Subject: Washington, DC VFR Terminal Area Chart; SFRA Depictions. (Multiple topics for discussion.)

Background / Discussion: This submittal includes several suggestions intended to improve charting products so that pilots are better prepared to successfully navigate the Washington, DC, Special Flight Rules Area (SFRA) and, in the process, help reduce SFRA pilot deviations and possible aircraft intercepts.

Based upon a Charting Forum discussion of the issues raised in this submittal, it may be prudent to add additional information to the Washington TAC and the A/FD with the goal of providing generic but complete procedures, with examples, so that prudent pilots using a current Terminal Area Chart and A/FD would be better able to comply with SFRA requirements to transition the area, arrive and depart SFRA airports, including fringe airports. Issues identified for discussion include the following:

1. The Northeast U.S. A/FD provides guidance, in its Special Notices Section, for SFRA VFR Outbound Procedures as well as VFR Inbound Procedures. Lacking, however, is a discrete section that describes pilot responsibilities and tasks when transitioning the SFRA without landing at an airport within the SFRA. Recommendation: Add a new section to the A/FD that describes transition procedures to air file a SFRA Flight Plan, possibly titled, “Guidance for Transiting (but not Landing) within the SFRA.” This guidance needs to be clearly written and unambiguous.

2. Airspace boundaries describing the lateral dimensions of the Leesburg, VA Flight Maneuvering Area (LMA) are published by NOTAM. While this airspace boundary is currently depicted on the Washington TAC, it is not very easy to discern, especially the southern and eastern boundaries. The LMA could be more prominently depicted, especially since the TAC charts are used both daytime and at night. Recommendation: Better depict this airspace on the Washington TAC, to eliminate pilot navigation errors.

3. The SFRA rule defines a class of airports called “Fringe Airports.” Each fringe airport requires special transponder settings, and procedures. Recommendation #1: Each fringe airport needs to be uniquely depicted on the TAC, with guidance as to applicable transponder settings required included in the chart legend. Recommendation #2: Add a new discrete section in the A/FD pertaining to ingress / egress procedures for fringe airports, possibly titled, “Guidance To / From SFRA Fringe Airports”. In this section, provide a list of all fringe airports. This guidance needs to be clearly written and unambiguous.
4. The SFRA rule defines a traffic pattern exclusion zone for Freeway Airport, with a radius of one nautical mile. It may be better to amend the present exclusion zone and replace it with a more realistic semi-circle or other geometric shaped exclusion zone centered on each runway end. Recommendation: Provide pattern location information so pilots can better comply with the intent of the rule.

5. The A/FD description for Freeway Airport indicates it is permissible to enter the FRZ under certain circumstances for conducting operations associated with instrument flight procedures. This note in the A/FD may be at odds with the intent of the published Rule. Recommendation: Please review the note in the A/FD to ensure that it's in compliance with the rule.

6. Operationally, it is often virtually impossible to obtain a complete reading of each SFRA NOTAM from Flight Service, either during preflight or while airborne, as each SFRA NOTAM is quite lengthy and complex. Likewise, SFRA NOTAMs posted on the FAA web site (www.faa.gov) are marked with the following caveat, "Depicted TFR data may not be a complete listing. Pilots should not use the information on this website for flight planning purposes. For the latest information, call your local Flight Service Station at 1-800- WX-BRIEF." Additionally, it is not clear whether commercial software “apps” hosted on mobile computing devices can be used as an acceptable source for official MET & AIS data. Recommendation: FAA should publish updated guidance as to what are the acceptable means for pilots to access authoritative SFRA NOTAM source data during preflight and while airborne.

Recommendations:

1. The Charting Forum should consider each of the above issues, and decide whether any charting or A/FD changes are needed.
2. Electronic chart providers (i.e., data integrators) should consider including more detailed SFRA boundary information (e.g., fringe airport corridor data) in future electronic aeronautical data distributions.
3. Mobile computing device preflight planning software (e.g., Foreflight, Pilot-My-Cast) should consider providing detailed SFRA information as part of their menu selection options.
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MEETING 11-01: Mr. Gary Livack, FAA/AFS-430, and Mr. Mike Lenz, FAA/AFS-800, submitted and briefed the issue.

Discussions centered on how SFRA information is disseminated in various FAA publications. Several shortfalls were identified.

- Procedures for Transient Aircraft
- Being able to find information on and the definition of Fringe Airports (reference was made to results achieved using Google’s search engine)
- Clarification of the 1 NM radius around Freeway Airport (W00).

