

Government/Industry Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF)

Meeting 08-02

October 22-23, 2008

MINUTES

I. Opening Remarks

The Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF) was held at the National Aeronautical Charting Office (NACO) offices in Silver Spring, Maryland. Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, ACF Co-Chair and Chair of the Aeronautical Charting Forum, Charting Group, opened the Forum on October 22, 2008. Mr. Moore introduced Mr. Terry Laydon, Manager NACO, who welcomed the ACF participants to the NACO offices, and acknowledged ACF Co-Chair Mr. Tom Schneider, AFS-420. Mr. Schneider chaired the ACF Instrument Procedures Group meeting held on October 21, 2008. Minutes of that meeting will be distributed separately.

II. Review of Minutes from Last Meeting

The minutes from the 08-01 ACF meeting were distributed electronically via the NACO website: <http://naco.faa.gov/index.asp?xml=naco/acf> last spring. They were accepted as submitted with no changes or corrections.

III. Agenda Approval

The agenda for the 08-02 meeting was accepted as presented.

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

ATA Charting Committees

Mr. Mitch Scott, Continental Airlines and Chair of the ATA Chart and Data Display Working Group was not in attendance. Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, reported that the committee had not met and that there has been no activity. The future intent of the committee is to hold ad hoc meetings only.

ACTION: Mr. Mitch Scott will report on the ATA Chart and Data Display Working Group at the next forum.

SAE G-10 Electronic Symbology Committee Report

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, provided an overview of the committee's ongoing effort to develop a basic, simplified set of symbols for use in electronic aeronautical displays. The goal is to establish symbols that are intuitive and universally recognizable. The FAA intends to use the results as a reference for use in future certification of electronic aeronautical displays. The committee is currently studying 150-200 intuitive symbols for electronic display and is nearly complete. The committee is currently working to complete the text portion of an Aerospace Recommended Practice (ARP) document, to be accompanied by a matrix of representative symbols in graphical form.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 2008, to be held at Jeppesen's office located in the Boeing/Alteon Building in Atlanta, GA. Their intent is to wrap-up their work in early 2009.

ACTION: Mr. Ted Thompson will report on the SAE G-10 Committee at the next forum.

ICAO/IFPP Committee Report

Report on latest activities of the Instrument Flight Procedures Panel (IFPP, formerly Obstacle Clearance Panel or OCP). Mr. Eric Secretan, FAA/NACO, has assumed other duties and no longer will be participating in the IFPP. Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, will be working with the IFPP and he provided a summary of some of the issues being worked:

- Naming of Step-Down Fixes (Mr. Tom Schneider FAA/AFS-420, commented that all step down fixes in the U.S. will be named.)
- Track, Course and Heading definitions and Usage
- RNAV Data Transfer Integrity
- Portrayal of Altitudes on an IAC (Mr. Ted Thompson Jeppesen, commented that some countries have a different definition of MEAs than others.)
- RF Legs

The following issues were approved by the IFPP and will be forwarded to ICAO:

- RNAV Helicopter Point-in-Space (PinS) charting for "proceed visually" and "proceed VFR" procedures
- Charting of Helicopter Point-in-Space (PinS) Route Departures
- Charting of IF, IAF, FAF, and MAPt

ACTION: Mr. Moore will submit the approved issues as IACC Requirement Documents to Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/NACO and will report on ICAO/IFPP activities at the next forum.

Temporary NAVAID Outages

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/NACO, reported that all NAVAIDs that are currently in an "Out of Service (OTS)" status and temporary NAVAID outages have been removed from the A/FD by established NFDD procedures. When a facility is now rendered out of service, that condition is carried via NOTAM and not published in the NFDD or reflected on the FAA charts or related products. The NOTAM is cancelled when the NAVAID is either returned to service or shutdown/decommissioned. Mr. Greg Pray, FAA/NFDC and Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/NFPO, have been working together to remove the dependent airspace on "shutdown" NAVAIDs so that they can be published in the NFDD as "decommissioned" and removed from charts and related products. They think there should be very few remaining "shutdown" NAVAIDs.

