

**AERONAUTICAL CHARTING MEETING (ACM)
MEETING 19-01 April 23, 2019
HOST: Air Line Pilots Association, International (ALPA)
535 Herndon Pkwy, Herndon, VA 20170**

Instrument Procedures Group Meeting Minutes

1. **Opening Remarks:** John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM, and welcomed the Instrument Procedure Group (IPG) to the Aeronautical Charting Meeting (ACM) 19-01. John Bordy thanked Darrel Pennington of ALPA, for allowing the ACM to use the ALPA facility.
2. **Welcoming Comments:** Darrel Pennington, ALPA, welcomed the group and provided administrative information related to the ALPA facility.
3. **Introductions:** Attendees introduced themselves and organizations they represented. A [sign-in roster](#) was circulated, and contact information was captured/updated.
4. **Review of Minutes from Last Meeting, ACM 18-02:** Steve VanCamp, Pragmatics, briefed there were no comments received regarding the draft minutes from ACM 18-02, and solicited any final comments by May 6, 2019. With no comments received, the minutes from ACM 18-02 are accepted.
5. **Informational Briefings:**
 - a. Status Update of 8260-series orders and Order 7910.5: John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, provided a status of several policy documents:
 - (1) Order 7910.5D, Aeronautical Charting Forum. Briefed from attached [slide](#). John Bordy mentioned the primary purpose of this document is to establish a forum to enable interaction between the FAA and the aviation community related to both aeronautical charting and the design of instrument flight procedures (IFPs). The order is currently under revision, and the new version, Order 7910.5E, will change the name of the order to, “Aeronautical Charting Meeting.” It will also remove the requirement for the FAA to provide public notice of upcoming meetings within the Federal Register. Background on why these changes are being made was provided. TJ Nichols, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, encouraged participants to provide feedback to the FAA if they believe the ACM is beneficial since there is some pressure within the Department of Transportation to reduce meetings. Expected publication for Order 7910.5E is October 2019.
 - (2) Order 8260.3D, U.S. Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPs). Briefed from attached [slide](#). Order 8260.3E draft version is currently being written, with the expected changes shown on the slide. It’s anticipated the draft will be complete in June 2019, and will then enter the FAA’s coordination process, which is the precursor to publication. The coordination process normally takes seven to nine months. Gary Fiske, AJV-82, asked about deleting RNAV (RNP) as a type of procedure eligible for close parallel approach operations requiring precision runway monitoring (PRM). John Bordy will send out an email to participants

describing the reason for prohibiting RNAV (RNP) procedures from participating in PRM approach operations.

(3) Order 8260.19H, Flight Procedures and Airspace. Briefed from attached [slide](#). Order 8260.19I draft version is in coordination with expected changes shown on the slide. This was originally going to be a change 2 to Order 8260.19H; however, due to the number of changes, the document had to be renamed. John Bordy indicated the primary purpose of this change is to standardize Performance Based Navigation (PBN) notes that are documented on PBN flight procedures. Estimated publication for Order 8260.19I is August 2019. Lev Prichard, APA, inquired about limited access for industry to meetings and groups like the STAR Working Group (WG) and the Departure Working Group (DWG), and the lack of interaction that occurs between those WGs and industry. John Bordy said these WGs are part of the US-IFPP, which is a governmental group, but they do reach out to industry when discussing significant changes. Lev asked about the change that will allow expected altitudes on STARs; John Bordy indicated this change will allow them only for STARs that do not contain any fix crossing altitude. John Bordy took an action to ask the STAR WG lead to contact Lev about his concerns. Gary McMullin, SWA, echoed Lev's concern about expected altitudes, and recommended the WGs be more inclusive with industry when considering changes to policies. John Bordy said the US-IFPP working groups will discuss enhanced industry participation in the future. Lev stressed the benefit of industry involvement early in the process. Rich suggested having other groups (e.g., PARC, PCPSI, etc.) provide informational briefings at the ACM would be beneficial, John Bordy said it will be considered.

