

Government/Industry Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF)
Meeting 01-02
October 25-26, 2001
MINUTES

I. Opening Remarks

The ACF was held at the Air Line Pilots Association offices in Washington, DC. Mr. Dick Powell, FAA/ATA-100, the ACF Co-Chair, opened the Forum on October 25, 2001 with thanks to Mr. Kevin Comstock and Mr. Simon Lawrence of ALPA for hosting the Forum. Mr. Powell also introduced Mr. Norm LeFevre, FAA AFS-420, as the new chair of the TERPS group. Mr. Kevin Comstock, ALPA, welcomed the ACF participants to Washington. Mr. Norm LeFevre, FAA/AFS-420, chaired the ACF Instrument Approach Procedures Subgroup meeting held on October 23-24. Separate minutes of that meeting will be distributed.

II. Review of Minutes from Last Meeting

The minutes from the 01-01 were accepted with the following corrections.

Section 4 Outstanding Issues:

01-01-140 Tabular Information on Descent

Change second paragraph, fourth sentence to "He pointed out that DME is needed because there are human factors and chart clutter problems when DME is not available."

Attendees List:

Change Mr. Gary Powell *FAA ATP-402* to *FAA ATP-104*.

III. Presentations, ACF Working Group Reports, ACF Project Reports

ICAO AIS/MAP Initiative Update

Mr. Dave Lewtas, ICAO, [updated the Aeronautical Chart Forum](#) on several ICAO issues. Mr. Lewtas discussed the new Annex 4, Aeronautical Charts, 10th Edition. Mr. Lewtas also described the new amendment 31 to Annex 15, Aeronautical Information Services, and the new format for ICAO regional Air Navigation Plans. Mr. Lewtas also stated that the aeronautical data models AIXM and SICM were being reviewed by ICAO with assistance from a U.S. university.

Mr. Lewtas stated that a new edition of the WGS-84 manual with guidance on the survey of taxiway centerline points and parking/docking position will be available soon and he undertook to send a preliminary copy to Mr. Dick Powell. Mr. Lewtas also pointed out that the ICAO Security Panel was currently meeting and is expected to provide recommendations regarding the review of ICAO Annexes in light of security concerns. He pointed out that Annexes 4 and 15 might be amended to deal with the security of aeronautical information.

Mr. Lewtas described the relationship between AIS/MAP Study Group (AISMAPSG) and the Obstacle Clearance Panel (OCP) as follows: if an Annex 4 element is related to procedure design it should be considered by the OCP; if an Annex 4 element is related to other issues, for example terrain portrayal, it goes to the AIS/MAP Secretariat or AISMAPSG. From there, the element is forwarded to the Air Navigation Commission (ANC) for preliminary ANC technical review and then to the States for comment. The States' comments on the proposal then returned to the ANC for final technical review. A further consideration occurs in the ICAO Council which has the final authority to adopt the amendment into Annex 4.

Mr. Lewtas pointed out that in the United States, ICAO charting activities go through AISMAPSG (Terry Laydon FAA AVN-500 or Dick Powell FAA ATA-100) or the OCP (FAA AFS-420 Mr. Lynn Boniface). Mr. Lewtas did point out that in some cases this process may be bypassed, for example the exceptional case last year when part of the Annex 4 amendment process was bypassed, and the ICAO compromise on Fly Over/Fly By waypoints was "fast tracked" by the ANC and went directly into Annex 4 without comment by the States due to an immediate safety concern.

Mr. Lewtas stated that the main sources for changes to Annex 4 are the AISMAPSG, the ICAO OCP, and the ICAO Secretariat. Mr. Lewtas stated that proposed future changes to Annex 4 would be introduced in amendment 53 applicable in 2004 are expected to include;

- Electronic Terrain Data requirements—developing with input from AISMAPSG and RTCA SC193
- Electronic chart displays requirements—developing with input from AISMAPSG and SAE-G10
- Standardization of geographic coordinate information—developing with input from AISMAPSG
- RVSM charting requirements—developing with input from AISMAPSG
- Radar Vectoring Chart requirements—supplemental recommended chart for use where minimum safe altitudes cannot be adequately shown on the Area Chart—State Letter will be sent out shortly—developing with input from AISMAPSG
- Instrument Approach Chart Procedure Title Standardization—developing with input from OCP
- Introduction of vertical path angle requirements—temperature based deviation table based on Baro VNAV criteria—developing with input from OCP
- Charting of procedure altitudes with lines above or below the altitude—developing with input from OCP

The major changes to Annex 4, 10th Ed are:

- Terrain portrayal on IAC, SID, STAR, and Area Charts
- Changes to airspace class depiction
- New Chapter 20 covering electronic aeronautical chart display
- Introduction of ADIZ portrayal on Enroute, WAC, 1:500,000, and small scale charts

The ACF took no position on this presentation.