ACTION: Mr. Brad Rush, and Mr. Greg Pray, will report at the next ACF.

Airport Source Data Committee

Mr. Dave Goehler, Jeppesen, [provided an update](#) of the problems and solutions of collecting airport data. Past contact with several airport operators (public and private) revealed a lack of awareness and/or general confusion about what types of information should be reported to the FAA's Airports Division, the preferred

(standardized) processes used to collect the various forms of data by the NFDC, and processes for public access or dissemination.

Mr. Goehler reported that they were close to completing a final draft of the Advisory Circular (AC) intended to provide non-regulatory guidance to airport operators for the submission of airport data changes to the FAA for public dissemination. Over the course of the summer, the draft AC was circulated within the FAA for comment. The FAA elected to not submit the draft for general public comment. FAA Office of Airport Safety and Standards will evaluate all feedback and develop the final version. Finally, a FAA legal review will be required (30 day period, minimum). It was noted that changes in FAA management may slow the publication process. Airports that receive federal funds will be expected to comply with the guidance in the new AC once it's officially published.

The Airport Geographic Information System (GIS) will be the primary entry point for requesting airport changes. The AC will give guidelines on how/when to use the Airport GIS. As of October 22, 2008 the FAA does not have an estimated publication date for the new Airport Source Data AC.

ACTION: Mr. Dave Goehler will report on subcommittee activities at the next forum.

Declared Distances

Mr. Richard Boll, NBAA, [provided an update](#) of the activities of the committee since the last ACF. The three main objectives of the subcommittee are:

- Address the need & provide guidance for airports to provide declared distances
- Documentation to support pilot education (AIM and/or IPH)
- Publication and Operational Use of Declared Distances (Charts and NavData)

The working group is pursuing efforts to provide policy guidance to airport operators to provide declared (operational) distance information to NFDC and public use by completing all appropriate sections of the FAA Form 5010. The effort shall begin with FAR Part 139 (regular scheduled service) airports, and will eventually expand to include all airports.

Mr. Mike Brown, FAA Manager, Airport Safety and Operations, has developed a Policy Guidance Letter (PGL) and Cert Alert to be issued to FAA Airport Safety Inspectors. Eventually, the information would be incorporated into the official airport safety policy manual.

Work continues on finalizing a "Draft" Policy Guidance Letter (PGL). The following is a summary of issues to be addressed:

- Improved collection of declared distance information for all US FAR Part 139 airports and runways on FAA Form 5010. Similar information and training will be provided to states for collection of declared distance information for non-FAR 139 airports.
- Incorporation of the FAA Cert Alert for reporting of Stopways into the new PGL.
- Harmonization of new PGL for declared distances with ICAO Annex 14.
- Address NBAA issue to limit the airport's designation of declared distances when used as a means to restrict unwanted or undesired aircraft operations (i.e. noise abatement).
- Harmonize with existing FAA advisory circular(s) covering airport design.
- Nomenclature for operational use of declared distances.
- PGL definition of Take-Off Distance Available (TODA) and limit on use clearways.

- Identification of the origin point for declared distances when not at the runway head.

Mr. Boll indicated that once the PGL/Cert Alert covering collection of declared distances has been issued, then the agenda item can be closed.

ACTION: Mr. Richard Boll will report on subcommittee activities at the next forum.

AC90-RNP Status Update

Mr. Mark Steinbicker, FAA/AFS-470, [briefed the issue](#) to the ACF. The purpose of this new AC90-RNP covers the application of public-use RNAV RNP procedures. It is intended to address and clarify numerous emerging variations of RNP procedure design, development and implementation. Any SID, STAR or IAP with an RF leg will be impacted (except Enroute charts).

