

**Government / Industry Aeronautical Charting Forum 12-01  
Charting Group**

**April 25-26, 2012**

**MINUTES**

**I. Opening Remarks**

The Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF) was hosted by Innovative Solutions International and held at Pragmatics Corporate Headquarters in Reston, VA. Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, opened the Charting Group portion of the Forum on Wednesday, April 25, 2012. Ms. Watson acknowledged the ACF Co-chair Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, who chaired the Instrument Procedures Group meeting held on April 24. Minutes of that meeting will be distributed separately.

Ms. Watson acknowledged and expressed appreciation to Innovative Solutions International for hosting the 12-01 ACF.

Ms. Watson acknowledged the former Chair of the Charting Group, Mr. John Moore, AJV-22.

**II. Discussion of Next ACF**

Ms. Watson informed the Forum participants that the tentative location for ACF 12-02 (October 23-25, 2012) would be ALPA's headquarters in Herndon, VA.

**III. Review of Minutes from Last Meeting**

The minutes from the 11-02 ACF meeting were distributed electronically last fall via the AeroNav website [http://www.faa.gov/air\\_traffic/flight\\_info/aeronav/acf/](http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/acf/). They were accepted as submitted with no changes or corrections.

**IV. Agenda Approval**

The agenda for the 12-01 meeting was accepted as presented.

## V. Presentations, ACF Working Group Reports, ACF Project Reports

### A) ICAO/IFPP Committee Report

Mr. Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420 and U.S. Member of the ICAO Instrument Flight Procedures Panel (IFPP), [provided an update](#) on the ICAO/IFPP Committee activities and an overview of the key topics of the recent ICAO/IFPP Integration Working Group (IWG) meeting.

Mr. Webb stated that since the last ACF, 29 papers have been presented to the Plenary, consisting of 7 working group reports, 2 new manuals and 13 papers with Amendments accepted. Mr. Webb provided a breakdown of accomplishments and future plans by work group.

*Air Traffic Management Workgroup (ATM) Accomplishments: Completion of Continuous Climb Operations Manual and Continuous Descent Operations Manual.*

*ATM Plans: Review and make changes to ICAO Doc 4444 – PANS-ATM; Address RNAV Transitions; Address phraseology and termination restrictions.*

*Integration Workgroup (IWG) Accomplishments: Inclusion of 11 different charting examples within the ICAO Doc 8697 Attachment; Naming concepts for PBN Instrument Procedures; Annex 4 Amendments for PinS Maneuvering Visual Segment Charting (2 papers); ICAO Doc 8697 Amendments for PinS Maneuvering Visual Segments (2 papers); PinS LPV Charting Concepts Paper.*

*IWG Plans: Depiction and Promulgation of RNP Accuracy Requirements; Mature Amendments for Charting of PinS LPV Procedures; Ad Hoc Group Results on Naming of PBN Procedures; Promulgation of SBAS LPV Lines of Minima; Best Industry Practices on Encoding the SBAS FAS Data Block*

*MWG Workgroup Accomplishments: MOC Reduction in a Turn; Implementation of the Visual Segment Surface; Temperature Compensation for MOCA; rewrite of Volume II Baro-VNAV Chapter; Approval of the removal of Simultaneous Parallel Approach Restrictive Language for SBAS and GBAS; Reduction of HL for Final Segments with Vertical Guidance; Adoption of Methodology of Calculated Obstacle Effects for Side Surfaces in Missed Approach for Vertically Guided Approaches.*

*MWG Workgroup Plans: completed redraft of Volume II Baro-VNAV Chapter; provide WP showing TERPS GQS Flexibility when compared with PANS OPS Visual Segment Surface; being Preparation of GBAS FAS Data Block Amendment for PANS OPS Volume II; introduce new task in response to IFPP/5 Paper.*

*PBN~NC Workgroup Accomplishments: Amendment to PANS OPS Permitting SBAS LPV use of ILS Obstacle Clearance Surface - ILS CAT I OAS and CRM Accepted; Acceptance of Amendment to PANS OPS to Provide Consistency with Annex 10 Amendment 85; Acceptance of SBAS LP Criteria Amendment; rewrite of PANS OPS*

*RnP Criteria* in progress; adoption of *DMAS Calculation for Missed Approach RNP < 1.0*.

PBN Workgroup Accomplishments: *RF Leg to FAF Criteria* (2 items); *Instrument Procedures* (3 items)

PBN Workgroup Plans: prepare text to populated *ICAO Doc 8168 Volume II, Part III, Section 1, Chapter 6 – GBAS*; collaborate with EUROCONTROL and US NSP Member on APV Terminology; Completion of *RF leg to FAF Criteria and Missed Approach Criteria*; Prepare *SBAS LPV ICAO Doc 8168 Volume I* material.

Helicopter Workgroup (HWG) Accomplishments: *PinS LPV Criteria from IFPP/9 (Editorials)*; *DOC 8697 Charting for PinS Approach Maneuvering Visual Segments*; *DOC 8697 Charting for PinS Departure Maneuvering Visual Segments*; Introduction of *Helicopter PinS LPV Charting Concepts*.

HWG Plans: Collaborate with IWG and finalize *Helicopter PinS LPV Charting and Promulgation Amendments*; review *RNP 0.3 Criteria* for applicability to all helicopter phases of flight.

**ACTION:** Mr. Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, will provide an update at the next forum.

## **B) Declared Distances**

Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, reported that the Declared Distances Working Group (DDWG) has not met since the last ACF and thus has no update to provide. He stated that he was awaiting the release of the new FAA Airport Design Advisory Circular 150/5300-13A which is due for release soon. Upon release of the Advisory Circular (AC), the DDWG will reconvene, review the AC and provide comment if necessary.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, inquired whether, in light of the new AC, Mr. Boll anticipated any revision to the meaning and use of the negative D icon on TPPs. Mr. Boll stated that he and the group wanted to see what the FAA publishes in the final version of the AC before making any recommendations on that subject.

**ACTION:** Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, will update the group following the DDWG assessment of the AC and will speak to possible revision of the use of the negative D.

### **C) Airport Surveying – GIS Program**

Dr. Michael McNerney, FAA/AAS-100, was not in attendance and no update was provided.