(4) Order 8260.43C, Flight Procedures Management Program. Briefed from attached [slide](#). This order was published in April with significant changes introduced for requesting new procedures, or for requesting amendments to existing procedures. The Regional Airspace and Procedures Team (RAPT) is discontinued, and instead an Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Validation Team will validate IFP requests at the Service Centers. The IFP Information Gateway¹ is now the primary means to request IFPs and amendments to IFPs. A significant change introduced by this order is the establishment of a national IFP prioritization team; this team will prioritize all valid IFP requests and establish the national production schedule. John Bordy recommend everyone review this document if they had a role or interest in the previous RAPT process. Rune Duke, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association (AOPA), mentioned that under Order 8260.43B, the military and industry could participate in RAPT meetings and discussion; he asked if this will still be permitted under the new system. John Bordy mentioned he wasn't sure, but would contact the OPR for Order 8260.43C to find out. John Collins said it would be nice if coordination documents on the IFP Gateway (that is, IFP forms and documents) remained available as a historical reference on what changes were made and how procedures were developed for a procedure. Rich Boll concurred, by stating it would be helpful to have continued access to forms, maps, and documents that are normally included in the original coordination packages. John Bordy stated he would pass this recommendation on. John Bordy will pass this on to AJV-5. Rich, NBAA, commented that 60 days for a public comment period on the IFP gateway is sometimes insufficient if a problem is discovered. John Bordy said he will pass this concern to the coordination team within AJV-A.

¹ https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/procedures/

(5) Order 8260.46G, Departure Procedure Program. Briefed from attached [slide](#). This was recently published, and Change 1 is being drafted with expected changes as noted.

(6) Order 8260.58A, U.S. Standard for Performance Based Instrument Procedure Design. Briefed from attached [slide](#). Order 8260.58B is being drafted with expected changes as noted.

b. Subscribing to IFP Policy Updates. Briefed from attached [slide](#), which shows the Flight Standards web page to subscribe to receive notifications related to new IFP policies. John Bordy suggested individuals or organizations interested in reviewing new or draft policies should subscribe.

c. ICAO Instrument Flight Procedures Panel (IFPP) Report. Briefed from attached [slide](#). ICAO is working to mature PBN requirement notes and accuracies for annotation on PBN charts just as the U.S. is doing. NavSpecs and accuracies on PBN procedures are both very broad, with some confusion and are being worked. RNP AR departure criteria is being developed for incorporation into Document 9905. SID and STAR transition policy development is ongoing, and while there isn't currently any ICAO policy for transition, some countries have their own policies and do include them on SIDs/STARs. "Visual Approach with Prescribed RNAV Track" is similar to the U.S. RNAV visual flight procedures, and development of a concept of operations in that area is ongoing (primarily through the Flight Operations Panel). ICAO is attempting to address a shortage of unique alphanumeric identifiers for Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes (e.g., Victor airways, T-routes, Q-routes, etc); some of the ideas being considered is the introduction of new letters that can be used to identify airways, and well as repurposing underutilized letters.

d. RF/TF Concurrent Operations Background and Charting. Gary McMullin, SWA, briefed using [slides](#). He discussed the background of the FAA asking the PARC Navigation Working Group (WG) to examine possible solutions for allowing concurrent charting of RF/TF legs from the downwind to the final approach course of a procedure. In general, the concept is to chart both an RF segment, as well as a series of TF segments (that essentially follow the same flight path) on a single chart. Gary displayed three chart examples being considered by the WG, but stressed those are concepts only, and that a preferred option is still being researched. Some factors being considered for determining a preferred option include database coding, equipment capabilities, costs versus benefits, and training requirements for certificate holders and for general aviation. Significant discussion followed related to human factor concerns, air traffic control clearances, procedure names, aircraft capabilities, etc. Rich Boll, NBAA, said the greatest hindrance to flying RF legs is not incapability of FMS systems, rather it is because of the FAA requirement to have an electronic map display for RF legs. Rich indicated this effort wouldn't be needed if Flight Standards removed the map display requirement from AC 90-105A. Rich stated we should be looking at removing the map requirement and perhaps using autopilot or flight director as a mitigation; he believes this would be much cheaper than the concept being proposed. Gary agreed we should explore this option. Lev Prichard, APA, mentioned some of these issues were brought up at recent Communications, Navigation, and Surveillance (CNS) meeting; however, Flight Standards has reduced participation within the CNS, therefore another avenue of communication has been lost. John Bordy will research and report on policy for FS attendance at the CNS. Due to significant interest with this item, this will be added as a briefing item at ACM 19-02.