Approximately 500 comments have been received since the AC90-RNP was published. AC90-RNP is intended to compliment FAA 8260-54a. RNAV RNP will be a “controlled implementation”. Guidance in this new AC90-RNP is NOT to be confused with previous guidance published for RNP SAAAR procedures. Much of the language in the AC comes directly out of ICAO’s Performance Based Navigation (PBN) manual. Highlights include:

- Defines basic and advanced RNP
- RNP with advanced RNP (i.e. RF legs)
- Incorporation of several FAA PARC recommendations

Several spin-off issues will affect charting and may require consideration by the ACF Charting Group. Issues to be considered and resolved:

- ICAO PBN Harmonization
- Requirements for Type 2 LOAs
- RNP to Angular Final Approach Course
- Temperature Compensation
- DME/DME/IRU RNP Capability
- RF Leg on Initial, Intermediate and Missed Approach Segments
- RF Legs will be used in SID and STAR procedure design
- Equipment Requirements, Moving Map, Flight Director, Roll Steering Autopilot, RF Legs Bank Angles, etc.
- Disposition of AC 90-94 (to be cancelled) and AC 90-97

Mr. John Moore expressed a need for consistency in the titling of RNAV RNP SIDs and STARs – with or without RF legs. Mr. Pedro Rivas, ALPA, agreed and recommended that a WG be considered to address these issues. Mr. Steinbicker also noted that the FAA may adopt the ICAO term AR (Authorization Required) instead of SAAAR.

ACTION: Mr. Mark Steinbicker, FAA/AFS-470 to coordinate with Mr. Webb and provide an update at the next ACF.

ACTION: Mr. Mike Webb FAA/AFS-420, to coordinate with ICAO.

Charting Notes on CAT II Procedures

Mr. Coby Johnson, Manager, FAA/AFS-410, [briefed the FAA's plans](#) to improve and increase airport access during low visibility conditions by increasing the utilization of certain existing ILS systems. For example, precision landing minimums for ILS CAT I may be reduced one day to 200' DA and RVR 1200 or RVR 1400, and ILS CAT II minimums may be reduced to RVR 1000 with HUD and/or Autoland for certain ILS systems. Implementation of this increased capability will involve new types of procedural notes related to landing minimums, to be promulgated on applicable 8260 procedure sources. Mr. John Moore, Mr. Brad Rush, and Mr. Coby Johnson all expressed their concerns over adding notes to charts that indicate non-compliance with ICAO SARPs.

Vertical Presentations on DPs/STARs

Mr. Mark Steinbicker, FAA/AFS-470, briefed that operational issues involving "vertical constraints" have increased (i.e. Salt Lake City RNAV SIDs). The FAA will be sponsoring a "study" or "working group" in cooperation with Ms. Divya Chandra, Volpe NTSC. Details about the establishment of the study group or working group have yet to be determined. They will investigate arrival and departure procedure charting issues – looking into the depiction of vertical constraints, crossing altitudes, etc.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, commented that any activity should involve NACO, Jeppesen and Lido. Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, indicated to Mr. Steinbicker that Jeppesen definitely wants to be involved. Mr. Steinbicker indicated a desire to keep the Volpe NTSC Study initially under the auspices of AFS-470. Once there was a better understanding of the issues, he would bring them back to the ACF to determine if a subcommittee would be the best means to progress the issues.

V. Outstanding Issues

04-01-168 Identifiers for Heliports and Helipads

Mr. Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, provided a brief recap of the issue. The goal is to create location identifiers for heliports and helipads in order to support helicopter operations. The initiative is intended to provide the required NOTAM support to private use heliports and helipads.

(Note: This item also relates to ACF Issue 05-02-177, Identifiers for Copter Point-in-Space procedures. It was decided to combine the two issues into one)

Mr. Mike Webb and Mr. Greg Yamamoto, FAA/NACO, propose to treat point-in-space helicopter procedures using the same method currently used for STARs (establish a 4-character “pseudo heliport” identifier). STARs may serve multiple airports in one geographic area. This solution would serve to reduce the potential total number of NOTAMs that would be duplicated otherwise.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Greg Yamamoto, FAA/NACO, will develop a schema for establishing identifiers.

