answers to Doug Thomas Louisville Airport misuse of airport markings and the A380 markings. Issues will be further discussed at ATPAC #142 in October. Bruce will forward name of Airports SME to Danny who will invite Airports to discuss issues. Airports showed for morning but did not stay for the rest of the meeting. Agenda item was deferred until ATPAC #143

**142** - Power point briefing. (Bruce McGray Philip Saenger) Harvey Hartmann will check data base on reports on airport markings and lights. AFS will check to see if any FSDO violations. Marc Gillian is attending a meeting with IAD will get feedback on airport marking and lights.

**143 - AOC 141-1 Runway Guard Lights (RGL)** Doug Thoman, IPA presented new AOC. Bruce McGray, AFS-410 spoke of the inconsistent use of equipment. ATPAC # 143 Status Update: Marc Gillman met with IAD did not find any issues with airport markings any longer. Harvey Hartmann checked data base for any write up on airport markings (see attached). Bruce McGray checked FSDO database no reports. IPA stated still issue at SDF. Gary stated he would take direct action on this. Doug Thoman again brought up SDF issue, Gary Norek said he would take an action item on this. Bruce McGray discussed some other issues such as Detroit re-wiring. Some 80 plus airports have issues.

**Guests from Runway Safety WG Herb Kind and Meigs** discussed focus of their group. Stated some Terminals have very well written SOPs regarding control instruction and they hope to get all airports to follow this standard. But may only be a short term fix. Bruce McGray ALPA stated old rules for training of pilots, ‘you never cross double yellow line and don’t cross red ever ‘without clearance and now they are breaking these rules with the new airport markings.

Dan Bartlett, NTSB, discussed Professional Communication via Phraseology training for pilots and CPCs. NTSB may want to turn this into a mandate to FAA. ALPA and NATCA welcomes NTSB recommendations use of slang and non-acknowledgment by pilots with call sign is a problem in the NAS. NATCA stated CPCs go through multiple over the shoulders and tape talks on phraseology. Dan state NTSB looking for NAS wide solution. DoD and ATPAC factions stated they also have reoccurring training on phraseology. NTSB stated IATA would like to be involved because of the confusion to international pilots.

**144 - AOC 141-1 Runway Guard Lights (RGL)** Doug Thoman, IPA presented new AOC example at SDF. Bruce McGray, AFS-410 spoke of the inconsistent use of equipment. Bruce McGray discussed some other issues such as Detroit re-wiring and stated some 80 plus airports have issues with inconsistent markings. **ATPAC #144 Status Update:** Bruce presented power point briefing and through this demonstrated how large this problem on confusion of hold lines is becoming in the NAS. He stated there is no common agreement in the FAA. He showed where RWSL DCP does not answer the problem and used examples form the 7110.65, AIM and 7110.118 to show need for plain language. He questioned how we can elevate the problem and expedite the changes. Airport representation must be part of the solution and stated that AAS-1 needs to be briefed. Bob Lamond and Marc Gittleman second that this become a Safety Item. Harvey and ATSAP will see if they can gather data on this issue and draw up a list of airports. Gary will email Herb King and get status of his work group and see if they are addressing this issue. PPT attached.

## AREA OF CONCERN 143-1

02/7/12

**SAFETY:** No

**SUBJECT:** Use of 'Descend Via [STAR] and maintain [altitude]' phraseology – Nav Canada Bulletin.

**DISCUSSION:** ALPA submitted AOC 143-1 Use of 'Descend Via [STAR] and maintain [altitude]' phraseology in Nav Canada Bulletin. Nav Canada issued an ATC Information Bulletin on the important North American differences regarding SID and STAR altitude restrictions for new Canadian procedures that are to go into effect 9 February 2012. In the bulletin NAV Canada provides several exemplar clearances with their associated requirements. The area of concern is the second FAA example shown below: DESCEND VIA {STAR designator) AND MAINTAIN\ altitudes

ALPA's concern is that this phraseology is not discussed in the .65 or the AIM and in ALPA's opinion is incorrect/ misleading. First, we believe that the above phraseology does not conform to any of the 'descend via' examples in the .65 or the AIM. Secondly, since the introduction of the 'descend via' clearance pilots have been trained that when issued a 'descend via' clearance that they must comply with all restrictions of the STAR, unless issued an 'except' to that clearance. ALPA believes that the introduction of this bulletin may generate confusion among pilots and controllers. Even in the FAA's Mandatory Briefing Item 12-01, the FAA states that "if ATC assigns an altitude to the aircraft following a STAR, whether or not "DESCEND VIA" has been issued, any published altitude restrictions are cancelled unless reissued by ATC." This is not in line with the example of 'descend via' in the .65 or the AIM.

### **Some issues associated with this practice are:**

1. If the 'descend via [STAR] and maintain [altitude]' is used, controllers can expect pilots who have not seen the bulletin to comply with the restrictions on the STAR until reaching the assigned altitude.
2. If the 'descend via [STAR] and maintain [altitude]' is used, controllers can expect pilots who have seen the bulletin to descend unrestricted to the assigned altitude.

**SUGGESTED ATP AC ACTION:** Discuss the subject and present a draft definition to the FAA for coordination.

### **RECOMMENDATION;**

1. Ensure the phraseology contained in the example above is not used by controllers.
2. Reinforce to controllers that if there is no need for a pilot to comply with the altitudes on a STAR that the clearance should just be a 'descend and maintain' clearance.

**Discussion:** FAA contended not written by FAA and not in accordance with FAA directives. Nav Canada made a mistake. However other ATPAC members, NATCA and ALPA contended that CPCs may use this phraseology identified by Canada in error and need to be trained on expected phraseology to use. ALPA moved to accept AOC and was seconded by NATCA.

### **144 - AOC 143-1 Use of 'Descend Via [STAR] and maintain [altitude]' phraseology in Nav Canada Bulletin.**

Nav Canada issued an ATC Information Bulletin on the important North American differences regarding SID and STAR altitude restrictions for new Canadian procedures that are to go into effect 9 February 2012. In the bulletin NAV Canada provides several exemplar clearances with their associated requirements. The area of concern is the second FAA example shown below: DESCEND VIA {STAR designator) AND MAINTAIN\ altitudes, **Discussion:** FAA contends that this was not written by FAA and not in accordance with FAA directives. Nav Canada mistake, however other ATPAC members, NATCA and ALPA contended that CPCs may use this phraseology in error and need to be trained on new phraseology. ALPA moved to accept AOC and was seconded by NATCA. **ATPAC #144 UPDATE: John Dutton/Mike Hilbert** The attached documents address document change proposals (approved) made to FAAO JO 7110.65 related to Climb via/Descend via/ speed,

effective August 15, 2012 delay due to PARC request for pilot training. ICAO IGIA response is led by Jim Arrighi, RNAV/RNP. See attached documents. AOC will remain open to see how these changes affect the NAS. Harvey will pull reports after change is implemented for the ATPAC #145.