**ACTION:** Dr. Michael McNerney, FAA/AAS-100, will provide an update at the next forum.

### **D) RNAV (RNP) SAAAR to AR (Authorization Required)**

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, provided an update stating that all but a handful of the subject procedures have been updated via P-NOTAM (revising the “Special Aircraft and Aircrew Authorization Required” note to “Authorization Required”). He reported that there are only several procedures in Alaska outstanding and he anticipates that they will be revised for the May 2012 charting cycle.

**ACTION:** Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, will provide an update at the next forum.

### **E) Discontinuation of VOR Services**

Mr. Ken Ward, FAA/AJW-911, [provided an update](#) on the FAA’s plans to decommission over 400 VORs by 2020. Mr. Ward briefed that a Federal Register notice of proposed policy and request for comments was published on December 15, 2011 (Available on line at <https://federalregister.gov/a/2011-31451>). The comment period ended on March 7, 2012. A subsequent Federal Register notice is due out within the month of May encompassing the comments submitted.

Work continues on the process by which the FAA will evaluate VORs currently in use to determine which can safely be decommissioned and which will need to remain operational.

Mr. Ward stated that the overall plan briefed at the last ACF remained unchanged, with the projected number of VORs decommissioned remaining at or about 450. The number of DMEs in the NAS will not diminish, but is expected to drastically expand. The total number of required DMEs anticipated is as yet undetermined.

A lengthy discussion ensued, during which Mr. Paul Eure, FAA/AJE-31, mentioned his concern that the current Standard Service Volume (SSV) for VORs of 40 NM, compared with the 77 NM proposed, may cause problems. It was also discussed how the decommissioning of a large number of VORs would impact GA, how the FAA would insure the continuation of a sufficient number to insure safety, etc. The issue presents major challenges with regards to the redefinition of SSVs, routes, fixes, airspace, flight inspection, DME/DME/IRU reassessment, etc. and the associated costs incurred in making these changes.

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, inquired as to budget implications for the FAA in defining fixes/airspace/procedure issues presented by the proposed migration to NEXTGEN. What are the costs associated with the charting changes that these actions will incur? Has the FAA planned and established cost projections for these changes?

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, responded that AeroNav Products is in the process of attempting to assess the cost impact, but that until detailed transition plans are received, this is not possible.

Mr. Thompson stated that the issue for commercial charting entities is the resources necessary to handle a large volume of changes to charts, procedures and database programming.

**ACTION:** Mr. Ken Ward, FAA/AJW-911, will notify the Chair of ACF-Charting Group should a briefing be warranted at the next ACF.

#### **F) Denver RNAV Project**

No update was provided at this ACF.

**ACTION:** Updates provided to ACF as events unfold.

#### **G) Proposed Charting of National Marine Sanctuaries on VFR Products**

Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, provided a briefing on the establishment and proposed charting of the [NOAA-Regulated National Marine Sanctuaries published in the Federal Register on January 26, 2012](#). Mr. Fecht stated that NOAA had requested that the FAA depict (on Visual Charts) the boundary areas for [Monterey Bay, Channel Islands, Gulf of the Farallones and Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuaries](#) and the associated altitude restrictions. Although these are not FAA Flight Restrictions, there are [significant monetary fines](#) associated with violation of these areas.

Mr. Fecht [presented several sample graphic depictions](#) of the Sanctuaries. The first slide depicted the Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary per current IACC Specifications. The Second slide showed a proposed depiction of the same sanctuary with the symbology retained, but the symbol color changed from blue to magenta. Additional notes were added to the chart to aid in identifying the new zones. He demonstrated that the areas would appear much more prominently in magenta and that users would be more readily able to recognize and thus avoid the areas.

Mr. Fecht opened the floor up to comments on the depiction proposal.

Mr. Tom Kramer, AOPA, asked if the depiction of the new NOAA areas (the magenta colored depiction) would be carried over to any other similar new 'areas' that are

established by other Government agencies. Mr. Fecht answered that yes, the magenta depiction, if agreed upon, would be established in the IACC specifications per an RD.

Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, inquired as to what implications NOAA's request had on IFR charts and whether that had been taken into account. Mr. Fecht stated that he was not aware of any analysis done by NOAA regarding IFR implications. Mr. Boll then asked how the FAA manages and tracks requests when they come from 3<sup>rd</sup> parties (other Government, non-FAA and non-DoD). Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, asked how will such regulatory airspace/protection areas be sourced? Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, responded that AeroNav's sources for such areas (non-FAA "airspace-type" areas) have historically been NOAA and the Department of the Interior. In this case, after the request came from NOAA, AeroNav was able to obtain the original Federal Register announcement describing the areas and use it as additional source. In many cases, particularly the Department of Interior areas, source is received via memo from that agency. Because these are not FAA Airspace, they are not sourced by the FAA (NFDD, FAA Order 7400, etc.).

Mr. Kramer asked if the Government, namely the FAA, was obligated to depict any/all Federal restricted/regulated airspace? Ms. Watson responded that yes, she felt the FAA would be remiss in NOT charting such airspace. She expanded on this thought by describing that the intended purpose of the Visual chart is as a tool for safe VFR flight – to show pilots where they can fly and where they perhaps should not. If these areas are not depicted on the charts, how will pilots know of their existence and be able to avoid them?

Mr. Rafael Quezada, FAA/AOV-330, voiced that because these are not newly-established areas, a Safety Risk Management (SRM) assessment to chart them is not required. The establishment of any new areas would require an SRM. For future areas or modification of existing areas, NOAA is obligated to coordinate with local FAA Airspace Service Area managing authorities.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-22, brought up the challenges in being able to maintain the charts if other agencies only provide information via the Federal Register. Mr. Moore suggested that an update agreement be established between the FAA and the Federal agency requesting the charting of airspace that is regulated.

Mr. Thompson noted that there is a need to database the parameters of these new areas and the altitude restrictions associated with them. Unless this is done, the NOAA regulated areas will not appear on any flight system. Mr. Thompson added that it appeared to him that NOAA was only looking to depict the regulated airspace on paper VFR charts and that they had not taken into account the broader ramifications of establishing such areas.

Mr. Boll expressed concern over the new NOAA areas that lie within the Los Angeles area, given the proximity of airports and approach and departure patterns within the LA area.

There was a general discussion regarding whether NOAA is authorized to establish flight restrictions. Ms. Watson, voiced that regardless of the steps NOAA took in the establishment of the areas, the CHARTING of the areas is already covered by IACC specifications and does not require further authority. She clarified that the question of NOAA's right to establish flight restrictions is a legal concern that is outside the scope of the Forum – the group is tasked to help determine how they should be charted as they now exist.