ACTION: Mr. Mike Webb will get industry input and report on issue at the next ACF.

04-02-170 Idents & Coordinates for Parachute Jump Areas (PJA)

John Moore, NACO, recapped the issue and turned it over to Mr. Greg Pray, FAA/NFDC. Mr. Pray reported that PJA identifiers have been assigned for some airports in NASR over the past 6 or 7 months. So far, none have appeared in the A/FD. Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/NACO, will speak to Ms. Debra Copeland, FAA/NACO, to see just how they were planning to list these identifiers in the A/FD. Ms. Watson pointed out that the provision of source was the original issue and that the previous source was the FAA’s Flight Service Stations (FSS). While most FSSs duties have been taken over by the contractor, Northrup Grumman, the provision of PJAs was omitted. USPA has verbally committed to providing annually revised listings to the FAA. The question was asked, how will we insure that USPA will continue to provide the source? The forum agreed that some sort of formal agreement was needed from USPA. Mr. George Sempeles FAA/NFDC will need to acquire a written statement to the ACF about source updates. The charting specifications have not been changed. ARINC version 19 accommodates PJAs.

Editorial Note: The following was received from Mr. George Sempeles, after the ACF: NFDC sent out a memorandum to the 3 Service Areas requesting a review of all PJA data within their jurisdictions. To date, NFDC has received responses from 2 of the 3 service areas. Data from the respondents is currently being analyzed by NFDC’s airspace specialists.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. George Sempeles to provide a written statement about source and will provide an update at the next ACF.

[05-02-177 Identifiers for Copter Point-in-Space Procedures](#)

Note: This item relates to ACF Issue 04-01-168, Identifiers for Heliports and Helipads. It was decided to combine the two issues into one. See issue 04-01-168 Identifiers for Heliport and Helipads. This issue will remain open until the related issue closes.

STATUS: OPEN

[05-02-179 Attention All-Users Page for Simultaneous, Parallel RNAV Departures & PRM Approaches](#)

Mr. Mark Steinbicker, FAA/AFS-470, reported that no progress had been made toward publishing advisory notices in an "All Users Page" in the front of each relevant TPP or publishing the information in the A/FD. Mr. Steinbicker agreed that AFS-410 would be responsible for these notices. However, the source data shouldn't be disseminated through the 8260-10, it should be coming through the NFDD.

Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, suggested that the notices should be published for each procedure, which is what ALPA and NBAA prefer.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Ernie Skiver, FAA/AFS-410 was asked to take this issue back to Mr. Coby Johnson at AFS-410 and Spyder Thomas, FAA/AFS-400 for Approaches.

ACTION: Mr. Mark Steinbicker will provide an update at the next ACF.

[07-01-192 Recording, Reporting and Dissemination of Usable Lengths for Takeoff and Landing](#)

This agenda item also relates to ACF agenda item 06-01-181 Declared Distance Information on Airport Charts (since closed in ACF 07-01).

The NBAA wants the FAA to provide in NFDD source "declared distance" or available runway length information (landing beyond displaced threshold) anytime the full length of runway is not available, typically when a displaced landing threshold exists.

The correlation between landing beyond threshold distances and declared distances must be carefully evaluated, as they represent different values and must be labeled appropriately.

Airport authorities are responsible for establishing their own declared distances.

The FAA is attempting to meet safety area standards by providing declared distances for airports in increasing numbers (via the NFDD and A/FD publication). Reference: FAA Order 5200.8 titled Runway Safety Area Program dated October 1999.

Mr. Richard Boll, NBAA, is chairman of the ACF Declared Distances Subcommittee. The agenda item is under the scope of this group. Refer to the subcommittee report provided earlier in these minutes.

Issue will remain open until resolution, then it will be reported back to the Charting Group.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Richard Boll will report at the next ACF.

