AERONAUTICAL CHARTING MEETING
Charting Group
Meeting 24-02 – October 9-10, 2024

RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT

FAA Control #24-02-394

Subject: Charting Cycle and Updating Charting Information Misalignment

Background/Discussion:

The FAA publishes many types of aeronautical charts in the U.S. that are intended to provide pilots with information, which is regulatory, non-regulatory, informational, or advisory in nature.

Responsibility and oversight of the processes for producing regulatory information such as IFR procedures is carefully defined. Information related to IFR procedures is centrally collected and managed by the National Flight Data Center (NFDC) then subsequently disseminated to the public in the form of the National Flight Data Digest (NFDD).

Non-regulatory, informational, or advisory charting information is most often produced at the local level by a regional FAA office, a local Air Traffic Control facility, or an individual Airport Authority. The information or the procedure applies only to a particular airport or affects operations in that area.

Differences between government and commercial charts are often questioned by pilots, airlines, ATC, and airport operators. The current situation needs attention and improvement. Below are ASRS reports highlighting issues with inaccurate charts.

ACN 2141992; Filed July 2024:

- Air carrier flight crew reported entering an active taxiway at ORD without clearance after following instructions from Ramp and looking at the charts. During cruise, the flight crew discovered that the airport diagram and terminal charts were different from one another, with the same taxiway having a different identifier between the two charts

ACN 2141954l; Filed July 2024:

- Air carrier flight crew reported the unclear SAN charts did not have the taxiway and asked ATC for assistance. While following ATC instructions, the flight crew made a wrong turn and required a tow to be pushed back to the proper taxiway. The dark lighting conditions and lack of barricades or signage were also contributing factors.

ALPA Pilot Member Reports Received August 22, 2024:

- The SFO 10-9 page and the moving map page did not agree with each other. The 10-9 page did not accurately depict the reconstruction.
- Several pilots expressed concern about the difference between the new taxiway shape of T and D in SFO vs. what is charted (the new design is better, but not

accurately charted) but it has been two months now without the chart source data changing.

- ALPA Air Safety organization (ASO) contacted SFO, Jeppesen, and FAA WSA to discuss the charting issue
    - ASO representatives were informed the charts will be updated at the next charting cycle (September 5, 2024).

Recommendations:

The source charting data is handled and shared between the FAA, and chart providers without the benefit of any clear or centralized source data oversight. Creating a national system for collecting, managing, and distributing source data (new or revised), could mitigate charting cycle misalignment between the information provided to the FAA and the information provided to commercial flight information companies.

Benefits:

1) Would adoption of the recommendation prevent or reduce the likelihood of occurrence of accidents or incidents?

Yes: Ensuring all charts (regulatory & non-regulatory) are updated during the same cycle provides pilots with the correct/accurate information to safely navigate the airspace and airport environments without confusion.

2) Would adoption of the recommendation mitigate a known or potential safety hazard?

Yes: Updating source data on all charts during the same charting cycle would mitigate confusion between current and inaccurate charts that could lead to potential safety hazards such as RWY misalignment, movement area incursions, etc.

3) Would adoption of the recommendation resolve a known or potential issue creating operator or Air Traffic Control system errors?

Yes: Accurate charts would reduce operator unintentional errors resulting from conflicting charting information. Accurate charts would reduce controller workload to correct system errors when an inaccurate chart is used.

4) Would adoption of the recommendation increase operational or system efficiencies?

TBD:

5) Would any additional benefits be recognized by adoption of the recommendation?

TBD:

Comments:
ALPA requests the FAA discuss this charting issue at the Fall 2024 ACM to allow the FAA, chart users, source data providers, and commercial charting organizations to discuss, potential solutions for improving current charting discrepancies.

Submitted by: Darrell Pennington
Organization: ALPA
Phone: (703) 689-4333
E-mail: Darrell.pennington@alpa.org
Date: September 4, 2024

Please send completed form and any attachments to:
9-AMC-AVS-ACM-Info@faa.gov

MEETING 24-02

Doug Wiley, ASO, provided a presentation on charting cycle misalignment. He explained that there are differences between government and commercial charts that result in questions from pilots, airlines, ATC, and airport operators. He is requesting that the FAA give this problem attention and look for ways to improve. He then listed reports that have been filed demonstrating this problem (slide 3). He showed several cases where the published FAA airport diagram depiction is different than what the pilot sees in the Flight Management System (FMS). Doug is recommending that the FAA create a national system for collecting, managing, and distributing source data to mitigate charting cycle misalignment between the information provided from the FAA and

commercial flight information companies. This would ensure that the products are on the same cycle as the data.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said he has also come across this problem. He said this issue is that the airport moving maps are updated more frequently than the Jeppesen and FAA airport diagrams. The problem is not with the data, but how the data is implemented.

Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen/Boeing, informed the group that the Jeppesen airport diagram is published to align with the FAA airport diagram. That way, if there are any NOTAMs issued, they can be used against that airport diagram. They don't update the airport diagram until they get an update through the appropriate channels, e.g., National Flight Data Digest (NFDD). He said there can be a lag between a taxiway being opened on the ground and the airport diagram showing it as open. If they have all the source documents for a construction project, Jeppesen will use the 10-8 pages to show the construction area, but the airport diagram will remain the same until the data is submitted. For their Airport Moving Maps (AMM) they use satellite imagery and engineering diagrams. That is why there can be a mismatch.

Rich said it's important to ask why we are using taxiways that are not yet depicted on the airport diagrams. He thinks airport officials should not open the new pavement for use until the products are published.

Brent Walker FAA/AJV-A242, explained that Airport Mapping publishes airport diagrams on a 56-day cycle. They have internal cutoff dates for their source data. For example, for the Sept 5th 56-day cycle date, the cutoff for accepting an aeronautical chart change (ACC) for an update to the airport diagram was July 24th. Rich asked if that cutoff date is relayed to airports. Brent said, yes, his team will look at the data that is submitted through the ACC portal and they let the airport know when that data will be published. Rich pointed out that since the airport will know when the changes will be published on the airport diagram, they should not open new pavement until that date. Aaron stated that there are instances where the data is submitted for a new taxiway and it's at that point that the airport opens it for use using a NOTAM. They often do not wait until the new airport diagram is published. Rich said this a real problem and he would like to assist ALPA with bringing this discussion to the FAA Office of Airports. They need to communicate to airports that new taxiways should not be opened until the updated chart is published. Aaron also offered his assistance.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, confirmed that this is not a charting issue for the ACM to solve. Rich and Doug agreed and said it is more of a communication and education issue. Jennifer then closed the briefing by thanking ALPA for the briefing, and said she is glad we were able to discuss it here and find a way forward.

STATUS: CLOSED