There was support within the Forum for the magenta depiction of such regulated areas on Visual Charts. However, because it is not known whether NOAA conducted the required coordination with local FAA Service Area representatives (as outlined by Mr. Quezada, above), it was agreed that there was a need for an impact analysis to be done within Terminal and Enroute.

**ACTION:** Mr. Paul Eure, FAA/AJE-31, will take the matter to the Western Service Area and have them conduct the necessary analysis. Mr. Eure will report back on his findings at the next ACF.

**ACTION:** Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321 and Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, will finalize the specification revision RD for submission to the MPOC/IACC for approval. Mr. Rick Fecht will report back on the implementation at the next ACF.

**ACTION:** Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, will coordinate with the AeroNav Products charting management on evaluating the impact of the NOAA regulated airspace on IFR products.

## VI. Outstanding Issues

### A) 05-02-179 Attention All-Users Page for Simultaneous Parallel RNAV Departures & PRM Approaches

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, reviewed the action items from the last ACF. Ms. Watson [presented the latest prototype](#) of the AAUP for Atlanta Hartsfield.

Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, provided an update on the changes to the 8620.46D. Mr. Schneider commented that coordination of the revisions would be complete within the next two months. Ms. Watson asked if the source process for creation of the AAUP (AFS-470 to ATC to FPO in Service Area to NFDC for publication in the NFDD) was to be included in the .46 guidance. Mr. Schneider responded that, at least at this time, that detail was not planned to be a part of the revision. Ms. Watson expressed concern that the source process needs to be firmly established and documented.

Mr. Kel Christianson, FAA/AFS-470, commented that the maintenance issues related to all AAUPs was still being worked out within AFS-470. It is expected that RNAV Departure AAUPs will only be created for a very limited number of airports (5 or 6 estimated) with simultaneous parallel operations. Mr. Christianson stated that it was his understanding that AFS-470 is to share the RNAV Departure AAUP responsibility with ATC. However, as to the question of who/what office is to be responsible for original creation and maintenance of an AAUP was still not clear.

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, in response to Mr. Christianson's inquiry, stated that AAUPs would be initiated by the local ATC facility requesting it. The proposed AAUP would then proceed to the Service Area, Flight Inspection, then to AFS-470 for oversight and ultimately to NFDC for inclusion in the NFDD. Ms. Watson again expressed concern that NFDC needs to know from what specific office are they to accept AAUPs for publication.

#### **STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Kel Christianson, FAA/AFS-470, to formalize the process within AFS-470 as to who would be responsible for creating and maintenance of AAUP and their submission to NFDC.

**ACTION:** Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, provide an update on the progress of the revisions and comment process for FAA Form 8260.46D and report back at next ACF.

**ACTION:** Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, to coordinate with Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420 on the AAUP data/document flow for establishing a new AAUP to be entered into the FAA Form 8260.46D.

**B) 07-01-192 Recording, Reporting and Dissemination of Usable Runway Lengths for Takeoff and Landing**

See the Declared Distance Working Group report in paragraph V. B.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Richard Boll, NBAA, will report back at the next ACF.

---

**C) 07-01-195 Charting and A/FD Information Re: Class E Surface Areas**

Mr. Paul Gallant, FAA/AJV-11, was not in attendance. No update was provided.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Gallant, FAA/AJV-11, to provide update at next ACF.

---

**D) 09-01-213 TERPs Change 21 Circling Approaches**

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed attendees on the progress made since the last ACF. Ms. Watson stated that an RD, based on former ACF recommendations, has been drafted and formally submitted to the IACC for approval. She thanked Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA and Mr. Roy Maxwell, Delta, for their help finalizing the TPP front matter guidance & tables. At present, the IACC is reviewing the RD. [Depictions were shown](#) illustrating the changes to be made within the TPPs, both in the explanatory front matter and on the circling lines of minima.

Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, inquired as to whether any changes had been made to the RD since it was submitted to the IACC. Ms. Watson replied that no further changes had been made.

Mr. Schneider added that changes have already been made to the 8260.19 with regards to the documentation of procedures to which the new circling criteria has been applied. (Additional Flight Data box of 8260 source document will contain a note "CHART CIRCLING ICON".)

A question was raised within the audience as to when procedure implementation of the Change 21 criteria is expected.

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, commented that Change 21 Circling implementation is anticipated to begin by the end of September 2012. Users should begin to see the changes appear on the charts in the early part of CY2013.

Mr. Schneider inquired as to whether guidance material was ready to appear in the AIM concurrent with the publication of the first procedures.

Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, replied that his office would follow up on AIM guidance.

Mr. Rich Dunham, FAA/AFS-420, commented that the Instrument Procedures Handbook (IPH) was in draft at present, but that the upcoming version would contain Change 21 Circling information.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to provide an update on IACC approval of the charting proposal at next ACF. (She will also provide a final copy of the approved RD to Jeppesen & Lido.)

**ACTION:** Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, to follow up on AIM guidance and report back at next ACF.

**ACTION:** Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, to provide an update on implementation progress at next ACF.

---

**E) 09-01-214 SMGCS Taxi Charts**

Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, provided an update on the work that has been done since the last ACF. Mr. McGray discussed the harmonization process between the FAA and ICAO regarding the naming of SMGCS, which within ICAO is referred to as “Low Visibility Operations (LVO)”. To help minimize confusion between the FAA and other aviation agencies, the FAA will henceforth refer to SMGCS as LVO/SMGCS.

Mr. McGray reported that of the 129 airports that had SMGCS, 56 have completed the operational verification program. JFK and SFO do not yet have fully approved SMGCS operations in place.

Mr. McGray stated that work was ongoing with regard to the standardization of charting symbology and overall chart standardization within Flight Standards and between IASA and ICAO.

Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, asked about the regulatory implications of SMGCS outside the FAA Part 121 and 135 worlds. Would there be any impact or relevance for the FAA Part 91 community?

Mr. McGray replied that the involvement and use of SMGCS within the Part 91 community was a gray area. Involvement within the SMCGS program would be up to the operator.

Mr. Rich Boll asked that NBAA be included in the discussions regarding the development and establishment of SMGCS operations at airports. Mr. Boll commented that NBAA’s Regional Representatives would be able to represent and be involved at-airport on behalf of the Association. Mr. McGray agreed to include NBAA in airport discussions.