07-01-193 Charting Helicopter RNAV Routes

Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, recapped the issue originally submitted by Mr. Paul Ewing, AMTI. ICAO Annexes say Helicopter RNAV routes are allowed to use the prefix letters "TK". Mr. Paul Gallant, Airspace & Rules, confirmed within the FAA that the combined prefix of "TK" for helicopter route idents is acceptable. The combination is accepted for the NASR database (per Greg Pray, FAA/NFDC), and would also conform to Jeppesen's ARINC database format as well (per Kyle Jermyn, Jeppesen). Paul Ewing confirmed that the routes would be GNSS Required.

Paul Ewing reported that a Notice of Proposed Rulemaking is being addressed within the Airspace and Rules branch of the FAA. He commented that other countries would need to know about these new routes. Air Traffic coordination will define what the requirements are.

Mr. Paul Gallant, FAA/Airspace & Rules, indicated that the establishment of new helicopter routes would require rulemaking (Docket action). The RNAV/RNP Office will provide comments to Airspace and Rules. Currently, there are two helicopter routes between Boston and New York and two between New York and Washington, DC that are ready to be published. Mr. Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, commented that the Helicopter Association Intl (HAI) is putting together a working group to take advantage of what is being done.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Paul Gallant, FAA/AJR-33 will report back at the next ACF. Valerie Watson (NACO) will draw up required IACC specification change documents to allow charting of these routes on IFR Low Enroute and VFR products.

07-01-195 Charting and AFD Information Re: Class E Surface Areas

Mr. Ray Nussear, FAA/NACO, recapped the issue at the ACF.

As the data was examined, various problems were discovered. For example, some airspace areas had two legal descriptions instead of just one. Airspace extensions haven't been keeping up with airports that have an added instrument approach procedures.

Based on the lengthy discussion it was obvious that there is a significant amount of work involved in reviewing the relationships and correlation of part time hours between related Class D and E airspaces. Legal documentation and airspace descriptions will be involved.

The clean-up process will take some time to resolve for FAA/Airspace and Rules. Mr. Nussear believes these actions will address and eventually resolve the original issue. Once NACO begins to see the legal descriptions cleaned-up, pilots will see the charts change. This may take a number of charting cycles to resolve. A revised legend for the A/FD is also required and perhaps addition of some verbiage in the AIM Chapter 3 to prevent confusion. The A/FD will continue to publish the hours of part-time airspace, but will provide a more correct introductory explanation of the relationship between part time Class C or D airspace with and without a full or part time Class E surface core w/extensions. Also, Order 7400.9 may need to be changed. Mr. Paul Gallant, FAA/AJR-33, is overseeing coordination within the affected offices of the FAA.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Paul Gallant, FAA/Airspace & Rules, to parse out discrepancies to the regions for clarification and report back at the next forum.

ACTION: Mr. Ray Nussear and Ms. Valerie Watson to coordinate with Airspace and Rules for exact A/FD Extension note wording and report back at the next forum.

07-01-196 Q Route DME/DME IRU MEA

Mr. John Moore, NACO, recapped the issue at the ACF. Many of the “Q-Routes” on High IFR Enroute charts have charted MEAs that are above 18,000 feet, but only apply to DME/DME/IRU operations; however, some chart users do not realize that GNSS aircraft can normally operate along those routes at FL180 and above. While the chart legend explains MEA charting methodology for Q Routes, it is not intuitively obvious looking at the chart that the charted MEA generally only applies to DME/DME/IRU operations. Whether it is because the chart user forgot, misunderstood or didn’t read the legend, the effectiveness of the charting to convey GNSS MEA information could be improved.

Mr. Moore recommended a pro-active approach by adding a “D” suffix to a DME/DME/IRU MEA (i.e. 24000D) similar to what is used for GPS MEAs (i.e. 2500G) and cover the explanation in the legend.

In Alaska the use of WAAS MEA may allow a lower MEA than GPS MEA.

Mr. Mark Steinbicker, FAA-AFS470 recommended splitting off the Alaska discussion from the lower 48 states to avoid confusing the issue.