6. Old Business (Open Issues):

a. 12-01-301: Publishing a Vertical Descent Angle (VDA) with 34:1 Surface Penetrations in the Visual Segment. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): A historical summary of the issue was provided. John Blair, Flight Operations Group, indicated his action to add additional information within the AIM was completed, with the information published in February 2019. The addition to the AIM explains that commercial charts/navigation database may contain VDAs even though the government doesn't provide this information. John Bordy informed the group that a change is being made to Order 8260.19 to prevent the charting of a "stipple" whenever flight inspection has directed removal of a VDA; this change will be published in Order 8260.19I. Once the change is issued to prevent charting of a stipple (when directed by flight inspection), the definition of a stipple within the legend of the FAA's Terminal Procedures Publication would require revision. Valerie Watson indicated AIS will submit a change to the charting specification to indicate that absence of a stipple indicates either the 34:1 surface is not clear, or there are visual segment obstacles. John Bordy recommend this item be closed since the original issue has been addressed; no objections to closure were received from the group so this item is closed.

Action Item: NA

Status: Item closed.

b. 13-02-312: Equipment Requirement Notes on Instrument Approach Procedures. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): Summary of the issue given. Discussion over past few years has turned more toward PBN requirements notes. Enhanced guidance for annotating PBN requirement notes on approach procedures and STARs have been added to draft Order 8260.19I. Explanation for the PBN requirements box has been added to the Terminal Procedures Publication legend and the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM). Joel Dickinson, Flight Operations Group, indicated he has not received any recent feedback related to PBN requirement notes, therefore we are now just waiting for the Order 8260.19I to be published. Rich Boll, NBAA, inquired about confusing entries on non-PBN approach procedures related to equipment annotation related to procedure entry and when such equipment may also be needed to fly the missed approach segment. John Bordy believes this was also corrected in the draft Order 8260.19I, but took an action to ensure it was corrected and to provide a copy of that section to Rich prior to the draft entering external coordination.

Action Item: John Bordy to provide Rich Boll, NBAA, sections from draft Order 8260.19I related to both equipment requirement notes and PBN requirement notes.

Status: Item open.

