## **ARTCC Boundary Data**

## MEETING 24-02

Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A311, began the <u>briefing</u> by explaining that this change came out of ACM item <u>18-01-320</u> which was a recommendation to publish Center surface boundary data for flight filing purposes. The short-term fix was to provide the requested data on the <u>AIS website</u> and in the CVS and .txt files. Since that time, the Aeronautical Data Team has been cleaning-up the boundary data to ensure it is defined by georeferenced points. Part of the issue that they are working to resolve is that there has been a confusion of terms because there is low and high charting and there are also low and high ARTCC boundaries. The plan is to take the low boundary. This will align NASR with the CSV and .txt files and accommodate NOTAM requirements and flight filing. The only difference users of this data will see is that there will be a shift in the low boundary since it is now the ground boundary. An effective date has not been set yet, but a NASR README file will be released to announce this change.

John Collins, Boeing/ForeFlight, mentioned that he was the original requestor for this data and said he uses the website to determine the ARTCC needed for flight filing, particularly for off-airport operations. When this change occurs, he said it will make sense to continue to publish this data on the <u>Center</u> <u>Surface Boundaries</u> website until users have fully transitioned to using the NASR data. Tom said he would have to investigate that.

Gary Fiske, FAA/AJV-P310, asked if the ground boundary will account for the underlying TRACON boundary. Tom explained there are a lot of other issues related to this topic. This specific change is considered a simple cleanup of published NASR data. Regarding all the other boundaries that are out there, they are used by the FAA for other purposes, but they are not put into NASR. The boundaries in NASR are used for three purposes: NOTAMs, flight filing, and charting. Gary said his concern is where the ATRCC boundaries meet and how they may not align with the TRACON boundaries which could result in inaccurate flight filing. He said only providing the ground boundaries may not capture the real picture. Tom pointed out that since they started publishing the CSV files with the ground boundaries, the problems with flight filing have been going away. As a result, they decided to put that data in NASR to also help with NOTAMs because the NOTAM office is having the same problem. Colleen Kubont, FAA/AAS-120, said she looked at this issue and found that some of these boundaries are not regulatory and are based on Letters of Agreement so those could not be captured in NASR. Gary said he just wanted to point out that only providing the ground boundaries will not tell the whole story. Tom stated that they are taking the low boundary to the ground. He agreed that they will have to look at the gaps that may create. Tom stated there are larger discussions going on regarding all ARTCC boundaries. NASR is not going to be able to cover them all, but the hope is that this change will help.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked John Collins if this an issue with the pilot on the ground or with the flight plan service providers directing the flight plan to the correct ARTCC. John replied that the surface boundaries are what are used to route flight plans, particularly for off-airport operations. Gary said it will depend on the altitude which the pilot is filing from. John disagreed and said filing using the surface boundary works for flight filing. Tom said the long-term goal is to use ERAM data to align all the data sets together.

JJ Biel-Goebel, Wisk, asked if this is an interim solution until Common Support Services-Flight Data (CSS-FD) is implemented in 2028. He explained that CSS-FD will allow the filing of flight plans digitally and

they will then be routed to the appropriate ERAM. Tom said he is not familiar with CSS-FD. Tom closed his briefing and said he appreciated the questions and conversation.