The general consensus was to use a “D” suffix for DME/DME/IRU MEAs and a “G” suffix for GNSS MEAs. Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, stated that Jeppesen would support the concept.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/NACO, will write-up an RD to add the “D” suffix to DME/DME/IRU MEAs for the IACC and report back at the next ACF.

07-01-197 Graphic Airport NOTAMs

Mr. Roy Maxwell, Delta Airlines, reported that digital NOTAMs were close to fruition and recommended closing the issue. The forum concurred.

STATUS: CLOSED

07-02-198 Use of Charts to Validate Navigation Database Information

Mr. Pedro Rivas, ALPA, [briefed the issue](#) to the ACF.

FAR 911.503 (a) states: “The pilot in command of an airplane shall ensure that the following flying equipment and aeronautical charts and data, in current and appropriate form, are accessible for each flight at the pilot station of the airplane.”

The briefing focused on a proposal developed by the NDCWG to add “procedure amendment number dates” to instrument approach charts to aid pilots in determining chart and database procedure coding currency.

Based on the NDCWG’s earlier telecons, the group decided to focus attention on terminal procedures, starting in the U.S., to develop a foundation for a potential solution that might work on a global basis. Enroute issues would be address later in 2009. It was generally agreed that Mr. Rivas would need to seek ICAO endorsement, as ICAO does not provide a “procedure amendment number dates” (version) system.

The proposed solution to the issue focused on charting the procedure effective date in addition to the Julian date on all IAPs. A discussion of the difficulties involved with P-NOTAMs ensued and Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/NACO and Mr. Greg Yamamoto, FAA/NACO, agreed to take up this issue with Mr. Rivas offline to work out any details. It was determined to keep the issue on the agenda until the next ACF.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: NACO to coordinate internally between AVN and IAP branch prior to contacting Mr. Rivas.

ACTION: Mr. Pedro Rivas, ALPA will report status at the next ACF.

07-02-200 Charting of Alert Areas

Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, recapped the issue. Basically, should Alert Areas be changed to magenta on Visual charts and to brown on Enroute charts? Mr. Lance Christian, DoD/NGA, stated that IACC RD 665 was in the process of being signed by the IACC.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valarie Watson to report at the next ACF meeting.

07-02-201 Charting of Flight Training Areas, USAF Academy

Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, recapped the issue. He reported that Mr. Dan Rund, Air Force Academy, contacted NACO via e-mail requesting to drop the issue. However, he left the issue for AOPA to pursue if they wanted. Mr. Pete Lehmann, AOPA reported that his organization’s members want these training areas charted on the flyway side of VFR TACs. This would serve informational purposes for pilots, similar to charted IFR Arrival Routes. Information on arrival routes come from FAA Cartographic Standards and originate from the region or facility. Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, explained that when using boundaries they must be legally defined.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/NACO, commented that Alert Areas were specifically created for the purpose of flight training and that, if through coordination with Airspace & Rules, the Alert Area criteria could be waived or made exception to, these areas might fit into that category. She also reiterated that NACO currently identifies these types of areas with boxed notes for pilot awareness.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Pete Lehmann will contact George Sempeles and will report back at the next ACF.

07-02-202 Inconsistent & Incomplete Charting of STAR Holding Patterns

The NBAA's recommendation is to chart Holding Pattern Leg Lengths and DME Min/Max Limits on conventional SID/STAR charts. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, took the issue to the AISWG. The consensus of the AISWG was to include a notation in the remarks section of the NFDD for each holding pattern to indicate specific usage for SID/STAR charting purposes. The 8260-2 will still be the source for holding pattern usage on SIAPs. Mr. Greg Pray, FAA/NFDC will put in NFDD and publish on the applicable SID or STAR.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Greg Pray will report at the next ACF.

07-02-204 Continued Charting of Airports "Closed Indefinitely"

Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, recapped the issue for the forum. Mr. Mark Ingram, ALPA, gave the example of Air Park South in Ozark, MO. The airport has been closed for 3 years yet remains in the A/FD and on the Kansas City Sectional. Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/NFPO, stated that State Aviation Departments have to officially close the airport to get it out of the FAA's system, although the FAA may have already taken action to remove or cancel related flight procedures.