c. **15-01-320: Common Sounding Fix Names.** John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): Original examples with similar sounding fix names have been corrected. The [IFP Gateway](#) is available to any user (pilots, ATC, etc.) to request amendments to procedures and/or fix names. John Bordy said he reviewed the Order 8260.19 and is unsure if additional guidance is needed there to address this issue since the requirement to avoid similar sounding fix names within 300 NM of each other is already within Order JO 7400.2. One of the challenges of the 300 NM rule is that the search must be performed manually within the FAA, since there is no automation tool available. Such a tool appears to be feasible, since there are web sites that will allow you to look for similar spelled and sounding fix names already (e.g., www.airnav.com); similar technology to assist the FAA should be explored (John Bordy action to continue looking into this). John Bordy mentioned new reports of similar sounding fix names received through the Aviation Safety Reporting System (ASRS) appear to be routed through the appropriate FAA offices, to include the controlling ATC facility, ATO Safety, Flight Standards, and Aeronautical Information Services (AIS). Some fixes have been amended based on ASRS reports; however, a single report may not necessarily result in an amendment. Lev Prichard, APA, mentioned pilots don't always fill out Aviation Safety Action Program (ASAP) forms or ASRS reports, therefore a single report may hide the fact that there could have been multiple instances of an issue (for example, with similar sounding fix names). Lev said they have experience taking ASAP reports directly to ATC facilities to show them a problem exists with fix names; however, ATC facilities often have no desire to change the fix names. Lev indicated when reports are received, they need to be treated seriously so that someone does something to correct the underlying issue. John Bordy mentioned has recently put more emphasis in routing and tracking issues reported through the ASRS. He also stressed that everyone has the ability to make a formal request to change instrument flight procedure via IFP Gateway; if the desired response is not forthcoming from the FAA, then issue may need to be elevated using the Order 8260.43 process. Gary Fiske, AJV-82 (contract support), mentioned that perhaps the ability of an ATC facility to retain certain fix names that have been reported needs to be taken out of their hands if the problem fixes are near each other. John Bordy asked Gary Fiske who within the FAA can direct the facilities to do that. Robert Connell, AJV-14, responded by saying their office and the Western Service Area corrected three pairs of fixes reported through the IFP Gateway within the past year. He agreed the IFP Gateway is the formal mechanism to request changes, but stressed that it is helpful to attach safety documentation to the request (e.g., ASRS, ASAP, ATSAP, reports) to increase the priority of the requested amendment. TJ Nichols, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, said the requirement to avoid similar sounding names already exists, however the point at which the names are checked in the procedure design process may need to change. This may need to be resolved before looking at a software solution. John Collins said it would be helpful if there was a "report similar sounding fix name" link on the IFP Gateway. John Bordy then displayed the IFP Gateway for the entire audience and provided a quick walk-through on how to request new procedures or amendments, and how to submit an inquiry related to instrument flight procedures. John Collins was not sure how many pilots know about the IFP Gateway. John Bordy mentioned that the recent publication of Order 8260.43C established the Gateway as the official means to request new procedures or amendments, however agreed that an FAA order is not the best medium for informing the public and that perhaps a companion advisory circular is needed. Valerie Watson, AJV-A, mentioned the same email address that is on the IFP Gateway (for submitting inquiries) are on FAA developed publications for use when reporting charting errors and recommendations. Rune Duke mentioned

AOPA has a fact sheet out describing the IFP Gateway's purpose, but an advisory circular could be helpful. Lev stated ASRS is not inclusive of everything reported through ASAP or ASIAs; John Bordy took an action to determine how those are routed. Ron Haag, AJV-A, mentioned the Aeronautical Information Portal was just implemented and can be used for submitting inquiries related to flight procedures as well. Valerie Watson added that language on the portal could possibly be improved to be more intuitive to the user; she agreed to look into this and report back.

Action Items:

- John Bordy will research feasibility of a software solution to conduct checks for similar sounding fix names.
- John Bordy to report if an advisory circular is needed to mirror some of the information within Order 8260.43.
- John Bordy took an action to look at routing of the ASAP reports.
- Valerie Watson to determine if language on the the Aeronautical Information Portal could be improved to be more intuitive to the user.

Status: Item open.

d. 15-02-323: Depiction of Low, Close-in Obstacles on SIDs & ODPs. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. Valerie Watson, AJV-A, advised the takeoff obstacle notes have been removed from all SIDs. John Bordy stated the US-IFPP Departure Working Group (DWG) is working on a concept that would result in removal of all low close-in obstacle notes from charts. The concept is to replace low, close-in obstacle notes with a published departure end of runway crossing height (up to 200 feet AGL) that would clear all low, close-in obstacles. For aircraft unable to meet the crossing height, a ceiling and minimum visibility option will be provided. The departure criteria lead within the DWG is currently working to mature the concept, and intends to conduct a safety risk management assessment. Several participants indicated they are concerned that recently the Air Traffic Organization (ATO) has not allowed them to participate as panel members during safety risk management assessments, however T.J. Nichols, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, indicated that Aviation Safety's safety risk management process isn't identical to the ATO. If the new concept isn't fully accepted, then the DWG will continue to explore other options. John Bordy stated that invites for the meeting should be forthcoming soon. Valerie Watson, AJV-A, asked if we remove these obstacles from charting, will they still be available somewhere else for departure planning of one engine inoperative; John Bordy indicated that the data will still exist, but perhaps further discussion is needed on how that can be made available.