RNAV Transition Working Group Update

Mr. Eric Secretan, FAA NACO and Co-Chair of the Working Group, presented the update. He reported that the working group was formed by the ACF to look at how RNAV charting would be implemented. Mr. Secretan stated that the working group's terms of reference are:

- No separate new RNAV Enroute chart series
- Enroute charts must support both conventional and RNAV users during the transition to RNAV
- The working group will identify charting requirements to support all users, without ambiguity

Mr. Secretan reported that the ACF approved the following recommendations at the 01-01 ACF.

- Increase the IFR Enroute chart scale—Result is that the number of charts increase (Current number of Lows is 28 and grows to 36 and current number of Highs is 6 and grows to 12—IACC is staffing the change)
- No “combined” RNAV/Ground based NAVAID
- RNAV routes will be Green

Mr. Secretan also pointed out these key RNAV charting points.

- RNAV equipped aircraft can use any NAVAID as a fix or waypoint
- Conventionally equipped (ground-based) aircraft are limited to only ground-based NAVAIDs and fix usage
- Unique symbology for RNAV is for non-RNAV equipped aircraft
- The radial out of the navaid with magnetic information should be shown if there is a turn at a waypoint
- MEAs will have RNAV values and will use “G” to identify GPS RNAV MEAs in the same color as RNAV MEA values

Mr. Secretan stated that RNAV routes through the Charlotte Class B are in the A/FD as 1 page of text and a 1 page graphic. Mr. Gary Powell, FAA ATP-104, stated that he would take the lead and work out of Atlanta on the routes through Class Bs. Mr. Secretan also stated that RNAV procedures for /E /F and /G would not contain coordinates for navaids etc. It was also stated that FAA AFS studied the Checker chart (DP) and that the human factors study of deviations concluded that chart clutter, numerous notes, information dispersed between numerous pages, the depiction of non-standard communication procedures, climb gradient information not located with associated waypoint, difficulty reading plate at night or in turbulence, crossing restriction depiction differences between Jeppesen and FAA as well as between FAA charts were a concern. Mr. Secretan stated that the recommendations of the RNAV transition working group would address some of these issues. Mr. Secretan also pointed out that Dry Heat and Chez were NFDD'd and charted per a deviation memo.

Mr. Lewtas, ICAO, commented that the ICAO OCP's position, according to its Secretary, was that where NAVAIDs exist it isn't necessary to show a waypoint symbol and a NAVAID symbol inside. Just the NAVAID symbol. Mr. Lewtas also stated that we should remain cognoscente of the electronic charting aspect of these symbols. DoD stated that it would follow whatever ruling ICAO makes regarding putting a triangle inside of symbology for reporting points. It was also stated that this “combined symbology issue” is not a radar vs. non-radar issue for compulsory vs. non-compulsory

reporting points, off shore gateways, or FIRs. Mr. Secretan also stated that the use of waypoints should apply to oceanic and gulf 'fixes' which are really waypoints. It was pointed out that this change would require large operational support and coordination through AT, AOPA, ALPA, FedEx, etc.

It was pointed out that we must clearly show why we are not happy with the current depiction and make a strong case that change is needed. It was also pointed out that Human Factors support would be needed. Mr. Brad Alberts, Federal Express Pilots Association, stated that it made sense to "fill in" a waypoint to make it a compulsory reporting waypoint. It was also pointed out that the only "fly in the ointment" is the case of a compulsory reporting navaid. It was suggested by Mr. Mike Riley, NIMA, that we leave the ground based status quo. It was also suggested that examples be provided of mixed ground based and space based procedures.