Editorial Note: The following was received from Mr. George Sempeles, after the ACF: NFDC prepared NASR report of airports/heliports with the status of "Closed Indefinitely" and similar variable "CLSD UFN". Report was sent to Brad Rush of NFPO to insure instrument procedures in to such facilities are N/A'd.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Greg Pray, FAA/NFDC to report at the next ACF.

08-01-206 Runway Status Lights Information Charts for Pilots

Mr. Pete Hwoschinsky, FAA/AJP-671 reported that Runway Status Light tests at San Diego and Dallas-Ft. Worth were positive. Los Angeles and Boston RWSLs will be completed by the end of 2008. Now the focus of the FAA is to get the information out to pilots.

John Moore suggested that the training material be included within the AIM. Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, commented that it was impractical to put lighting information on Airport Diagrams. Jeppesen would support some general information in front of each book instead.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Peter Hwoschinsky, FAA/AJP-671 will work the issue offline with Ms. Valerie Watson FAA/NACO, Mr. Greg Pray FAA/NFDC, Mr. Ted Thompson and Mr. Axel Freidrich, Lido, and will update the status at the next ACF.

08-01-207 Depiction of Minimum Crossing Altitudes on Graphic Departure Procedures

Mr. John Moore recapped the issue. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS420, provided a report on the outcome of the single IPG subcommittee telecom that took place in July 2008. It was decided that all unannotated crossing altitudes would be assumed to be MCAs (for obstacle clearance, NAVAID reception, etc). When a crossing altitude is specified by Air Traffic, it will be annotated "ATC" and an accompanying "MCA" will *always* be published. Air Traffic would not be permitted to clear aircraft below the "MCA" altitude. It was agreed by NACO and Jeppesen that the ATC altitude would be the one coded in the databases.

Mr. Schneider reported that Flight Standards has determined that minor changes/clarifications to 8260.46d guidance for the application of MCAs are warranted. Also, additional clarifying guidance for Air Traffic (7110.65) and AIM language is appropriate. Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/NACO, is responsible for applicable NACO charting specs and the TPP legend. She has written and presented RD 667 to the MPOC for consideration. Mr. Schneider is overseeing related activity and plans to coordinate publication and release. A follow-up telecon of the subcommittee will be arranged, perhaps before year's end.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, will convene another meeting and report at next ACF.

08-01-208 TPP Rate of Climb Table Improvements

Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, recapped the issue. Mr. Richard Boll, NBAA inquired what the highest climb gradient was of all currently published DPs. New York's La Guardia Airport has a DP with a 900 ft/nm climb gradient and there's currently one procedure in coordination with a 1000 ft/nm. Mr. Roy Maxwell, Delta Airlines, requested that a cap be established before it could be approved as a public procedure. Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, replied that there is a cap in the 46C at 500 ft/nm. Mr. Moore proposed that Mr. Maxwell write a RD to the IPG proposing such a cap. Mr. Boll asked if a standard formula could be posted below the current table for climb gradients in excess of what is currently published. Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, commented that some procedures have their own climb gradient table published on the procedure, but that is not an option for all DPs. NGA's table goes up to 1000 ft/nm now, but has a higher airspeed rate than that on the FAA's. Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/NACO and Lance Christian, NGA/OMS will look at the issue at the next IACC MPOC meeting and report at the next ACF.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Ms. Valerie Watson to report at the next ACF.

VI. New Charting Topics

08-02-210 Charting Medical Facility Heliports for EMS

Mr. James Lamb, FAA Safety Team (FAAST) briefed the issue to the ACF. He cited one recent fatal midair accident in Flagstaff, AZ, this year that involved two EMS providers flying into a single heliport. Compounding the problem are younger, less experienced pilots entering into the system as Vietnam era pilots retire.