Action Item: John Bordy will report DWG progress/actions on this effort.

Status: Item open.

e. **16-01-325: Priority of Terminal Procedure Amendments.** John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. A completely new process is now in for prioritizing the production schedule of all procedures within the NAS as described within the recently published Order 8260.43C. ATC facilities can now add input for priority. John Bordy indicated new language has been added to draft Order 8260.19I reiterating that STAR NOTAMs are limited to 224 days as currently described within Order 7930.2, Notices to Airmen (NOTAM). Language has also been added to inform designers that STAR amendments must be submitted as soon as possible after NOTAM issuance. At the previous ACM meeting, it was asked why IFP P-NOTAMs could not be used to effect amendments to STARs and SIDs (currently not allowed by policy). John Bordy stated the idea has merit, and will be introduced as a new agenda item at the US-IFPP in June. John Bordy asked Rich Boll if he was amendable to closing this item in light of the recent publication of Order 8260.43C and the new language within draft Order 8260.19I. Rich Boll stated this issue could be closed, but that he would like a new item introduced (for tracking purposes) related to the proposal to expand use of P-NOTAMs to STARs and SIDs.

Action Item:

- John Bordy will submit a new agenda item to the US-IFPP with a proposal to allow use of IFP P-NOTAMS for STARs and SIDs.
- John Bordy will draft a new agenda item for the next ACM related to the proposal to expand use of IFP P-NOTAMS for STARs and SIDs.

Status: Item open

f. **16-01-326: FAA Order 8260.46F, “Top Altitude” Charting Constraints.** John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. The original recommendation to allow two top altitudes per airport served by a SID was not accepted, instead the FAA currently permits two top altitudes per named-SID, regardless of how many airports the SID serves. There are plans to amend the current policy to allow three top altitudes per SID, provided no more than two of them are numerical values, while the third would be limited to “assigned by ATC”. Gary McMullin, Southwest Airlines, indicated he still has a concern about the FAA’s use of “assigned by ATC” as a top altitude, however he stated his concern will be worked through the PARC’s Pilot Controller Procedures and Systems Integration (PCPSI) working group. Gary Fiske, AJV-8 (contract support), asked for clarification if Flight Standards is indeed moving forward immediately with allowing three top altitudes. John Bordy stated three top altitudes will be added to the next iteration of Order 8260.46. Based on the original recommendation not being accepted, and the subsequent actions related to previous discussions being complete, John Bordy suggested closing this item. No objections to closure were received from the group so this item is closed.

Action Item: NA

Status: Item closed.

g. 16-02-327: Arrival Holding Patterns Required for Approach Entry. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. He indicated language has been added to draft Order 8260.19I to allow arrival holding patterns at feeder fixes, as well language to encourage designers to place fixes on airways that will allow entry from both arrival directions. Chart note options to accompany the arrival holding patterns were posted on the ACM-IPG website to solicit feedback; two individuals provided feedback to Rich Boll, NBAA. Rich Boll displayed [slides](#) showing five options for chart notes and asked for a show of hands indicating preference. The group voted for the option #5 example, which states: “**Proc NA via V343 northeast bound without holding at JOXIT. ATC CLNC REQD**”. This note will be referred to the US-IFPP 19-02 meeting as the preference of the ACM-IPG. Rich Boll indicated completion of draft AIM language to support this proposal is awaiting final determination of the note.

Action Item: John Bordy will refer the selection of the note to the US-IFPP in June to obtain concurrence and report back.

Status: Item open.

h. 16-02-328: Increasing Complexity of Speed Restriction Notes on SIDs & STARs. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. John Bordy mentioned speed restriction notes examples were amended within the recent publication of Order 8260.46G (applicable to departures), but that he still needs to add standardized examples to draft Order 8260.19I before it enters external coordination.

Action Item: John Bordy will work on draft Order 8260.19I and report on status.