Mr. Kevin Comstock, ALPA, asked why there was a problem producing charts based on direction for DPs. Mr. Gary Powell, ATP, answered that Air Traffic operational considerations drive the current method. For example, the runway changes due to winds at Charlotte 3 times a day. It was also stated that notes are unique for every procedure and that there is an effort to put all notes in the same spot.

ACTION: Mr. Eric Secretan will provide an information paper to the next ACF.

Area Chart Terrain Depiction Update

Mr. Eric Secretan, FAA NACO, reported that this was in IACC for staffing.

Terrain Depiction on IAPs Update

Mr. Terry Laydon, FAA NACO, reported that a production schedule was being worked out and that NACO will be working with the printing contractor on scheduling. Mr. Laydon reported that the drying time for the second color of ink was an issue but that NACO does have terrain on the California IAPs.

VFR Waypoints Working Group Update

Mr. Hal Becker, AOPA, provided the ACF with this update. He stated that there are VFR waypoints on a number of terminal area charts. He stated that all terminal area charts with VFR waypoints will have them charted on the planning side as well. Mr. Becker also stated that the use of VFR waypoints on Sectionals is being addressed and that the Southern Region, West Coast of Florida and the Florida panhandle as well up the East coast to North Carolina is being reviewed. Mr. Becker also stated that the Nov 01 New Orleans Sectional will have VFR waypoints and that these points are all NFDD'd and appear in NACO and Jeppesen databases. Mr. Becker stated that it was always the intent to include VFR waypoints on Sectionals too. Mr. John Moore, FAA NACO, expressed a concern about chart clutter and how it would be addressed. Mr. Becker responded that guidelines have been drafted by Air Traffic to address chart clutter and that each Visual Point has a contact number at Air Traffic to resolve this issue. Mr. Norm LeFevre, FAA AFS, stated that we should not have reporting points over hospitals, amusement parks, etc. Mr. LeFevre suggested that the FAA should develop a policy on areas we don't want to put these VPs. NATCA stated that regional 530s look to ACF type bodies for guidance on VPs

over sporting events, hospitals, etc. and that the exclusion of these types of locations for VPs should be added to Air Traffic guidance. It was also pointed out that the user community and Air Traffic select these points.

Mr. Becker stated that FAA AFS is working on Mountain Pass Waypoints. He stated that Coronado Pass in Colorado and 2 passes in Alaska have been identified as the first to be charted once a process has been defined. Mr. Becker stated that the visual chart will have a note referring the user to the A/FD or some other FAA publication. He stated that the FAA General Counsel is involved with this effort. He pointed out that the pass waypoints will only identify the entry point to the pass.

Mr. Becker stated that a magenta caution note for VFR waypoints will be located at or near the lat/longs list of waypoints on the charts and that all charts will have a list of lat/longs for the VFR waypoints. This caution note will caution aircraft on converging at GPS waypoints. The caution note is as follows:

Caution: GPS accuracy necessitates extra vigilance for other aircraft when navigating near any fix retrieved from a GPS database.

It was also pointed out that the caution note also appears in the AIM and it was suggested that the caution note appear in the users manual of RNAV equipment. The ACF agreed that the VFR waypoint working group could proceed with the note.

ACTION: Mr. Norm LeFevre will look into the development of policy or VPs; he will check the 7210.3 Facility Management as a first start.

FAA/NACO GPS/FMS Database Update

Mr. Eric Secretan, FAA NACO, reported that the National Flight Database product would be available in January 2002 with the February 21, 2002 effective date the first release. Through 2002 the data will be updated every 56 days at a subscription cost of \$86 per year. In January 2003 when procedures are added, the data will be updated every 28 days, at a subscription cost of \$172 per year. Mr. Secretan stated that the CNF issue is being worked and that FAA General Council will address the issue of NOTAMs vice the database alert that Jeppesen uses. Mr. Mike Riley, NIMA, stated that NIMA issues NOTAMs for DAFIF and that he has a document that the FAA can use. Mr. Dick Powell stated that NATCA and NATS would also be involved.

Chart Forum Update

Mr. Bill Hammett reported that a letter has made its way to FAA General Council via FOB 10A and APF 100. This will establish the Chart Forum as a Federal Advisory Committee so that we can operate legally. Until then we will operate as normal.