On behalf of the Emergency Medical Service (EMS) industry, participants of the FAA Safety Team requested all medical heliport/helipad information be available and displayed on aviation maps for use by helicopter pilots. The participants in the EMS/FAA meeting believed this to be an important safety feature that could help reduce future EMS helicopter accidents. Charting frequency information will facilitate communications between traffic on the same frequency and will mitigate confusion or lack of communication between several inbound aircraft.

Currently multiple aircraft, owned by different operators, enroute to the same medical facility may be operating on individual dispatch frequencies because they may be unaware of a CTAF frequency designated for the destination heliport or helipad. Charted heliport/helipad locations would also assist and mitigate low visibility operation concerns. Although EMS helicopter pilots may be in contact with ATC, they often do not communicate or coordinate directly with one another. The FAAST believes this poses a serious safety issue.

The EMS/FAA representatives also recommended that heliports/helipads be charted on US FAA VFR Terminal Area Charts (TAC), and that Helicopter Route Charts be developed for all large metropolitan areas. Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/NACO, stated that NACO has 9 helicopter route charts now. Mr. John Moore, FAA/NACO, asked what their definition of “large” was, referring to “large metropolitan areas”.

Mr. Moore and Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, expressed a need to address the whole subject of helicopter operations that would consider the availability of source data, aeronautical charting, and availability of information for electronic databases.

Essential issues to consider are:

- What are the requirements?
- What information is necessary to support HEMS operations?
- Where would the source come from?
- How would source data be promulgated and updated?

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/NFPO commented that the FAA Airports Division would need to be involved, as would NFDC. Also, many heliports and helipads are privately owned and operated. As such, they may not want to give out that information. Hospitals have limited landing privileges.

Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, commented that FAA NFPO already oversees the development of numerous IFR “special” helicopter procedures. The FAAST’s recommendation expands the subject into the VFR arena. Mr. Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420 is already involved in several helicopter issues – but with regard to IFR aspects. Mr. Lamb agreed to coordinate with Mr. Webb on the issues. Mr. Lamb has been asked to provide additional information at the next ACF to address the issues discussed and specific user requirements. Mr. Lamb commented that an EMS user group meeting would take place sometime in the near future.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. James Lamb to provide additional information at the next ACF.

VII. Closing Remarks

Mr. John Moore thanked everyone for their participation. A special thanks was extended to Mr. Dick Neher for providing snacks and drinks for the three-day event. Acknowledgement was given to Mr. Jim Grant, FAA/NACO, for his work as the ACF/CG Secretary for the past two years. Mr. Grant will be passing on his duties to Mr. Gary Workinger, FAA/NACO. Official Minutes will be published and provided via the internet. The two website addresses (IPG and CG) will be provided via email to all participants when the minutes have been posted.

VIII. Next Meeting

The next meeting of the ACF (09-01) is scheduled for April 28-30, 2009 at the USGS facility in Reston, Virginia. Mr. Lance Christian, NGA requested a list of individuals attending the event be forwarded to him. Attendees are expected to provide a government issued photo ID and will be expected to sign-in/sign-out personal computer laptops at the door. The location for ACF meeting 09-02 in October 2009 has not been confirmed.

Editorial Note: Mr. Steve Serur, ALPA, agreed in an email received after the ACF, to host the 09-02 ACF (October 27-29, 2009) at ALPA offices in Herndon, VA.

Please note the attached (Attachment 7) Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) listing for action items. It is requested that all OPRs provide the Chair, John Moore, (with an information copy to Mr. Gary Workinger) a written status update on open issues no later than April 3, 2009.

Note – These status reports will be used to compile the minutes of the meeting and will be the “for the record” statement of your presentation. A reminder notice will be provided.

A special thanks to Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, for providing his meeting notes for use in these ACF minutes.

XI. Attachments

1. Attendees/Mailing List
2. Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) List

ACF Website URL Disclosure: Website URLs included these minutes were accurate and reflect the URL address at the time these minutes we drafted and approved.