Mr. Paul Gallant, FAA/AJV-11, stated that information pertaining to the SFRA is comprised of inputs from the FAA Final Rule, FAA Office of Safety and TSA. Mr. Gallant recommended that Mr. Frank Hatfield, the Director of Systems Operations Security, be consulted in any future discussions.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, stated that what the FAA publishes about the SFRA is per specific guidance – either taken from the Rule itself, or added as recommended by Sys Ops Security and the Office of Safety.

Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, agreed to chair a working group to review and respond to the issues raised in the RD.

**ACTION:** Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, to chair a working group to review and respond to the issues raised in the RD.
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<td><a href="mailto:franklin.hatfield@faa.gov">franklin.hatfield@faa.gov</a></td>
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MEETING 11-02: Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, provided an update on progress made since last ACF. Mr. Fecht broke down his briefing into six mini updates, itemized below:

1. **SFRA Transit Guidance Section missing from A/FD** – Gary Livack, FAA/AFS-430, to pursue through his office a submission to AFS-800 of a requirement to coordinate with Potomac TRACON and summarized the SFRA transit process for publication in the “Notices” section of the Northeast A/FD. Any resulting requirement from AFS-800 would be sent to Airport Mapping and copied to System Operations.
2. **SFRA Fringe Airports** – No charting or A/FD action required for this item. Fringe airports are not an issue with pilots or ATC. Talwyn Hayley and Steve Broman will coordinate information concerning the possible abandonment of two of the fringe airports. Flying M Farms airport (MD77) abandoned in NFDD.

3. **Depiction of the Leesburg Flight Maneuvering Area on Baltimore-Washington Terminal Area and Washington Sectional Charts** – Mr. Fecht spoke with contacts at Leesburg Airport and Leesburg Aviation Adventures to locate additional landmarks to be considered for charting to aid pilots in identifying the boundaries of the Leesburg Flight Maneuvering Area. Neither contact was able to provide any additional landmarks.

   A prototype of the Baltimore-Washington TAC depicting the Leesburg Maneuvering Area was generated with the training area boundary lines (blue lines) made thicker and the white masking widened to provide better visibility of the area. Both the current charting depiction and the prototyped were presented. Consensus of the forum was in favor of the new prototype.

   Systems Operations and AFS-400, with AFS-800 will pursue the creation of VFR Waypoints inside the boundary lines of the maneuvering area, with AFS-800. Dennis Boiken, Leesburg Airport, expressed his support for the concept of creating VFR Waypoints.

4. **Freeway Airport (W00) Exclusion from the DC Flight Restricted Zone (FRZ)** – There were three questions associated with this topic.
   a. One Nautical Mile radius from “airport” – radius generated from where? From the Airport Reference Point (ARP), which is published in the A/FD.
   b. Revision of airport exclusion – No action. Airport exclusion will not be revised.
   c. A/FD note in conflict with SFRA – Natalie Smith (Potomac TRACON) coordinated with Chris Criswell (NFDC) to eliminate obsolete airport note from NASR. Remark was deleted in NFDD 161 on August 19 2011 and removed from A/FD for October 20 2011 edition.

5. **Lee Airport departure procedure over water** – Not a charting issue, no action taken.

6. **Access to SFRA NOTAM updates** – Not a charting issue. NOTAMs provide information replacing or augmenting charted information. Gary Livack will pursue the issue with Barry Davis.

**ACTION:** Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, to report back at next ACF on implementation of the line and mask changes to be made to the Leesburg Flight Maneuvering Area on Baltimore-Washington Terminal Area and Washington Sectional Charts.
MEETING 12-01: Mr. Ron Haag, FA/AJV-321, provided an update on progress made since last ACF. Mr. Haag presented the latest revision to the depiction of the Leesburg Maneuvering area. The white masking of the boundary area has been expanded and the blue boundary line thickened, making the area more readily discernable. The new masking has been implemented and viewable on the 84th Edition of the Baltimore-Washington VFR Terminal Area Chart, Effective Dates February 9, 2012.

Ms. Watson commented that the workgroup had held a meeting with Mr. Gary Livack, FAA/AFS-400, on the background issues related to the Washington SFRA. AeroNav Products worked the Leesburg charting issue. The other revisions that Mr. Livack requested are connected to the Rule itself, or are specific publication requirements provided by FAA Safety and cannot be revised by AeroNav Products authority. Mr. Livack was provided contact information on the Government entities involved with SFRA rules and regulations.

**STATUS:** CLOSED