**SMGCS Working Group**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Phone #</b>	<b>Email</b>
Mr. Bruce McGray	FAA/AFS-410	202-385-4725	<a href="mailto:bruce.mcgray@faa.gov">bruce.mcgray@faa.gov</a>
Mr. Ted Thompson	Jeppesen	303-328-4456	<a href="mailto:ted.thompson@jeppesen.com">ted.thompson@jeppesen.com</a>
Ms. Valerie Watson	FAA/AeroNav	301-427-5155	<a href="mailto:valerie.s.watson@faa.gov">valerie.s.watson@faa.gov</a>
Mr. Juergen Kuhnhenh	LSY (Lido)	41-44-828 6546	<a href="mailto:juergen.kuhnhenh@LHSystems.com">juergen.kuhnhenh@LHSystems.com</a>
Mr. Dale Bryan	Veracity Eng	202-243-9516	<a href="mailto:dale.bryan@veracity-eng.com">dale.bryan@veracity-eng.com</a>
Mr. Steve Serur	ALPA	703-689-4333	<a href="mailto:steve.serur@alpa.org">steve.serur@alpa.org</a>
Mr. George Legarreta	FAA/AAS-100	202-267-8766	<a href="mailto:george.legarreta@faa.gov">george.legarreta@faa.gov</a>
Ms. Monique Yates	NGA	301-243-1436	<a href="mailto:monique.m.yates@nga.mil">monique.m.yates@nga.mil</a>
Ms. Deborah Copeland	FAA/AJV-322	301-427-5070	<a href="mailto:deborah.l.copeland@faa.gov">deborah.l.copeland@faa.gov</a>
Mr. Chris Criswell	FAA/AJR-32	202-267-9302	<a href="mailto:christopher.criswell@faa.gov">christopher.criswell@faa.gov</a>

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, will provide an update at the next ACF.

**F) 09-01-215 Reporting and Depiction of Stopways**

See the Declared Distance Working Group report in paragraph V. B.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Richard Boll, NBAA, will report back at the next ACF.

## **G) 11-01-233 Removal of (ATC) Crossing Restrictions from STARS**

Mr. Jim Arrighi, FAA/AJV-14, was not in attendance at the ACF.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, summarized the actions taken place since last ACF. Ms. Watson reported that there no existing ATC crossing altitudes (at least not annotated on the charts as "(ATC)" – the existing charted altitudes may exist to serve ATC purposes, but are not published on the plates as such) on STARS, but 33 Departures do still have ATC crossing altitudes annotated as "(ATC)". Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, stated that the Terminal offices are in possession of the listing of the 33 subject Departures and the ATC altitudes will be removed when the procedures are next modified.

Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, commented that Mr. Arrighi has not been in touch with his organization to address the NBAA's concerns regarding Lost Communication.

The issue will remain open until the remaining 33 procedures have been amended to remove the ATC crossing restrictions, and Mr. Boll's concern regarding Lost Comm has been satisfactorily resolved.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, to report on status of 33 remaining Departures with ATC crossing altitudes.

**ACTION:** Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to coordinate changes to AeroNav Products' affected charting specification(s) after all of the affected procedures have been revised.

**ACTION:** Mr. Jim Arrighi, FAA/AJV-14, to address the Lost Communications aspect of the original concern.

---

## **H) 11-01-234 VOR Test Frequencies (VOT)**

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, reported that she had briefed the MPOC on the proposal to have VOR Test Facility (VOT) frequencies depicted on airport diagrams. The MPOC reviewed the matter and was not in favor of adding VOTs to airport diagrams and put forth a counter a proposal.

The MPOC proposes that VOT frequencies be published in the AF/D within the individual airport entries where ground-based, on-airport VOTs exist. The current consolidated VOR Test Facility (VOT) listing in the back of the AF/D will be retained as it is a useful way for pilots to locate an airport with a VOT in a given area.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-22, voiced a concern regarding the duplication of information within a single publication and the associated potential for error or conflict

of data. Mr. Bob Carlson, FAA/AJV-322, responded that the airport entry data and, in the near future, the back matter A/FD data would be electronically extracted from the NASR subscriber files and would always match.

Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, discussed how pilots in the field, when utilizing the PDF version of the A/FD, have to search through the document to find VOT information where it currently resides in the back matter. Having the VOT information on the airport page would help pilots find the information quicker when utilizing electronic editions.

Based on the consensus of the discussion, Ms. Watson motioned that the former MPOC proposal regarding VOT frequencies on airport diagrams be withdrawn and guidance be submitted to the Airport Mapping Team to initiate VOT frequency publication in individual airport entries in the Flight Supplements. The motion received support.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

---

**I) 11-01-235 Removal of RP\* from VFR Charts**

Mr. Ron Haag, FAA/AJV-321, provided an update of the progress made since last ACF. He stated that explanatory text had been published in the 2012 Chart Users Guide, on the FAA Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) Homepage and in the AIM. It is hoped that with better user understanding of the charting convention, the confusion associated with the interpretation of this chart attribute will be resolved.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

---

**J) 11-01-236 Depiction of Wind Turbines on VFR Charts**

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed on developments since last ACF. An RD proposing that wind turbines be represented on FAA Visual charts with the ICAO-accepted symbol has been formally drafted and submitted to MPOC/IACC.

Ms. Watson anticipates the RD to be approved in the near future and expects to be able to report at the next ACF that implementation has begun.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to provide update on status and implementation at next ACF.

---

**K) 11-01-238 Aerobatic Area Symbols on VFR Sectional Chart**

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed on the actions taken since the last ACF. She took the item to the Aeronautical Information Services Working Group (AISWG) for action. NFDC is now publishing these activity areas as NFDD “add-on” pages. The areas are not contained in the NASR database, but as a first step, at least the information is now being publicly disseminated by an official FAA source (NFDC).

Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, briefed the ACF on actions within the Visual Charting Group regarding the possibility of using symbology to depict activity areas on visual charts. Research found that a total of 115 A/FD special notices are in effect pertaining to aerobatic and/or training areas. Mr. Fecht reported that of the 86 existing aerobatic areas, 84 have published dimensions which would allow their parameters to be charted. Eight aerobatic areas are identified by notes on the charts placed in the proximity of the area. Additionally, he reported that of the 29 existing training areas, 10 have published dimensions which would allow their parameters to be charted. Twenty-seven training areas are identified by notes on the charts placed in the proximity of the area.