Status: Item open.

i. 17-02-329: Need for CNF at Terminus of Dead Reckoning (heading) Segment. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. There was no change to status due to the cancellation of US-IFPP 19-01. This will be discussed at the next US-IFPP meeting in June.

Action Item: John Bordy will present at US-IFPP 19-02.

Status: Item open.

j. 17-02-330: Climb gradients for Standard Instrument Departures. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. Recommendations from ACM WGs were referred to the US-IFPP Departure Working Group (DWG). The recommendation to calculate (but not publish) a climb gradient that would be required to meet an ATC crossing altitude restriction and to obtain AFS approval if more than 500 ft/NM was published within Order 8260.46G (published Nov 2018). The second part of the recommendation, which is to publish climb gradients necessary to meet ATC crossing altitude restrictions, is still actively being discussed within the DWG, and more information related to whether or not this recommendation will be accepted should be available by ACM meeting 19-02. Valerie Watson, AJV-A, asked what the specific objection is to charting a climb

gradient. A lengthy discussion followed related to historical practices related to charting obstacle and ATC crossing restrictions, in addition to how the FAA currently publishes climb gradients, which as of now, is only done for obstacle clearance purposes (exception is for LNAV engagement to 500 ft AGL). Rich Boll, NBAA, questioned the adequacy of the 500 ft/NM value for determination of when FS approval is needed since he believes higher field elevations may dictate a lower value; John Bordy took an action to refer this to the DWG and to request the DWG consult with performance engineers on this issue.

Action Items:

- John Bordy will report on DWG progress on the issue.
- John Bordy will ask the DWG to consult with performance engineers to examine the 500 ft/NM value used for determining when FS approval is required. Concern is whether this is adequate for higher elevation airports.

Status: Item open.

k. 17-02-331: Visibility/Climb Gradient Requirements for Takeoff. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. John Bordy indicated a new requirement was added to the periodic review section of draft Order 8260.19I to ensure takeoff minimums are consistent SIDs from the same runway that share similar initial runways. John Bordy reported that scheduled amendments to the BOACH and SHEAD SIDs were cancelled, as those two procedures will now be cancelled (and replaced) as part of a larger project in 2020.

Action Item: John Bordy will report on status of issue.

Status: Item open.

l. 18-01-333: Special Authorization Category I (SA CAT I) and Special Authorization Category II (SA CAT II) Chart Note Change. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. Order 8400.13E was already published with the note change included. Draft Order 8260.19I has been drafted with new note format with target publication in August 2019. John Bordy asked Doug Dixon, Flight Operations Group, if this item could be closed; he indicated no objection to closure.

Action Item: NA

Status: Item closed.

m. 18-01-334: Charting PBN Requirement Box on RNAV DPs and STARs. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. Valerie Watson, AJV-A, indicated that IAC charting specifications will be drafted once verbiage within Order 8260.19I is drafted indicating what procedure developers are required to annotate. STAR PBN requirements notes have been added to the draft Order 8260.19I, and John Bordy will forward the draft verbiage to Valerie. Departure PBN requirements notes are being drafted for Order 8260.46G, Change 1; this should be complete by June with expected publication approximately seven to nine months after that. A question was raised if there will also be an equipment requirements box on SIDs and STARs to indicate non-PBN requirements needed to fly the procedure. Rich Boll, NBAA, mentioned the WLKCR RNAV SID out of Van Nuys contains a DME crossing restriction, but DME is not listed as a requirement for flying the procedure. TJ Nichols, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, said Order 8260.46 will be reviewed to ensure situations like the WLKCR are addressed within policy.

Action Items:

- John Bordy will forward draft Order 8260.19 and Order 8260.46 to Valerie Watson so AJV-A can complete IAC charting specifications for PBN Requirements Boxes for RNAV DPs and STARs.
- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will compare the WLKCR SID at Van Nuys to language within Order 8260.46 to determine if adjustments to policy are needed.

