AERONAUTICAL CHARTING MEETING Charting Group Meeting 25-01 – April 23-24, 2025

RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT

FAA Control #25-01-405

Subject: Charting Non-Standard RWY End Safety Areas

Background/Discussion:

Methods to establish a Runway End Safety Area (RESA) could be accomplished with 1000 ft, EMAS, a declared landing distance or a combination of these elements. However, some runways do not have the space for a Runway End Safety Area (RESA). Declared distances are sometimes used by Airport Authorities to comply with FAA requirements for Runway Safety Areas specified in AC 150/5300-13, Appendix H. For airports that cannot accommodate the standard 1,000ft RESA (overrun/underrun) using a declared landing distance may limit or eliminate some aircraft from operating at certain airports or on certain RWYs at airports with multiple runways.

Roanoke/Blacksburg Regional airport runway 6 currently does not have a RESA and there is a steep drop in terrain elevation approximately 60 ft after the runway departure end. Runway 24 has approximately 200 ft before a steep drop, road and then an interstate highway after the runway departure ends.





Bob Hope airport runway 15/33 both have approximately 200 ft before roads or railroads after the runway departure ends.

Recommendations:

ALPA recommend the FAA and airport operators of Part 139 certificated airports chart associated distances for any runway with non-standard RESAs. An example of the chart note could include "RESA non-standard at 350ft" to inform pilots a standard overrun/underrun is not available.

Currently, a list of Part 139 runways that do not meet the RESA standards does not exist. ALPA recommend the FAA and airport operators of Part 139 certificated airports annotate on form 5010 and develop a master airport list for Part 139 certificated airports that do not have a standard RESA.

Benefits:

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

Yes: Providing non-standard RESA information on Form 5010 and chart information would allow the calculation of aircraft performance for runways with non-standard RESAs.

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

Yes: The information provided on airport diagrams and in databases used by FMS would allow the calculation of takeoff and landing performance.

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

Yes: The absence of non-standard RESA distance information may cause pilots to inadvertently exceed the maximum permitted takeoff and/or landing weight

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

N/A

- 5) Would any additional benefits be recognized by adoption of the recommendation?
- Standardization- since pilots expect to have the RESA as a safety margin.
- Safety- Pilots need to know when there is a non-standard RESA for calculating aircraft takeoff and landing performance
- aircraft, passengers, cargo, and crew can be protected. With proper/correct performance information, an aborted takeoff at a maximum decision airspeed provides for a safe outcome. An unrealized reduction in the safety margin will result in incorrect performance calculations, which could result in negative outcomes for aircraft, passengers, cargo, and crew.

Comments:

Submitted by:Darrell PenningtonOrganization:Air Line Pilots Association, IntPhone:(703) 689-4333E-mail:Darrell.pennington@alpa.orgDate:March 20, 2025

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