AERONAUTICAL CHARTING MEETING
Charting Group
Meeting 25-02 – January 12-14, 2026

RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT

FAA Control #C_25-02-407

Subject: Distances in Profile after FAF on IAPs

Background/Discussion: Charting multiple distances after the Final Approach Fix (FAF) causes many discrepancies due to double rounding, resulting in user queries to Terminal Charting. In addition, if the DME used is from a NAVAID not aligned with the Final Approach Course (FAC), the DME distances at each fix will differ from the distances in the profile which again causes confusion. All of this leads to many questions and portal queries.

Recommendations:

Terminal Charting is proposing charting only one distance after the FAF in the profile view. If there is a distance for both the Distance to Threshold (DIST to THLD) and Distance to Missed Approach Point (DIST to MAP), the profile will only show the DIST to THLD. If the DIST to MAP is needed for a time-distance table, that distance will be provided above the time-distance table.

Benefits:

1) Would adoption of the recommendation prevent or reduce the likelihood of occurrence of accidents or incidents? NO

2) Would adoption of the recommendation mitigate a known or potential safety hazard? NO

3) Would adoption of the recommendation resolve a known or potential issue creating operator or Air Traffic Control system errors? NO

4) Would adoption of the recommendation increase operational or system efficiencies? YES, less computation for charting.

5) Would any additional benefits be recognized by adoption of the recommendation? YES, less confusion and less portal queries. More consistency to have the chart follow the procedure.

Comments:

Submitted by: Krystle Kime AJV-A22
Organization: FAA
Phone: 202-267-3145
E-mail: Krystle.kime@faa.gov
Date: 9/2/25

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

MEETING 25-02

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, began the presentation by explaining that the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) 4 Specification for Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) charts states to depict the distances in the profile between each component. To accurately calculate the distances and to avoid double rounding, they use the distances on the procedure, which are provided to the hundredths, then round. Sometimes the rounded segments on the profile may not add up to the unrounded distance. This results in receiving aeronautical inquiries that question this discrepancy (see Slides 3-5 for examples). To address these concerns, the Terminal Charting Team is recommending that only one distance be charted after the final approach fix rather than showing the distances between every component.

Dan Waker, FAA/AFS-420, asked if the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) explains this issue. Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed support for this recommendation and added that the AIM does not explain the rounding issue. He does not think there is value gained in putting the individual segment lengths when a pilot is only interested in the distance from the threshold.

Kevin Kessler, FAA/AFS-420, asked if the distances were defined in the Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) legend and to explain that this is an approximate distance. Krystle said it is not currently explained; however, she thinks these questions will still come in even if they are explained.

Dan asked if the pilot was using the distances to calculate some sort of timing, or to get to the step-down fix. Rich replied that pilots are not using the distance shown in the profile view. Bill de Groh, APA, added that we are only talking about changing the distances inside the FAF to the threshold. Outside the final approach fix (FAF), those distances may help facilitate descent gradient assessments.

Lt Col Travis Wilkes, USAF Flight Standards, said he is a flight instructor at the United States Air Force's Advanced Flight School, and he does not support this recommendation. He explained that, on a conventional procedure, when the timing is to the missed approach point (MAP), pilots need that distance to locate the MAP. If pilots are confused as to what those distances are and how to use them, I suggest expanding upon that information in the AIM. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, agreed with Travis and noted that there needs to be an explanation in the TPP and/or the AIM to note that these distances are rounded. John Collins, ForeFlight, agreed that he also thinks it is important to know the distance to the missed approach point. Rich noted that he agrees that if the missed approach point is not coincident with the runway threshold, it’s good to know how far the runway is from the threshold. Several others in the audience also agreed that they do not support this proposed change, however, there was support for documenting this in the TPP Legend, Chart Users’ Guide, AIM, or Instrument Procedure Handbook.

Jennifer thanked Krystle for the recommendation and for the audience feedback. She said the consensus of the group is that we should not proceed with changing the way profile distances are depicted, however, pilot guidance should be published to document the current practice. This item will be closed on the ACM agenda, and the pilot guidance piece will be taken back for consideration.

STATUS: CLOSED