Status: Item open.

n. 18-01-335: Discrepancy Between STAR and Approach Common Fix Speed and Altitude Constraints. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. Policy currently exists to require speed and altitude constraints to be identical when a STAR and approach procedure share a common fix. The HAWKZ STAR and ILS procedures used in the original recommendation as examples are scheduled for amendment in 2020 as part of a large Seattle project. Kevin Allen, AAL, mentioned they discovered a couple more instances where there are disconnects between STARs and approach procedures, and when found, they enter requests into the IFP Gateway to have the procedures corrected. Gary McMullin, SWA, said a method is needed to rapidly make simple changes to STARs (such as adding a speed constraint). John Bordy suggested this item be closed since policy already exists to prevent occurrences and since the procedures are scheduled for amendment in 2020; Darrel Pennington, AOPA, will consult with original submitter to determine if closure is acceptable.

Action Item: Darrel Pennington to advise if this item can be closed.

Status: Item open until advised by Darrel Pennington.

o. 18-02-336: Add Multiple Identifier to Certain HI Procedures. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. John Bordy indicated current policy already requires the addition of a unique alphabetical suffix to a procedure name when procedures to the same runway use the same guidance for lateral navigation (e.g., RNAV, TACAN, ILS, etc). Kevin Kessler, AFFSA mentioned that he spoke to the procedure developer for the Hill AFB procedures, and that they will take action to bring those procedures into compliance. John Bordy indicated he had yet to forward the other examples listed in the original spreadsheet to the appropriate agencies, but would do so after the ACM. John Bordy indicated he spoke to the OPR for Order 8260.3 where copter naming policy is also contained; the OPR is amendable to adding clarifying language to ensure copter procedures abide by the same requirement. Valerie Watson, AJV-A, asked if the proposed change to copter naming results in a new format since it may require changes to chart specification. John Bordy didn't believe so, but agreed to send Valerie Watson the draft policy (once complete) so she could review it.

Action Items:

- John Bordy will report on status of the open procedures from the spreadsheet presented at the last meeting.
- John Bordy will report on status of adding additional copter-naming policy within Order 8260.3.
- John Bordy will forward changes to Copter-naming procedures to Valerie Watson, AJV.

Status: Item open.

p. 18-02-337: Improve Remote Altimeter Airport Notes. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. A review of Order 8260.19 found that there's already a requirement to include a state identifier whenever confusion could exist when there's more than one city with the same name in close proximity, for example, "When local altimeter setting not received, use Springfield, MO altimeter setting..." He also mentioned that the altimeter setting frequency on the RNAV (GPS) RWY 7 procedure at Russellville, KY has been corrected (although no state identifier was added). In light of the existing Order 8260.19 requirement, and the corrections made to the frequency on the procedure used in the original recommendation, is any change to policy actually really needed? Valerie Watson, AJV-A, stated there are stand-alone weather systems that aren't at airports, and; therefore, may not be associated with a city that has an airport. She also mentioned there are cities with multiple airports, so using city/state could be ambiguous whereas identifying weather systems with an identifier would be a means to identify them uniquely. Rich Boll, NBAA, prefers using the location identifiers of the airports of where the systems are located as opposed to cities/states. Valerie Watson suggested using the identifiers of the AWOS systems as that would address the stand-alone systems as well. John Bordy mentioned these suggestions would require changes to processes within AJV-A's Instrument Flight Procedures Group, so he took an action to obtain their feedback. John Bordy indicated he would introduce this item to the IFPP for consideration.

Action Items:

- John Bordy will coordinate with AJV-A Instrument Flight Procedures Group to determine impact.
- John Bordy will brief this at the US-IFPP 19-02.

Status: Item open.

q. 18-02-339: Revision of Take-Off Obstacle Notes. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. This will involve significant policy changes related to low, close-in obstacle notes. This issue was not referred to the US-IFPP due to its cancellation in January, but will be referred to in June for discussion within the DWG. In the interim, significant policy changes are under consideration related to the new concept discussed as part of issue 15-02-323, Depiction of Low, Close-In Obstacles on SIDs and ODPs (see above). Jose Alfonso was not present to discuss Airports GIS data availability.