Discussion was opened up as to whether aerobatic and training areas should be identified on the charts with symbology or should the current practice of “notes” remain in place. Feedback from the audience was that the current practice of using box notes was sufficient and, at least for the present and until such time as solid dimensional data could be obtained, databased & utilized, is the only viable option.

Doubts regarding the validity of many of these activity area entries was voiced. Many have been in publication for years and it is possible they are no longer in use. It was proposed that the currently published activity areas be vetted through the Service Areas to confirm their continued validity. When this has been accomplished, the group will return to the question of where (charts, A/FD) the information would best be provided.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, to follow up on both training and aerobatic areas to see if the special notices are still pertinent and if these areas are still active.

---

**L) 11-01-240 SRFA Charting**

Mr. Ron Haag, FA/AJV-321, provided an update on progress made since last ACF. Mr. Haag [presented the latest revision to the depiction of the Leesburg Maneuvering area](#). The white masking of the boundary area has been expanded and the blue boundary line thickened, making the area more readily discernable. The new masking has been implemented and viewable on the 84<sup>th</sup> Edition of the Baltimore-Washington VFR Terminal Area Chart, Effective Dates February 9, 2012.

Ms. Watson commented that the workgroup had held a meeting with Mr. Gary Livack, FAA/AFS-400, on the background issues related to the Washington SFRA. AeroNav Products worked the Leesburg charting issue. The other revisions that Mr. Livack requested are connected to the Rule itself, or are specific publication requirements provided by FAA Safety and cannot be revised by AeroNav Products authority. Mr. Livack was provided contact information on the Government entities involved with SFRA rules and regulations.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

---

**M) 11-01-242 Lead Bearing/Lead DME**

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed that the Lead Bearing/Lead DME issue is before the US IFPP. Mr. Rush stated that most charting organizations have an existing ability to chart lead bearing/lead DME information when specifically requested on the procedure source document.

Mr. Rush anticipates hearing back from the US IFPP in the near future and will report back at the next ACF.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, to report back at next ACF.

---

**N) 11-02-244 Depicting Terrain on DPs**

Mr. George Bland, AFFSA, briefed the issue, [presenting several concept depictions](#) of terrain displayed on a departure procedure. Mr. Bland noted that in all the depictions presented, the plan view was to scale.

Mr. Ron Canter, FAA/AJV-353, restated that almost all of the FAA Departures (and Arrivals) are NOT charted to scale (being limited to the TPP-sized planview) and therefore do not lend themselves to terrain depiction.

Mr. Bland commented that within DoD's Departure program, the military charting community had a degree of flexibility not available to the FAA. For instance, they could depict the Terminal area of a DP in one scale and transitions in a different scale. Of key concern to pilots within the military community is situational awareness, particularly of rapidly-rising terrain.

Mr. Canter reiterated that the FAA is tasked with being able to fit an entire DP within the parameters of a single size-limited page and that sometimes the lateral extension of these procedures is hundreds of miles. These procedures cannot possibly be drawn to scale given today's restrictions on charting.

Mr. Bland inquired of Mr. Canter whether there was any possibility of terrain being depicted by user request for a specific procedure. Mr. Canter replied back to Mr. Bland's question with a definitive no – chart attributes (such as terrain) may not be added to FAA products counter to approved specifications.

Mr. Bland stated that the military has gone forward to establish their own criteria for charting terrain on a DPs.

The idea of adding circled "to scale" areas to Departures and the possibility of adding terrain to only these areas, was discussed. Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, voiced that before the FAA considered such action, extensive Human Factors study would need to be conducted. The possibility of users misinterpreting the data or mistaking the lack of data for the lack of precipitous terrain would need to be studied.

Mr. Bland acknowledged the differences between the charting environments and specifications between the DoD and the FAA.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-22, suggested that given that the DoD has a requirement to provide terrain information on their SIDs/DPs, that they run their concepts through the Volpe Human Factors Group. Volpe may be able to find a way to meet DoD requirements. Mr. Moore commented that the IACC would be very leery of adopting the current proposal and would require full vetting, including SMS and human factors studies.

Ms. Watson stated that at present, the FAA has not received a civil request to depict terrain appear on SIDs/DPs. The request before the Charting Forum is solely a military request and the military is free to modify their specifications to meet their customers' needs. She stated that in her view, it is doubtful that the FAA would adopt such a change to their specifications at this time.

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, commented that the charting industry is on the verge of transitioning to electronic charting and that it may possible in the future to add many attributes that under the limitations of today's paper products are just not feasible.

There was a consensus within the group that there is an advantage to showing terrain on SIDs and STARs but due to limitations of current chart parameters, planview size, procedure size, printing process, economic factors etc., for the FAA it is not currently possible.

Mr. Bland and Mr. Lance Christian, NGA, both understood and accepted the situation from the FAA perspective.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

---

**O) 11-02-245 Automated UNICOM on IAPs and Sectionals**

Ms. Maura McGrath, FAA/AJW-163, from the non-Fed Weather Program office, [was to have presented an update](#) on activities since the last ACF, but Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed in her absence.

Ms. Watson briefed on the decertification of the SuperAWOS systems, which occurred in January 2012. Subsequently, NFDC, after working with the non-Fed Weather Program office, formally decommissioned all of the decertified systems, an action which caused them to be removed from all FAA charts and publications.

Ms. Watson further briefed that the FAA Terminal Team has been working the necessary procedural revisions caused by loss of local altimeter source at the subject airports with respect to minima. Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, confirmed that the procedural revisions resulting from the AWOS decommissionings are being addressed via P-NOTAM.

Associated with SuperAWOS are the Automated UNICOM (A-UNICOM) systems. There remain questions regarding charting of A-UNICOMs. Mr. Rush stated that there was still no resolution as to whether A-UNICOM systems need to be discriminated from normal UNICOM systems in our FAA databases and on FAA charts/publications.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to follow up with Ms. Maura McGrath, FAA/AJW-163, on the Automated UNICOM system issue and brief at the next ACF.