ICAO Airport Idents

Mr. Dick Powell reported that 2 negative replies were received from the Cartographic Change Proposal. He stated that ARTS III support (ATP) and NATCA (naming convention) were issues yet to be resolved. It was suggested that ATA, ATP, Jeppesen, NACO, NATS, will have to meet with AT to address ICAO idents. Mr. Dick Powell stated that nothing would happen until the meeting is held.

Government Chart AC

Mr. Norm LeFevre, AFS-420, stated that he would write a new AC to tell the pilot how to use government charts. Mr. LeFevre would like to form a sub-group for non-government folks as a means for the non-government folks to provide input to the AC. The new AC will be AC 90-XX.

STAR/DP Charting

Mr. Dick Powell, ATA-100, stated that FAA would return to SIDs from DPs. AFS-1 and AAT-1 have signed off on the change. He stated that AFS, AVN, and AT must get together as an Ad-Hoc group as part of the TERPS group. Mr. Bill Hammet, AFS-420 ISI, stated that Obstacle DPs are textual or graphic and SIDs will be graphic. It was also stated that SIDs were recognized internationally as a clearance and that we need to be careful.

ACTION: Mr. Dick Powell will work on a CCP to get this rolling.

IV. Outstanding Issues

94-01-040 Charting of Parachute Jumping Areas

Mr. Dick Powell, ATA-100, stated that PAJA frequencies are being NFDD'd and added on Sectionals and TACs.

STATUS: CLOSED

97-02-105 Charting of Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace (ATCAA) Frequencies Above 18,000

Mr. Dick Powell, FAA ATA-100 reported that the Free Flight Action Plan (RTCA WG) made a recommendation to print VHF frequencies in the Sectional Tabulations so pilots can call for real-time information on SUA status and also requested that ATCAAs be charted on enroute, sectional, and terminal area charts. Mr. Powell stated that there has been no Air Traffic decision to chart.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Mary Walker, Mr. Dick Powell, and Mr. Don Pate will meet and work on this issue.

98-01-108 Airport Names, Identifiers, and Associated Cities

Mr. Dick Powell reported that the A/FD and the TPP both list airports by associated city name. The IACC has signed off adding the associated city name and these names will be added to the IFR charts during the reformat. Mr. Mike Riley, NIMA, reported that only ICAO identifiers would be charted on NIMA foreign charts.

STATUS: CLOSED

98-02-111 Tabular Data for Military Operations Areas (MOAs) times of use NOTAMs issue

Mr. Dick Powell reported that in April 01 a meeting was held at FAA HQ to review this issue and discuss ways to resolve the problem. Participating in the meeting were representatives from ATA, ATP, DoD, U.S. NOTAM Office, and bargaining units. The only type of SUA that currently meets the criteria for issuance of a NOTAM is a restricted area. One of the outcomes of the discussion was an acknowledgment that status information for other SUA areas might be appropriate as NOTAM material. The group discussed the fact that MOA/MTR information is presently available in the system as an "unnumbered message." Pilots can receive this information by specifically asking the FSS briefer.

The group agreed that an effort would be made to try to determine the volume of unnumbered messages that are created daily and then consider what the impact would be if SUA information were to be included in the NOTAM criteria. The group agreed to reconvene in May to examine the results. Unfortunately, for a variety of reasons, a follow-up meeting has not been scheduled and may not be scheduled soon due to recent events. Mr. Powell also reported that he attempted to address this issue

3-4 years ago via a memo sent through ATC but without result. Mr. Brad Alberts, Fed Ex Pilots Association, suggested adding this to the NOTAM system but Mr. Dick Powell reported that the NOTAM system lacks the capacity to support it. It was also reported that MOAs, WA, AA, etc were local dissemination and Restricted Areas were wide dissemination.

Mr. Mike Riley, NIMA, reported that NIMA would be putting a note in the AP book that when a user reads see activated by NOTAM the user is referred to some additional text.