Action Items:

- John Bordy will provide a status of Airport GIS data availability.
- John Bordy will brief this at the US-IFPP 19-02.

Status: Item open.

r. 18-02-340: Obstruction Coordinates in Source Documentation. No action taken. Requires clarification/development of the issue.

Action Item: John Bordy will seek clarification/development of the issue.

Status: Item open.

s. 18-02-341: Chart Departure Obstacle Clearance Surface (OCS) Beginning Height. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing a summary and current status. There is no change to the current status; however, Kevin Kessler, AFFSA, agreed that their needs could likely be met if the Air Force could be granted access to FAA procedural data via AJV-A's "Toolbox" application.

Action Item: John Bordy will query if AJV-A can grant the Air Force access to their "Toolbox" application.

Status: Item open.

7. New Business (New Agenda Items):

a. 19-01-342: Charting "NA When Local Weather Not Available" for Alternate Minimums. John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing the issue for Tony Lawson, AJV-A, who was not in attendance. The current practice of annotating certain alternate minimums as "NA when local weather not available" is inconsistent. John Bordy indicated part of the reason for the inconsistency is due to an error in the Order 8260.19, whereby the determination on when the annotation was required pointed to an incorrect paragraph; this will be corrected in Order 8260.19I. John Bordy asked all attendees to review the recommendation, and to provide feedback to Tony Lawson via e-mail. Valerie Watson, AJV-A, said charting would prefer a combination of options one and three, which is AIM guidance/education, plus the general statement in the Terminal Procedure Publication (as opposed to each set of minimums). Lev Prichard, APA, added that "local weather" isn't clearly

defined. Additional discussion followed as to what type of forecast could be used when selecting an alternate (e.g., TAF, area forecast). John Bordy stated these issues will be researched and addressed as part of this issues. Rune Duke, AOPA, said this issue (as pertaining to Part 135 operators in Alaska) was mentioned as part of the recent reauthorization; John Bordy will review the reauthorization language for any pertinent information.

Action Items:

- John Bordy requests all review the issue, proposed options, and provide feedback to Tony Lawson via [e-mail](#).
- John Bordy will work with the Flight Operations Group to determine local weather requirements for selecting alternate airports.

Status: Item open.

b. 19-01-343: Clarify Text of Notes that Affect Minima. Andrew Lewis, Garmin briefed the issue from [slides](#). This issue is related to Charting Group Issue 18-02-327, but is more specific to chart notes that raise minimums (DA/MDA and/or visibility). Andrew displayed and discussed specific examples of notes from the presentation where the intent of the increases are unclear. Rich Boll, NBAA, pointed out the grammar could be interrupted differently. Gary McMullin, SWA, indicated pilots should not be required to perform math while flying to determine the correct minimums; increases to minimums should instead state the final intended values. Valerie Watson, AJV-A, indicated that regardless of what changes are made, procedure designers will need to annotate the correct minimums that are required; chart developers should not be required to calculate adjustments. Andrew then discussed procedures with step down fixes and displayed another confusing example, where it is unclear whether an increase applies to just the step down fix minimums, or to both sets of minimums. John Bordy proposed following the Charting Group Issue 18-02-327 if changes are not made with that issue *then* look at possible changes (clarification) from this RD accordingly. Michael Stromberg, UPS, reiterated Gary McMullin's earlier point, that he would prefer to see just the final value (as opposed to required increases that pilot's must add). Item is accepted.

Action Items:

- John Bordy will monitor the progress of ACM-CG Issue 16-02-327.
- John Bordy will review Order 8260.19I to identify any policy that could be improved to remove ambiguity of chart notes related to minimum increases.

Status: Item open.

8. Next Meetings:

a. ACM 19-02: Scheduled for October 22-24, 2019, host NOAA Science Center, Silver Springs, MD.

b. ACM 20-01: Scheduled for April 14-16, 2020, host NOAA Science Center, Silver Springs, MD.