---

**P) 11-02-246 Publication of Special Notices in the A/FD**

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed the issue. In the past, Special Notices source information was received by AeroNav Products (FAA/AJV-3) via internal FAA memo or email from Cartographic Standards, FAA/AJV-22. Recently, the National Flight Data Center (NFDC), FAA/AJV-22, has begun publishing the data in the National Flight Data Digest (NFDD) as “add-on” pages. The information is not entered into the NASR database, but IS now publicly disseminated by the FAA office responsible for Aeronautical Information Management.

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, expressed his appreciation for the progress the FAA has made in publicly disseminating Special Notices via NFDD and conceded that it was a marked improvement over the old process. However, he has concerns regarding the details of publication – the fact that individual revisions are not flagged as “changed” and that apparently ALL Notices are not being disseminated. (The recent Teterboro, NJ, Dalton Visual Departure was cited as an example.)

Mr. Thompson asked for an offline discussion with Ms. Watson and individuals from the NFDC (FAA/AJW-21) office to discuss possible improvement to the process. There were no NFDC representatives present, but Ms. Watson agreed to meet with Mr. Thompson and engage NFDC in a discussion to help improve the process.

Mr. Thomas Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, inquired as to the process by which Special Notices are initiated and documented. Mr. George Sempeles, Quality Manager for FAA/AJV-32, stated that the Notices are received at the NFDC office from the Service Areas, but that there is not a formally documented process. Mr. Schneider suggested that a process be established and formalized.

Mr. Roy Maxwell, Delta Air Lines, voiced that it would be beneficial to end users if specific changes on the charts and within such publications as the A/FD were highlighted or flagged in some manner. Ms. Watson responded that the charting offices are aware of this and are working toward solutions. She cited the “compare” tool currently available in the digital TPP files which shows clearly what has changed on a terminal procedure. Mr. Bob Carlson, FAA/AJV-322, stated that though “change bars” are used in A/FD back matter, they are not yet utilized within the airport entry section of that publication. He commented that the A/FD is in the process of becoming an automated product and though an estimated 1000 revisions are made to the airport section of every A/FD per cycle, it is possible that some sort of change alert mechanism can be built into the system in the future.

Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, noted that many of the A/FDs contain flight procedures and inquired as to whether such information is appropriately placed within the Special Notices section of the A/FD. He expressed specific concern about Visual Flight Procedures in the A/FD that could easily get “lost” placed as they are.

Mr. Thompson added that Jeppesen has struggled with the whole issue of Visual Flight Procedures for years and agreed with Mr. Boll that the Notices Section of the A/FD is probably not the ideal location for them. Mr. Thompson continued, stating that due to the wide variety of Special Notices, some with a direct impact on flight operations and others without, a “scrub” of the section might be worthwhile.

Further discussion ensued regarding the variety of items contained in the Notices section (from VFR Departures to tethered balloons). Several attendees expressed the opinion that flight-critical information can easily be overlooked if imbedded in a section of a publication containing non-critical entries.

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, acknowledged the challenge presented and explained that in many ways the A/FD has become a “catch-all” for those items which don’t fit within other existing charting and pilot information publications. He agreed that the matter should be looked into.

Ms. Watson asked whether the Charted Visual Flight Procedures (CVFP) Order 7100.79 could be revised to accommodate some or all of the VFR Procedures currently published in the A/FDs. (CVFPs are published in the Terminal Procedures Publications not the A/FDs.) Mr. Kyle McKee, FAA/AFS-410, stated that the order was

currently under revision and he would investigate the possibility of incorporating the procedures under discussion.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Kyle McKee, FAA/AFS-410, to coordinate with AJV-14 on exploring and expanding scope of FAA Order 7100.79 to include VFR Departures and Arrivals.

**ACTION:** Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, to work with NFDC through Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B on refining the NFDD sourcing process.

**ACTION:** Mr. Bob Carlson, FAA, AJV-322, to discuss within the A/FD Team a reassessment of the contents and criteria by which items are added to the Notices section.

---

**Q) 11-02-247 Approach Control Phone Numbers in A/FD**

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed the item. Ms. Watson stated that she had been in touch with Terminal and Enroute ATC to discuss the matter.

Mr. Paul Eure, FAA/AJE-21, briefed that since the last ACF, he had discussed the topic with the FAA Centers and that they were not in support of publishing Approach Control phone numbers in the A/FD. Mr. Eure stated that there were a lot of factors involved, including the logistics behind obtaining and maintaining the phone numbers (over 2,100 phones in all) and security concerns. Many of the centers stated that they had local, informal arrangements in place between the facility and associated airports on the dissemination of Approach Control phone numbers.

Mr. Gary Fiske, FAA/TEG-Y90 (representing FAA/AJT), was not in attendance, but had previously communicated to Ms. Watson that Terminal ATC was in agreement with Mr. Eure's comments and that at this point in time are not ready to release phone numbers for publication in the A/FDs.

Mr. Boll, NBAA, emphasized that in today's environment, pilots utilizing cell phones to communicate with Approach Control is a common practice. He still feels that having Approach Control contact numbers easily available would be very beneficial. In his opinion, the FAA is excluding GA from an efficient means of communication. Mr. Boll accepted, on behalf of NBAA, the position and comments voiced by Mr. Eure and Mr. Fiske.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

## VII. New Charting Topics

### A) 12-01-248 NEXTGEN Procedure for the Naming of Aeronautical Navigation Aids

Ms. Connie Atlagovich, FAA/ZOB ARTCC, introduced the topic and gave a general overview of the background for the proposal. Ms. Atlagovich stated that Cleveland Center has been going through a massive redesign of their airspace and through the process, concerns from current air traffic controllers surfaced pertaining to the naming conventions that are in place within the FAA regarding to the loss of VORs and establishment of a waypoint at the same location. Currently, VORs have three letter location identifiers and waypoints have pronounceable five letter identifiers. The proposal presented supports a process by which, when a VOR, for example “CLE”, is decommissioned and replaced with a waypoint, that the VOR ident be retained and prefixed with a 2-letter combination “KQ” resulting in a 5-letter waypoint ident “KQCLE”. It was suggested that this practice would benefit both local ATC and the pilot community by creating a named point with geographical significance, and would result in a smoother and safer airspace redesign transition process.

Mr. Michael Ruple, FAA/ZOB ARTCC, [presented a PowerPoint briefing](#) that provided more detail to the issues raised regarding the proposed naming conventions of waypoints established over positions where previously NAVAIDs were located.