STATUS: OPEN

99-02-117 Charting Enhancements to Reduce the Risk of Landing at the Wrong Airport

Mr. Dick Powell reported that he is still awaiting the list from ALPA. Mr. Brad Rush, AVN-160, reported that he has a list from ALPA. He reported that there are 12-13 but a couple fall out of the plan view or would cause a scale change. Under current spec these airports are only charted if they are under the final approach track. A change to the IACC spec is being worked. Also the AIS/WG is addressing this issue. Mr. Rush reports that the AIS/WG should resolve this issue by the next ACF. It was also reported that Lake Charles should be added to the list to take a look at. Mr. Dave Lewtas, ICAO, stated that 11.10.1.2 of Annex 4 provides some guidance.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Brad Rush will report the status at the next ACF.

00-01-119 Raising Nationwide Charting Standard (Ground/Airports)

Mr. Dick Powell reported that he met with the new Airport Safety Branch Manager to inform him of the request from Executive Jet to amend the 5010 to include runway classification information. It was also stated that the Army Corps of Engineers could drop a ball to determine PCN values.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Dick Powell and Mr. Dave Sheehan will meet with Airports to begin efforts to maintain and publish.

00-02-120 Airport Identifiers in the TPP

Mr. Dick Powell reported that an IACC document was circulated and signed. Mr. John Moore, NACO, reported that this would be implemented next year.

STATUS: CLOSED

00-02-121 Amendment Numbers in the TPP

Mr. John Moore, NACO, reported that this has been signed by the IACC and will be implemented as the procedure changes. Mr. Bill Hammett stated that this should be addressed by TPP volume and asked how textual procedures will be addressed. Mr. Hammett also stated that this needs to be addressed by the NOTAM group. He stated that if the NOTAM group needs to implement faster than they need to come up with extra money to fund faster implementation.

STATUS: CLOSED

00-02-122 Note for Offset Localizer

Mr. Dick Powell reported that ATA-100 now has the letter from AFS-420. ATA-100 needs to generate a requirement document to forward to IACC for a spec change. It was reported that AVN-100 has already included the note information on the 8260. It was stated that the IACC would determine how to chart.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Dave Thompson, ATA, will prepare a requirement document for the IACC.

00-02-123 Charting of ILS Glide Slope Icon in Approach Plate Profile

It was reported that Mr. Mike Riley, NIMA, non-concurred with the IACC requirement document. Mr. Riley stated that the feather has nothing to do with where the pilot intercepts the Glide Slope. DoD says that the length of the feather is up to the publisher. NIMA says that NACO can shrink the feather up to where the intercept occurs. This will require a NACO policy letter. Mr. Norm LeFevre and Mr. Marty Walker stated that ILS information is flight checked to 18 miles for the Localizer and 10 miles for the Glide Slope. Mr. Brad Alberts stated that the Glide Slope feather should not extend beyond the step down fix.

STATUS: CLOSED

ACTION: NACO will produce a policy letter for feather depiction.

00-02-124 Non-radar Terminal Areas

Ms. Pat Fair stated that ARS told her they have no charted coverage of Radar. She said that they have no reliable information that could be used for charting. It was stated that each facility knows where they have coverage. Mr. Marty Walker stated that even if you knew where to chart them, a pilot wouldn't always necessarily be able to get vectors even if the equipment would support it. Mr. Simon Lawrence withdrew this issue.

STATUS: CLOSED

00-02-125 Departure Procedures/Multiple Runways

The goal of this issue is the elimination of multiple departure graphics at major airports. An RNAV departure procedure independent of the departure runway is proposed. This issue included the Chez and Beantown work. See the “*Star/DP Charting*” and “*RNAV Transition Working Group*” discussions in the presentation section of these minutes. Mr. Brad Rush stated that policy, criteria, and FMS (built in disconnect and times for ATC can’t be calculated by FMS accurately) issues still need to be resolved. Mr. Bill Hammett stated that Charlotte was/is a prototype and that kinks still need to be ironed out before the ACF addresses this issue. Mr. Brad Alberts and Mr. Simon Lawrence stated that the FMS only drives the procedure to the outbound gate and strongly recommended that vectors not be built into FMS procedures. They also recommended that altitude restrictions not be built into FMS procedures. This issue will remain open pending evaluation of existing procedures. It was also stated that the Charlotte work would provide valuable data.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Gary Powell will report at the next ACF.

00-02-126 Circling Restriction Symbology

The recommendation is instead of a textual description the development of a graphic representation of the circling area in areas where circling is not authorized. Mr. John Moore reported that there is a problem of real estate on the chart and that we should only put information on the chart when there may be confusion. But then you have information in two different areas. Mr. Norm LeFevre stated that many pilots don’t interpret the word circling restriction correctly. Mr. LeFevre stated that a good example was in South Dakota but couldn’t remember the procedure. Mr. Brad Alberts suggested putting the note in the circling minimums area.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: NIMA and AOPA will poll their users to determine if this is what they want. However, if they do want a graphic added then they may lose other information. Proposals for charted are encouraged for presentation at the next ACF.

ACTION: Mr. Norm LeFevre and Mr. Brad Rush will investigate this issue further.

00-02-128 Temporary Flight Restriction/Notice of Proposed Rulemaking

Mr. Dick Powell reported that this issue was sent to the Federal Register on September 11, 2001. There is a question of how to maintain these things. What do we publish? What are the criteria? If pursued the A/FD specs will need to be amended. Mr. Powell reported that regional 530s initiate TFRs and that the regional 530s must meet charting deadlines and provide adequate information. Mr. Eric Secretan stated that this is only a subset of all the data and asked why we should do this if the pilot still

needs to go elsewhere for the all the TFR information. Mr. Hall Becker stated that the NOTAM system sometimes falls short for smaller events.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Dick Powell and Mr. Terry Laydon will look at developing a process to publish and will review the issues.

00-02-131 VFR Waypoints

VFR Waypoints appeared on the San Diego and Los Angeles Flyways in November 29, 2001.

STATUS: CLOSED

00-02-132 Airport Diagram Magnetic Variation

This issue was submitted by Mr. Brad Rush, AVN-160. Mr. Rush points out that airport diagrams charted by both NACO and Jeppesen include a magnetic variation value provided by the National Geodetic Survey and these values are charted with an epoch value (currently 1995). In addition, he points out that all magnetic bearings on the airport diagram are charted based on this value. Mr. Rush states that this is a cause of confusion to pilots using instrument procedures which are developed using the Variation of Record value assigned to airports and facilities by AVN-160 IAW FAA Order 8260.19C paragraph 216. Currently on facility Variation of Record is published in the AFD. Mr. Rush suggests that airport Variation of Record be published in the AFD. Mr. Norm LeFevre stated that if we publish two magnetic variations, we might cause confusion.

STATUS: CLOSED

ACTION: Mr. Norm LeFevre will include an explanation of airport diagram magnetic variation in the new charting AC 90 XX. He will also add a discussion of assigned variation for NAVAIDS.

00-02-134 Charting SMGCS

Ms. Pat Fair reported that an Order has been written for standard taxi routes and that 11 airports have them. She stated that AT had non-concurred on publishing them in the A/FD due to naming and other issues. The routes are currently based on a letter of agreement between the air carrier and the airport. It was reported that NACO is producing 530+ Part 139 airport diagrams to support airport safety. It was also reported that the Runway Safety Office is working on this issue and that the ACF cannot move forward until they complete their work. This issue remains open pending direction from the Runway Safety Office.

STATUS: OPEN

00-02-135 DME Fix Authorization on Converging Initials or Feeders

As originally presented it was recommended that wherever DME is available from a VOR facility that provides feeder route or initial approach segment guidance, which facility is not the facility providing final approach segment guidance, the DME distance at the terminus of such feeder route or initial approach segment should be established and charted as a legal means of determining the terminus fix of the feeder route or initial approach segment. ACF 01-02 endorsed this suggestion. Mr. Eric Secretan reported that Jeppesen provides explicit information on the chart. It was agreed that NACO would chart if data appears on the 8260 and NACO will chart the primary make-up. The ACF consensus was that the 1986 policy letter on this issue should be incorporated into IACC specs.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: AVN and ALPA will work to provide examples of depiction. Mr. Simon Lawrence will send 2 or 3 procedures to Mr. Brad Rush to chart.

ACTION: AFS and AVN will identify on 8260, once this is done NACO will chart.

01-01-136 Charting Waypoints with both Fly-over and Fly-by Functions

The ACF consensus is to chart as fly-by in the plan view. Mr. Dave Lewtas stated that the OCP felt that it should be charted as the most constraining feature (fly-over). It was further stated that ICAO plans to include guidance in PANS OPS to cover this. ICAO also recommends against creating dual use points. It was stated that if the waypoint were charted twice then it should be charted as fly-by on the plan view and fly-over on missed approach icons. Mr. Brad Rush stated that 2500 GPS waypoints still need to have fly-over/fly-by designated.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: AVN, AFS, et al will find examples of dual use waypoints and forward them to Mr. Dave Lewtas, ICAO.

01-01-137 Standardization of Equipment and Procedure Notes

The recommendation when this issue was first presented was that where a radar fix is one of two approved methods of determining a fix on an approach course, it should be classified as an equipment requirement and appear in the briefing strip. The recommendation continues by requesting that where radar is required for radar vector transition on the approach course, this should appear in the plan view. If adopted, the AIM should explain these requirements to the pilot.

The previous consensus was that the problem occurs only when there is ambiguity over aircraft equipment vs. ATC radar needed. The ACF previously agreed that every approach that requires radar for entry should be looked at and corrected first per the charting decision reached by the group (radar required [vectors] for procedure in the plan view, radar and/or DME for equipment requirement by the title). The use of little balls or balloon boxes and subscript was discussed as a means of identifying

where specific equipment is required in the procedure. Previously, Mr. Marty Walker, FAA ATP-120, stated that radar vectors are not mandatory. Dave Eckles, FAA AFS-420, stated that he had presented this issue to the ICAO OCP but that the OCP wasn't prepared to address the issue at its last meeting. Mr. Eckles also stated that the AIM correction for radar required was in PCG currently and will likely be corrected soon.

It was reported that AT would not allow transitions at some places like Dallas and BWI. It was also stated that 75-100 airports don't have a tie-in to the enroute structure. It was also stated that name changes in the pilot-controller glossary need to be addressed. Finally, it was stated that a change to the .19 is required to address when/where to publish radar required. Mr. Brad Rush also stated that he has not received a list from Mr. Roberts yet.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Simon Lawrence will send a list of affected procedures to Mr. Brad Rush, Mr. Mary Walker, and Mr. Norm LeFevre.

ACTION: Mr. Bill Hammett and Mr. Marty Walker will research and submit a change to the AIM to support this issue.

01-01-139 Departure NOTAMs (UFN type NOTAMs)

When this issue was presented it was suggested that the current classification/distribution method of UFN NOTAMs that affect departures is deficient which affects Jeppesen, NACO, and the Airlines. It was pointed out that there was a recent issue at PANC with the Anchorage TWO and KNIK FIVE departures. Further, it was suggested that this type of NOTAM should be treated with the same "respect" as an "FDC", "CCP", or "P" NOTAM. It was suggested that if this were done, the changes/information would be duly noted and action would be taken to reflect the necessary changes to the affected published procedures. Finally, it was recommended that a date and time stamp be entered into the expiration field of NOTAMs that are between 30 and 90 days in duration. The ACF (01-02) supports the recommendation.

Mr. Dick Powell stated that action on this issue should be deferred until addressed by the NOTAM working group. ALPA stated that it felt that the NOTAM system is not working. It was stated that AVN and AFS could support the recommendation but that ATP-300 still needs to work the issue. It was also pointed out that ATA-1 and ATP-1 have directed that NOTAM issues be researched.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Dick Powell will forward the issue to the NOTAM Working Group for consideration.

01-01-140 Tabular Information for Descent (non-precision approaches)

Mr. Dave Eckles, FAA AFS-420, initially presented issue, which is based on an NTSB recommendation related to an accident investigation. The recommendation provides for the support of constant angle of descent approaches by using a cross-reference table with altitude/distance information.

Previously, Mr. Eckles stated that the NTSB desires to have the tabular form of the data on the bottom line of the plan view for various airspeeds and recommended altitudes from the FAF. It was stated earlier that if implemented this recommendation would reduce the size of the plan view and that the added information might cause confusion. When this issue was introduced Mr. Kevin Comstock, ALPA, stated that VOLPE had looked at this and had briefed the ACF 4-5 years ago. He pointed out that there was a problem with non-collocated DMEs.

When the issue was introduced it was pointed out that the JSIT had recommended the DME ribbon. However, what should be done with RNAV procedures when the MAP is not the threshold? Mr. Terpstra stated that it would be desirable to chart distances that a pilot sees on his/her instrument display

When the issue was introduced Jeppesen representatives stated that they had considered the NTSB recommendation but that they only wanted to put the information (DME-ribbon) on selected charts due to a limitation in their computer and data support. In the future, Jeppesen will upgrade their computer support and plan to chart the information where supporting data is available.

Previously the ACF consensus was that if the recommendation was adopted, the new requirement be implemented as follows:

1. Part 139 airports first
2. Non-Part 139 airports--5000' or greater runways
3. All other runways

Mr. Dick Powell reported that through the CAST process an agreement was reached to install 107 new DMEs. Mr. Powell stated that this will be a significant expenditure and that the ACF should work charting issue to support the new DMEs to improve safety.

Mr. Dick Powell and Mr. Norm LeFevre reported that they could not find Mr. Eckles letter (refer to action item below).

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Dave Eckles will develop a requirement and forward it to the IACC to address. This requirement will cover non-precision DME procedures only, not RNAV, with the altitude based on FAF to threshold distance using the ICAO specification.

01-01-141 Terrain and Obstacles on Instrument Approach Procedure Profile View

Mr. Dave Eckles, FAA AFS-420 originally presented this issue which is based on an NTSB recommendation. The previous consensus of the ACF was not to chart terrain or obstacles on the profile view due to several issues. For example, the profile view may vary in scale. Also, it would be challenging to determine what width/swath size to be depicted. Finally, the ACF felt that the depiction of this data would increase chart clutter.

It was stated that the IACC, both DoD and NACO, rejected the recommendation due to the significant impact on resources.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Bill Hammett and Mr. Norm LeFevre will look for the AFS-420 response to the NTSB and report back to the ACF or correspond with the NTSB to determine which direction the to go.

ACTION: Mr. Dave Lewtas will send examples to Mr. Dick Powell

V. New Charting Topics

01-02-142 The Use of ABxxx Fixes

Mr. Terry Mahaffey, National Air Traffic Controllers Association, submitted this issue. Mr. Mahaffey stated that the charting of fixes spelled "ABxxx" could present the opportunity for aircrew confusion or navigation error. He stated that when an FMS aircraft is given "direct to" a fix/waypoint/navaid, the FMS asks the pilot if he/she want "ABEAM" points shown. If this desired and selected, all fixes along the aircraft's route between its present position and the fix/waypoint/navaid being flown toward are changed and depicted as "ABxxx" fixes. If DAL were between the present point and the point cleared-to, a new point would be created and depicted on the pilot's FMS display as ABDAL.

Mr. Mahaffey recommends that fixes beginning with the character "AB" be deleted from the list of available fixes, and recalled where already in use. There are currently 108 published fixes of this type, such as ABDAL, located abeam Morgantown, West Virginia (DAL is Dallas, Texas). He further recommends that ICAO be advised of this issue so that they can pursue similar action.

AVN-100 responded that they have no new AB fixes and will not issue new ones.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Dick Powell will generate a list of AB fixes and pursue changes.

01-02-143 Military Landing Rights Ms. Ann Behrns, USAF, submitted this issue. She requests that enroute charts use parentheses around the airport name to indicate No DoD contract fuel is available. Rather than the current indication of No Military Landing Rights. She also requests that the legend be updated to reflect the change to no DoD contract fuel available.

STATUS: CLOSED

ACTION: Mr. Mike Riley will submit an RD to the IACC.

01-02-144 Eliminate Void Times from FAR 7110.1 Mr. Mike Riley, NIMA, presented this issue. He stated that the Services had reviewed DoD operations and found that due to modernization, void times are no longer used for Search and Rescue Operations or to deactivate flight plans as currently defined in FAR 7110.1. He recommends removing the void time requirement for FAR 7110.1.

STATUS: CLOSED

ACTION: Mr. Marty Walker will take the issue back to ATP-300 to review and respond to Mr. Mike Riley.

VI. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the ACF is scheduled for April 29-May 3, 2002. NACO will host the meeting at their facilities in Silver Spring, MD. Dress will be casual. The following meeting will be held October 21-24, 2002 and will be hosted by the AOPA at their facilities in Frederick, MD.