Mr. Ruple presented slides that illustrated the Cleveland ARTCC airspace prior to the airspace being reworked and a slide showing the evolution of the airspace as it moves to all-RNAV by 2015. Mr. Ruple illustrated how familiar NAVAID idents play a role in aiding both pilots’ and controllers’ local knowledge of location. He then presented an argument for how, without utilizing some new form of naming convention, the redesigned airspace will result in a loss of geographic situational awareness.

Mr. Kevin Allen, US Airways, expressed support for retaining geographic NAVAID IDs, but recommended keeping the existing three letter ID followed by “99”; e.g., STL99. He believes this would be preferable and provide better geographical situational awareness.

Mr. Paul Eure, FAA/AJE-31, commented that whenever there is such an overhaul of airspace, where a NAVAID has been replaced with a waypoint, there is a process to disseminate the change to both pilots and controllers. Several audience members commented on how this appeared to be more about the learning curve associated with a transition period where pilots and controllers alike are going to have to adjust to changes within the system. Mr. Eure pointed out that the number of NAVAIDs in the NAS will decrease drastically in the future and users, over time, will come to learn the new waypoints established in their place. He reminded the group that relocated controllers are trained on the new airspace to which they are assigned and that retraining on modified airspace is essentially the same process.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, stated that this Forum’s focus was specific to charting issues and that the issue raised by Ms. Atlagovich and Mr. Ruple is one of

policy. The proposal is counter to established FAA naming conventions and those conventions need to be addressed. Ms. Watson directed the proponents to several pertinent FAA Orders (7400.2 Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters, 7350.8 Location Identifiers Handbook, 8260.19 Flight Procedures and Airspace) in which the current fix/waypoint naming conventions are documented and suggested they contact the offices of responsibility for those Orders. She stressed that from a charting perspective, waypoint names are charted as published by source and that the matter is beyond the scope of this forum.

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, mentioned that an issue not raised by Ms. Atlagovich and Mr. Ruple's presentation is the lack of an ident naming convention for stand-alone DME's. This issue will also need to be addressed as the FAA moves to an RNAV-based NAS.

Mr. Rush stated that he would forward the proposed waypoint naming convention recommendation to System Operations Services (FAA/AJR) for consideration. He stressed that ICAO naming standards need to be looked at as well. Mr. Rush acknowledged that the redesign transition is a problematic issue and that this specific proposal may well have merit, but that the process of changing naming conventions starts with System Operations.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, will forward the recommendation to System Operations and will request that a representative provide a response by the next ACF.

**ACTION:** CLE ARTCC will contact Offices of Responsibility for FAA Orders which document current waypoint naming conventions to recommend their proposal.

---

**B) 12-01-249 Consolidated ILS CAT II and CAT III Depictions**

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, submitted and briefed the issue. Ms. Watson briefed that the consolidation of ILS CAT II and CAT III information onto a single terminal plate has been recommendation by the US IFPP. She explained that 90% of the information on these charts is shared and that the consolidation can easily be accomplished.

Ms. Watson [presented graphics](#) depicting the current separate depictions and the proposed consolidated depiction. She outlined the specification changes, among which are: chart title, which will be of the format ILS RWY XX (CAT II & III); removal of DH/RA from the profile view (it is clearly listed in the minima); prefacing lines of minima to clarify CAT II or CAT III; prefacing CAT II or CAT III specific procedural notes.

Ms. Watson mentioned that this consolidation is currently practiced by Jeppesen and Lido and that the pilot community is familiar with the depiction.

The group consensus was to move forward with the CAT II and CAT III proposal. Ms. Watson will submit a specification change RD to the MPOC/IACC.

Ms. Watson then [presented an add-on proposal](#), with graphic examples, for consolidating SA CAT I and CAT II plates into a single depiction. She explained that the logic is the same as the CAT II and III proposal.

Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, inquired whether the proposed SA consolidation had been presented to Mr. Chris Hope, FAA/AFS-410. Ms. Watson stated that she wanted to vet the proposal at the ACF before staffing to individual offices, but would certainly forward the proposal to Mr. Hope.

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, commented that at present, his organization does not consolidate SA approaches, but if the FAA implements the proposal, Jeppesen will probably follow suit.

The submission of a formal proposal to IACC for consolidating of SA ILS charts will be delayed to allow for Flight Standards review of the proposal.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to submit RD for CAT II and CAT III consolidation to the MPOC/IACC.

**ACTION:** Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, will forward SA CAT I and CAT II consolidation proposal to Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, Mr. Chris Hope, FAA/AFS-410, Mr. Bryant Welch, FAA/AFS-410, and Mr. Mike Webb FAA/AFS-420, for review.

---

**C) 12-01-250 ICAO IFPP PBN Charting**

Mr. Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, briefed the issue, [providing an overview](#) of discussions that have taken place within the ICAO IFPP Integration Working Group on Naming Concepts for Instrument Procedures. One of the challenges within the workgroup continues to be the language used within the pilot community versus the language currently being used by various aviation agencies. Part of the on-going process is the harmonization of such language amongst all parties. Within ICAO, procedures have to be translated into five languages and the meaning has to be the same across all five. Due to the current lack of harmonization, the minimums and flight requirements are not fully understood.

The challenges that lie ahead of the panel are daunting. The Group is attempting to establish a naming convention that:

- Is intuitive and understood by pilots in over 160 ICAO member states
- Enables a pilot to select the right type of procedure
- Enables a controller to quickly know what type of procedure a pilot is flying or is able to fly
- Works within current, legacy and future flight boxes to ensure the ability to store, access and display a given procedure
- Allows database programmer to develop and/or modify coding that will allow the procedures to be properly databased and function within current systems (ATC and aircraft)

Mr. Webb stated that due out in November will be a State Letter from ICAO. The State Letter will be open for a comment period of 90 days. If the number of comments is few, the matter could then move forward. A large number of comments could cause the matter to return to the Working Group level. Once approved, the time period given for member states to implement will be 2 years.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, moved that the RD be closed as the item was not, in its present form, a charting issue that was ready to be addressed yet within the Charting Forum. Ms. Watson added that the item will be added as a briefing item and invited Mr. Webb to come back to the Charting Group to provide updates at future ACFs.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

---

**D) 12-01-251 Alaska Low IFR Enroute Charts – T Route Note**

Proposal submitted by Catherine Majauskas, FAA/AFS-470, to revise the equipment requirement note for T-Routes on the IFR Low Altitude Alaska Enroute charts. Final iteration of note “Low Altitude RNAV Route TSO-C145 or C146 required” was approved by Mr. Kel Christianson, FAA/AFS-470. Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, will submit an EC for the change to the MPOC/IACC.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

---

**E) 12-01-252 Warning Note on Vertical Descent Angle (VDA)**

The issue was briefed at IPG on Tuesday, April 24, 2012.

The new issue was submitted by Mr. John Collins, GA Pilot, and is closely related to ACF-IPG Issue 12-01-301, *Publishing a Vertical Descent Angle (VDA) with 34:1 Surface Penetrations in the Visual Segment*, which was submitted by FAA Flight

Inspection Services, FAA/AJW-331, as a result of a Southwest Airlines complaint of receiving GPWS alerts while flying a published vertical descent angle (VDA) on approach to Birmingham, AL.

Mr. Collins' submission also expressed concern when VDAs and VDPs are published when 34:1 and 20:1 visual surface penetrations exist and requests a cautionary note on the approach chart when this condition exists.

Mr. Collins stated that even though VDAs are for information only, advisory in nature, and are not protected for use below the MDA, many pilots are increasingly rely on the VDA as guidance to the runway. Mr. Collins provided an example location where it is impossible to fly a stabilized approach to the runway because there is terrain penetrating the VDA.

Mr. Collins closed by emphasizing that a cautionary note when there are 34:1 and 20:1 penetrations of the VDA would be a great added safety measure.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, noted that FAA-produced RNAV charts, [the stipple symbols used when the 34:1 slope is clear](#). Lack of the symbol on FAA charts indicates that the 34:1 slope is not clear. She also noted that notes on the IAPs are based on FAA Order 8260.19 and the cautionary note would have to be assessed by Flight Standards.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, agreed to staff the issue through AFS-400 and report at the next meeting.

---

**F) 12-01-253 ILS Category III a/b/c Minima**

FAA/AFS-410 was asked to brief the Forum following a Federal Register announcement that removes Category IIIa, IIIb and IIIc definitions from use.

Mr. Chris Hope, FAA/AFS-410, briefed the issue. Mr. Hope [showed the audience current FAA CAT III](#) minima on IAP charts, which consists of minimums for CAT III a/b/c. He then showed the proposed CAT III minima, which consists of a single RVR value which reflects the lowest minima allowed based on the performance classification of the ILS equipment. The a/b/c notations no longer apply.

Mr. Hope's presentation included an explanatory discussion involving updated Operation Specifications (the revision of OpSpec C060).

Based on these changes, AFS-410 has proposed revision of the information provided with in the approach minimums table on CAT III approaches plates. The proposed change would impact approximately 120 FAA Public-use CAT III approach procedures.

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, commented that Jeppesen tailors to airlines and that he estimates that the proposed change would impact 500 to 600 Jeppesen charts. Mr. Thompson asked when and at what rate would the 8260 procedure source documents be revised.

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, responded that the procedures would not all be changed at once via P-NOTAM (as is often done in cases like this), but the changes would be incorporated as procedures are updated for other reasons or are worked for biennial review.

Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, stated that the 8260.19 Change 3, due for a March 2103 release, would contain the revised guidance for CAT III minima procedure annotation.

Mr. Mike Frank, FAA/AFS-52, spoke about his concerns with the change going directly to Final Rule without prior internal coordination and his concerns with the fact that the change is not compliant with ICAO standards. He stated that the current recommendation can be adopted, but will require the U.S. to file a difference with ICAO as other ICAO member states follow ICAO Annex 6 with regards to CAT III a/b/c.

Mr. Hope said that the FAA is working with ICAO to see if other countries will consider adopting the changes proposed by the FAA. To date, ICAO has asked for more time to consider the proposed changes.

Mr. Frank asked if the final rule is implemented in June, how does the FAA intend to accommodate international users? Would the FAA publish two charts - one for U.S. users and one for international operators?

Mr. Rush stated that the FAA would only publish one chart for all users.

Mr. Frank added that the rule change needs to go through the NRPM process and that until that process is completed, that the proposed RD should be put on hold.

It was noted that Boeing has submitted a comment to the proposed changes that a NPRM period is warranted in order to allow input from international operators.

Mr. Ed Ward, Southwest Airlines, asked that the FAA inform and educate pilots regarding any changes made impacting CAT III charts. Mr. Rush agreed, stating that the FAA would inform and educate pilots through the release of Safety Alerts.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Mr. Thomas Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, to work on the 8260.19 Change 3 revision.

**ACTION:** Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, following 8260.19 revision, will work to implement changes to ILS CAT III procedures. He will initiate a Safety Alert by Terminal to inform and educate pilots when the first revised procedures appear.

**ACTION:** Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, will process an EC to revise the IACC specifications.

---

## VIII. Closing Remarks

Mr. Max Hall, Chief Operating Officer (COO), Pragmatics, Inc., made closing comments stating that ISI/Pragmatics was pleased to have housed the 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary meeting of the ACF. Mr. Hall offered the Pragmatics facility for future meetings and solicited feedback on what could be done to improve their support.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, along with Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, thanked Innovative Solutions International for hosting the 12-01 Forum and thanked the Forum attendees for their participation. Notices of the official minutes will be announced via email and provided via the Internet. The two website addresses (CG and IPG) are provided below:

- [http://www.faa.gov/air\\_traffic/flight\\_info/aeronav/acf/](http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/acf/)
- [http://www.faa.gov/about/office\\_org/headquarters\\_offices/avs/offices/afs/afs400/afs420/actipg/](http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/avs/offices/afs/afs400/afs420/actipg/)

Please note the attached Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) listing for action items. It is requested that all OPRs provide the Chair, Ms. Valerie Watson (with an information copy to Mr. Alex Rushton) a written status update on open issues no later than October 5, 2012.

**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.

The ACF 12-01 Attendee List is attached along within this PDF document.

Special thanks to Mr. John Banks, ISI Pragmatics, for his support during the 3 days of the ACF.

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

## IX. Next Meeting

ACF 12-02 is scheduled to be held October 23-25, 2012, location ALPA Headquarters, Herndon, VA.

ACF 13-01 is scheduled to be held on April 23-25, 2013, Innovative Solutions International, a Pragmatics, Inc., Corporate Headquarters, Reston, VA.

## X. Attachments

- A. 12-01 Attendee Roster
- B. Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR)