

Government/Industry Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF)

Meeting 16-01

Charting Group

April 27-28, 2016

ALPA

Herndon, VA 20170

CHARTING GROUP MINUTES

I. Opening Remarks

The Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF) was hosted by the Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA) at their headquarters in Herndon, VA. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, opened the Charting Group portion of the Forum on Wednesday, April 27. Valerie acknowledged ACF Co-chair Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, who presided over the Instrument Procedures Group (IPG) portion of the Forum the previous day. Valerie also expressed appreciation to Darrell Pennington and ALPA for hosting the 16-01 ACF.

II. Review Minutes of Last Meeting, ACF 15-02

The minutes from ACF 15-02 meeting were distributed electronically last fall via the Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) ACF website: http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/acf/. The minutes were accepted as submitted with no changes or corrections.

III. Agenda Approval

The agenda for the 16-01 meeting was accepted as presented.

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

ICAO/IFPP Committee Report

Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420 and advisor to the U.S. Delegation to 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 ICAO/IFPP Integration Working Group (IWG), [see Slide #3](#).

Mike also spoke to several other charting topics that are being discussed in working groups in preparation for the IFPP 13th Panel Meeting in September 2016. He touched on issues related to a revision to the RNP AR Procedure Design Manual, the charting of procedure design magnetic variation, and the restructuring of PANS OPS Volumes I and II. More information on these topics is included in Mike's [presentation slides](#).

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

PARC PBN Procedure Naming and Charting

Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, provided an update on the Performance Based Operations Aviation Rulemaking Committee (PARC) Performance Based Navigation (PBN) Procedure Naming Action Team activities since the last ACF. Mike showed several [Instrument Approach Procedure \(IAP\) prototypes](#) with the new Equipment Notes Box added with a delineating line to the top portion of the existing notes box in the pilot briefing strip. Mike stated that the new section of the notes box will be for equipment requirement notes for conventional procedures and for PBN requirements for PBN procedures. He emphasized that the equipment box would only appear when specifically noted on the procedure source document. Mike asked for formal written comments on the charting proposal to be sent to him no later than 30 June 2016 via email – mike.webb@faa.gov.

Mike asked Divya Chandra, VOLPE, about her thoughts on the human factors aspect of the new equipment box. Some procedures will not have specific requirements and Mike asked Divya for her opinion of how users might respond to seeing either no notes box or an empty notes box. Divya commented that the lack of information might be of concern depending upon how often the equipment box appears on the charts. If it is present on a large percentage of procedures, pilots might be confused or concerned when encountering a procedure without. Mike discussed the possibility of showing the box whether there was data in it or not. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, stated that there is precedent for not showing a briefing strip informational box when there is not information to be placed in it, i.e., the approach lighting system box. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, and Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, agreed that an empty box would be more likely to cause pilot confusion by leading users to assume that necessary data had been inadvertently left off the plate. Consensus of the audience agreed and it was decided that the equipment box will not be shown unless the procedure source document specifically calls for equipment notes. Divya then stated that as long as the layout of other information on the chart isn't grossly impacted (it would not be), she felt that the lack of a box would have minimal impact.

There was ACF consensus in support of showing the equipment/requirement notes consolidated into the briefing strip notes box, separated by a delineating line, as shown on the prototypes and for NOT showing an empty (place holder) box when equipment notes are not specified on the procedure source document. It

was also agreed that this notes box need not be labeled, but should only contain the specific information documented on the procedure source.

Mike then discussed the topic of changes to PBN procedure names. Mike re-stated the ICAO position for adopting “RNP” in procedure titles and reiterated that the U.S. is still planning to retain (and will file a difference to state this) the use of “RNAV” in the title. The U.S. is planning to change the parentheticals to remove GPS and include a single navigation specification shown in parentheses at the end of the procedure title. Mike stated that these changes are supported and he would like the implementation process to begin.

Rune Duke, AOPA, asked about the impacts of the titling changes on the FMS. Mike stated that because procedure title parentheticals are not included in the FMS title or verbalized by ATC, there should be no effect.

Mike stated that there may be redundancies for a time regarding items in the title and in the equipment box until all the titling changes can be accomplished, i.e., GPS will be in the procedure title and the equipment box until the titling changes can be made to remove GPS from the procedure title. Mike stated that he is working with Tom Schneider regarding the procedure name changes which require an update to FAA Order 8260.3 and FAA Order 8260.19.

ACTION: Mike Webb, AFS-420, will provide an update at the next ACF.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, to draft an IACC Requirement Document for depiction of the briefing strip Equipment Box for IAPs and report back at next ACF.

Airport GIS

No briefing was given.

Discontinuation of VOR Services

Leonixa Salcedo, FAA/AJM-324, briefed the issue, providing an overview of the VOR MON program and a status report since the last ACF. She reviewed the goals of VOR MON Program (See [Slide #2](#)) and the VOR MON Program Timeline (See [Slide #3](#)). She stated that the Federal Register Notice (FRN) on the “Provision of Navigation Service for the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) Transition to PBN (Plan for Establishing a VOR MON)” is due out in a few weeks. Leonixa stated that the number of VORs targeted for discontinuance remains at 308 by 2025.

Leonixa then discussed the recent VOR MON Program accomplishments, including holding two National Planning Working Group meetings to discuss the discontinuance waterfall and the role of Instrument Flight Procedures in the program implementation. Leonixa also reported that the first VOR (Orangeburg, SC) was discontinued in February 2016.

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, asked if the addition of new DMEs is still part of the plan. Leonixa stated yes and said that a different group within the FAA is handling that aspect of the program.

Rune Duke, AOPA, asked what operators can expect regarding operations and decommissioning. Dale Courtney, FAA/AJW-292, responded that when a VOR is decommissioned, a NOTAM will be issued, the NASR database will be updated and all affected airways, procedures, fixes, etc., will be amended.

Ed Phillips, FAA/AJW-B62, expressed concern over the potential lack of synchronization between changes to procedures and charts when a VOR is decommissioned. Leonixa replied that her office is working to ensure that all VOR decommissionings are carefully pre-coordinated to ensure that all aspects of the affected airspace and procedures will occur concurrently on a single chart effective date cycle.

Bob Lamond, NBAA, asked if it is possible to publish a list of everything that a specific VOR decommissioning will affect. Dale replied that a notice will be published for general awareness, but will not include a list of all the impacts.

Gary Fiske, FAA/AJV-822 asked if the resultant DMEs are going to be charted. Valerie replied yes, for the present. Per consensus from the last ACF, if the VOR portion of a VOR/DME is decommissioned, the remaining DME would still be charted. She stated that this decision could be reevaluated in the future if a proliferation of DMEs results in chart congestion.

John Collins, GA Pilot, asked, for users of 6-month VFR charts, where the notice of a decommissioning would be published. Valerie stated that all NAVAID decommissionings are published via NOTAM. Also, the Chart Bulletin in the Chart Supplement (previously the Airport Facility Directory or AFD) provides interim updates to VFR charts, so a decommissioned VOR would appear in the Bulletin for an affected VFR chart until the chart is re-issued and reflects the change. The IFR Enroute charts are updated every 56 days, so this should not be an issue.

ACTION: Leonixa Salcedo, FAA/AJM-324, will provide an update the next ACF.

FAA Order 7100.41A PBN Implementation Process Update

Newton Gentry, Contract Support, FAA/AJV-142, briefed changes since last ACF. Newton gave an [overview](#) of the PBN Implementation process and stated that the original release of FAA Order 7100.41 was approved for use on April 3, 2014. The order establishes a five-phase process for the development and implementation of PBN procedures and/or routes. Newton provided details of each phase in his presentation. Newton then reviewed the details of the 7100.41 (Alpha) release (see [Slide #11](#)). He stated that all stakeholder comments for the Alpha release have been resolved and that the final document is scheduled for release April 29, 2016.

Brian Townsend, American Airlines, asked if community outreach is being added to the process. Newton commented that the Order establishes that public outreach will occur, but does not specifically state what that may entail. Newton stated that the level of outreach is dependent on the specific project and its impacts. Coordination is being done with the Service Center Operations Support Groups regarding environmental concerns.

Mike Stromberg, Air Wisconsin, inquired whether the impact studies relate to traffic volumes at given locations and if the intent is to reduce traffic. Newton stated that the studies do not look at traffic volumes specifically, but the goal is to look at the overall impact of the design on communities.

Newton added that work will start on Order 7100.41B in 6-8 months.

VFR Chart Print Schedule Realignment and Synchronization

Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223, briefed the issue. Rick stated that since the last ACF, the proposed change to the Visual Charting Print Schedule has been eclipsed by the shift to Available on Demand (AOD) Printing (see briefing below). Rick added that this shift would enable the Visual Charting Team to adjust resources to focus on other projects that are of interest to stakeholders, such as developing a digitally seamless U.S. VFR Chart and moving to a 56 day VFR product update schedule. Given these changes, this topic is withdrawn.

Caribbean Aeronautical Charts and Alaskan VFR Wall Planning Charts Briefing

Katie Murphy, FAA/AJV-5222, provided a [briefing](#) on the new Alaskan VFR Wall Planning Chart. Katie stated that the development of this chart was in response to comments received following the announcement of the discontinuance of the World Aeronautical Chart (WAC) series. She explained that the new Planning Chart is similar to the existing U.S. VFR (Lower 48) Wall Planning Chart. The chart is constructed at a scale of 1:2,000,000, is not for navigation but is intended for preflight planning purposes only, and is designed to be mounted on a wall. The first edition of this chart is scheduled to be effective on 10 November 2016 and will be revised every 2 years. Katie announced that prototypes would be available for the audience to view throughout the remainder of the ACF and that input is welcome.

Barry Lewis, FAA/AJV-5223, provided a [briefing](#) of two new VFR Caribbean Charts that are also being produced in response to the WAC discontinuance. These charts will provide complete VFR coverage, at a scale of 1:1,000,000, in Caribbean areas previously supported by the WACs, with additional coverage of Cuba. (See [Slide # 3](#)). The new Caribbean charts will show, in addition to previously charted standard WAC attributes, Class D and E Airspace, more detailed obstructions and expanded airport data including UNICOM/CTAF/AWOS information. The first edition of the Caribbean 1 Chart will be 15 September 2016 with a one year update cycle. The first edition of the Caribbean 2 Chart will be 10 November 2016 with an update cycle of 2 years. Barry also announced that prototype charts are available for viewing at the ACF and that comment is welcome.

Rune Duke, AOPA, expressed support for both new charting products. Rune asked if shareholders would be provided an opportunity to provide formal feedback prior to the public release of new the charts. Katie responded that she was not aware of a planned comment/review period prior to release, but that she would ask her management if that can be accomplished.

Samples of the charts were left for ACF attendees to view.

Available on Demand (AOD) Charting

Lauren Priem, FAA/AJV-553 and Monica Price, FAA/AAQ-722, provided a [briefing on Available on Demand \(AOD\) Charting](#). Lauren explained that the FAA is transitioning its printing and distribution of paper aeronautical products from FAA print contracts to FAA-approved print providers in the private sector. The FAA will provide digital files to the print providers for printing and distribution. This will allow the FAA to focus more energy and resources on its core work. It was stressed that this is a business process change not a change to the digital content or the fidelity of the data. Lauren emphasized that FAA paper products will continue to be made available in the market.

Monica then briefed the vetting process for the potential print providers and the key elements of the print provider agreement (See [Slide #11](#)). She announced that Williams & Heintz, who currently prints the Enroute and Visual Charts, has recently signed on as the first FAA-approved Print Provider.

Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, asked about the impact of AOD on in-house FAA subscribers of the charts. Lauren stated that her office was reaching out to over 700 points of contact within the FAA regarding in-house standing order subscriptions and working to ensure that questions are addressed in advance, that FAA colleagues are aware of what AOD is and is not, and that paper will continue to be available.

Gary Fiske, FAA/AJV-82, expressed his concern over the change, emphasizing that FAA field facilities cannot afford any disruption to their currently provided FAA product subscriptions. Lauren stated that her office is reaching out to all FAA subscribers. She also stated that they are going to be holding FAA teleconferences for internal subscribers, separated into “product users” and “purchase card holders” to address specific concerns of this transition.

Michael Stromberg, Air Wisconsin, asked how this change would impact FAA revenue generated from chart sales. Alan Gibson, FAA/AJV-5111, stated that paper sales since 2009 have decreased 64%. Alan added that changing to the AOD process will, in the long run, save the FAA money, but stated that this decision was primarily about freeing up resources to so the FAA can focus more energy and resources on its core work.

Rune Duke, AOPA, stated that he sees the value of electronic charts, but stressed that there are still a lot of pilots using printed paper products and that it is crucial that the FAA ensures their availability. Lauren reemphasized that the paper products WILL be made available in the market.

John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, expressed concern that if the publishing of the charts is market driven, what degree of oversight will the FAA have in regards to the quality, e.g., paper weight and ink quality? Monica stated that the FAA will look at the print quality when a potential provider initially submits a sample to become an FAA-approved print provider. After that, the quality will be market driven and print providers will be responsible for their own quality control. It is in their best interest to provide a quality product to the users.

Vince Massimini, MITRE, asked if the FAA intended to conduct recurring reviews of the print quality of products published by approved print providers. Monica responded that no, the quality control process is with the print provider, however it is written into the agreement that the FAA can audit a print provider’s product at any time if they are receiving complains about the quality. Vince then asked about the process for submitting problems or complaints about the products. Monica said that there will continue to be an FAA

feedback email address published where comments can be submitted. Additionally, the FAA will require that charts be traceable to the provider by requiring that the print provider's identification be included on the output product.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, asked what action will be taken if a print provider makes a mistake. Monica said that the print provider is liable for their printing errors and it is their responsibility to notify their customers. If there is an aeronautical data error in the FAA-produced file from which the chart is produced, the FAA would correct that error by updating the digital file and issuing a NOTAM.

NOTAM Briefing

Lynette Jamison, FAA/AJR-B11, announced that Jerry Torres is the new manager of the U.S. NOTAM Office Operations and Policy Group. Lynette stated that work continues on modernizing NOTAMs with implementation of new NOTAM policy. She anticipates providing a more detailed presentation at the next ACF.

ACTION: NOTAM Offices will provide an update at the next ACF.

Atlantic Coast Route Project (ACRP)

Ray Spickler, FAA/AJV-142, presented a [briefing on the Draft PBN Route Structure Concept of Operations \(ConOps\)](#). Ray stated that in the future, PBN is envisioned to be the primary means of navigation through the NAS. He discussed the benefits a PBN Route Structure by use of strategically placed PBN ATS Routes (See [Slides 13](#) and [14](#)).

Ray reviewed previous efforts to establish PBN-based routes. He stated those efforts were perhaps not well coordinated and therefore resulted in low to near zero utilization. This new effort strives to ensure that the routes established will be more heavily utilized and will more efficiently optimize airspace in the NAS. The Atlantic Coast Route Project (ACRP) will be the first of five phases of implementation of the new PBN Route Structure across the U.S. and is scheduled to be completed in 2017. See the [presentation slides](#) for a detailed explanation of the ACRP.

Lt. Col Jen Scott, USAF, expressed concern, stating that the U.S. military does not have 100% GPS capability and that much of their operations rely heavily on the conventional NAS. She stated her belief that a large shift from a conventional route structure to a GPS route structure would impact the military's ability to safely navigate through the NAS.

Rob Goodson, NGA, asked about the implementation plan. Ray stated that the intent is to publish all of the new PBN routes on the Enroute charts, leaving the existing conventional routes in place. After a trial period of 56 to 112 days (2 ARINC cycles), many of the conventional routes would then be removed. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, expressed her concerns regarding the impact this would likely cause to chart congestion. She stated that this approach would likely cause a tremendous amount of congestion that could result in a safety issue if the charts become unreadable. She voiced that a large number of Enroute chart

users continue to utilize paper charts and the success of the project depends upon those charts being easily decipherable by users.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, echoed the concern expressed by Valerie regarding the overlay of a large number of new routes on the existing and already congested East Coast structure. Ted said that there is the potential to generate a high degree of chart clutter to the point where the charts become unusable. It was suggested by several people in the audience that the FAA may have to adjust the scale or the coverage or possibly even create duplicate charts to be able to accommodate this project. Valerie expressed her doubt regarding these options, stating that it would be extremely unlikely, if not impossible, for the FAA to produce extra RNAV-only charts or increase the scale of existing Enroute charts in time for the expected October implementation. Ray voiced that he recognizes the concerns of charting and is willing to explore other solutions.

Ray also briefed that his office wants the new routes published on the charts prior to them being made operational. Valerie voiced concern over this and asked the purpose/logic of deliberately publishing regulatory routes that are not intended for use and asked how this was foreseen to be accomplished. Ray responded that the publication would allow pilots and ATC to “become accustomed” to the routes by seeing them on the charts for a cycle or more until they become operational. The current plan is to publish 30 to 40 Q Routes and then immediately NOTAM them out on the day they become effective. Valerie commented that in the 1970s the NTSB issued a recommendation that IFR procedures should not be published with the express intent to immediately NOTAM them out and assumed that this also pertained to airways (which are essentially IFR procedures).

The group discussed the issues regarding premature publication of non-operational routes, publication of a new series of routes on top of already congested underlying existing structure and the charting and operational problems that may ensue. Various solutions were suggested. Valerie suggested that an incremental implementation of the route project be investigated and suggested publication of a few new routes, deletion of a few old ones, publication of a few more new, deletion of a few more old ones, etc., until the area is restructured according to plan. Barring a stepped approach, she suggested it would be preferable to make all of the new routes effective and deletion all of the old routes effective for the same ARINC cycle.

Ray stated that he will look into these issues and committed to engaging with AJV-5 regarding an implementation strategy and possible charting solutions. Lance Christianson, NGA/XCF, expressed concern and requested that Ray’s office also engage DoD charting individuals in the discussion as the NGA has a vested safety interest in the compromised readability of the FAA Enroute charts that could result from this project. Ray agreed to include the NGA in his discussions with AJV-5.

Ted asked Ray about the value of the current Navigation Reference System (NRS) waypoint grid – asking if the waypoints are being used and if they are planned to be retained. Ray stated that the NRS grid still has value and that his office is looking at ways to optimize use of the system. Gary Fiske, AJV-82, commented that he hopes they plan to retain the current NRS grid system and waypoint nomenclature.

PBN Strategy - 2016

William “Bill” Fernandez, FAA/AJV-142, provided a [briefing on the PBN Navigation Strategy](#). The strategy includes replacement of conventional terminal procedures with PBN procedures, replacement of conventional Jet Routes and Victor Airways with RNAV Q and T Routes, expansion of the use of PBN, RNAV and RNAV RNP. The focus will begin with the 15 busiest airports and the entire transition is expected to be completed by 2030.

John Collins, GA Pilot, stated that a key issue to the success of the FAA PBN plan is avionics capability. The avionics in place today aren’t readily able to handle deviations from established PBN procedures and/or routes.

Michael Stromberg, Air Wisconsin, commented that the biggest issue he sees is getting users to install the equipment in their aircraft because the cost to upgrade is significant. Mike emphasized that there needs to be a quicker, cheaper way for pilots to be able to use this new advanced PBN technology. Bill responded that the NAS has to serve all of the flying public. The plan is to prepare for those that can use the new technology and for those who cannot.

Bob Lamond, NBAA, expressed his support for Michael’s point regarding the cost of equipping the aircraft. Bob also stated that the FAA will not reach its PBN goals if it does not address the criteria. He stated that there is a work group under the PARC that is looking at these criteria issues.

Lev Prichard, APA, echoed the comments regarding the cost of equipping aircraft.

Rune Duke, AOPA, expressed his concerns over the certification requirements that are so expensive and time-consuming that it presents a barrier for the GA community.

Assessing and Reporting Airport Conditions, Revised Procedures

Lynette Jamison, FAA/AJR-B1, [provided a briefing](#) on the changes being implemented regarding the assessment and reporting of runway conditions via NOTAM. Lynette discussed the expanded NOTAM system for filing Field Condition (FICON) NOTAMs and [showed examples](#). Technical details of the changes can be found in presentation slides.

V. Outstanding Charting Topics

[07-01-195 Charting & AFD Information Re: Class E Surface Areas](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553 reviewed the issue. Paul Gallant, FAA/AJV-113, stated that the publication of revised AIM guidance regarding the specifics of the disposition of Class airspace and associated extensions when an airport's air traffic control tower closes is scheduled to appear in the 26 May 2016 edition.

Paul then stated that the list of AIS-identified airspace legal descriptions needing revision continues to be worked by his office and reported that approximately 65% of those descriptions have been corrected and republished. He will report back on continued progress at the next ACF.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Paul Gallant, FAA/AJV-113, to report back on updating airspace legal descriptions at the next ACF.

[13-01-262 Airport Facility Directory \(AFD\) Depiction of Traffic Pattern Altitudes](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue. Rick Mayhew, FAA/AJV-5331, stated that of the 19,585 runways databased in NASR, 1,191 of have published Traffic Pattern Altitudes (TPAs) in NASR. Rick [reviewed how the FAA gathers TPAs](#). He stated that FAA Form 7480 (see [Slide #6](#)), owned by the Office of Airports, is the form that is the source for populating the NASR database with TPA information. Rick stated that the Office of Airports only fills out the field for TPAs when the traffic pattern is "non-standard". Because of the lack of a firm definition of what is "standard" or "recommended", Rick made the recommendation to the Office of Airports that the TPA box be filled in every time. Rick reported that Chris Criswell, FAA/AAS-100, had stated to him that his office recognizes there is a gap in the information and will work with Rick to address the issue.

Lev Prichard, APA, agreed that the AIM definition for a standard traffic pattern altitudes IS confusing. He suggested that this issue could be resolved by cleaning up the AIM definition. Bob Lamond, NBAA, agreed and offered to help Lev revise the AIM guidance. Valerie stated that if the definition for "standard" or "recommended" is made clear in the AIM, the FAA could reasonably retain the policy of only publishing *other* than standard or recommended.

Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, agreed. The best solution is to clean up the AIM definition to better define standard TPAs and then only publish those that are non-standard.

Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-5441, cited several other FAA publications where traffic pattern altitude guidance is published. He emphasized that when the AIM definition is clarified, the other FAA publications will need to be updated accordingly.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Lev Prichard, APA, and Bob Lamond, NBAA, to work on clarification of the AIM guidance for Traffic Pattern Altitudes.

[13-01-270 Stepdown Fix Chart Notes](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue. Bob Lamond, NBAA, stated that NBAA concurs with the removal of the profile stepdown notes as long as the published AIM guidance provides a very clear description of stepdown fix use.

Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, said that he has drafted revised guidance for FAA Order 8260.19H to remove all of the stepdown fix chart notes (including the “LOC only” type notes).

Valerie asked Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, what progress he had made in the revision to the AIM guidance. Bruce reported that no progress had yet been made, but said that he will coordinate with Rich Boll, NBAA, to revise the AIM language. Rune Duke, AOPA, stated that this is an educational concern for AOPA and they would be willing to help with the drafting of new AIM guidance.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Bruce McGray, AFS-410, Rune Duke, AOPA, and Rich Boll, NBAA, to review existing AIM guidance and draft revisions necessary to clarify stepdown fix use.

[14-01-274 Solar Power Plant Ocular Hazard Symbol on Aeronautical Charts](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the topic and stated that there are currently two solar power plants depicted on the FAA VFR Sectional charts. Rick Mayhew, FAA/AJV-533, reported that he has investigated the publications strategy, but, due to the fact that there are currently only two such areas being requested for charting, it is not financially feasible to modify NASR to add the new resource to the database. He stated that such locations will continue to be handled via NFDD “add-on” pages for the foreseeable future.

Jill Olson, FAA/AJV-553, reported that since last ACF she sent an inquiry to ATO Safety regarding the identification of solar plants that are classified as an ocular hazard for pilots. The intent is that the ATO Safety Office provide guidance on the criteria that could be used to determine if an ocular hazard warrants depiction on the charts and/or as a text notice in the Chart Supplement. Jill reported that she has not yet gotten a response back from ATO Safety and will continue to follow up.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jill Olson, FAA/AJV-553, will continue to reach out to the ATO Safety Office regarding charting/publication criteria for ocular hazards.

[14-01-279 Naming of FAA Certified, National Disseminated AWOS-3 Systems on Private Use Airports](#)

Rick Mayhew, FAA/AJV-533, reviewed the process for the establishment of a new private AWOS system. The problem he was finding was that there was no way to track or verify if private AWOS systems are being maintained and certified after initial certification. Rick stated that he has been in contact with the Non-Fed Weather Office regarding this issue but has not yet come up with a viable solution. Rick would like to

develop a Public/Private Use flag in the weather resource in NASR, but would need the Non-Fed Weather Office to have a mechanism to alert NFDC when a system is no longer certified and should no longer be considered public-use.

Dale Courtney, FAA/AJW-292 commented that AWOS owners cannot opt out of maintenance and if they cannot comply, the system is shut down. Dale added that there is a tracking system for all certified public and private AWOS systems. Dale said that he would reach out to the Non-Fed Weather Office to close that loop and get the needed information fed to NFDC.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Dale Courtney, FAA/AJW-292 will coordinate with the Non-Fed Weather Office to get the FAA Certified AWOS systems data to NFDC.

[14-02-282 VASI PAPI Differences](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the topic. Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-5441, stated that Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-54, has submitted changes to the AIM language. The new language will describe the Obstacle Clearance Surfaces for both VASIs and PAPIs in terms of nautical mile vs the existing nautical/statue mile. The AIM language is in the process of finalized and should appear in the November 2016 release.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-5441, to update on the publication of revised AIM guidance.

[14-02-284 DME Facilities – Charting and MAGVAR Issues](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, briefed the issue. Valerie stated that the IACC Requirement Document (approved by the ACF sponsored DME Workgroup) supporting depiction/publication of DME NAVAIDs has been signed and that AJV-5 is prepared to publish these facilities. She also reported that the NASR and AIRNAV databases are able to accommodate DME as a NAVAID type. Valerie asked Dale Courtney, FAA/AJW-292, if we can move forward with the DMEs that have been thus far retained as VOR/DME facilities with the VOR portion decommissioned. Dale responded yes. All outstanding items have been completed and it was agreed to close this issue.

STATUS: CLOSED

[15-01-289 Adding “CPDLC” Information to Airport Diagram and Terminal Procedures and Updating the AFD](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue. Valerie stated that the CPDLC potion of this recommendation has been completed and that the RD has now become a discussion about Terminal Weather Information for Pilots (TWIP), another digital communications system brought up by Rich Boll,

NBAA, at the last ACF. Rich was concerned with the sorely outdated AIM text regarding TWIP, its use and availability.

Valerie reported that she has been working with Gordon Rother, FAA/AFS-430, on the publication of Rich's suggested AIM revisions to the TWIP entry. The new guidance has been submitted and should appear in the May 2016 edition. Valerie also reported that AFS-430 had a difficult time finding a source for TWIP availability. The AIM guidance will list 43 airports with current TWIP availability.

Valerie also had an IOU from the last ACF to research digital communications availability, usage and source, with an eye to possible publication on and in FAA products. Valerie found that there is no single FAA office that handles digital communications. Many current digital communications systems are private-use, may require subscription and/or special equipment in the cockpit. She stated that if and when a request is submitted to the ACF to look into a specific digital communication type (like CPDLC), it can be investigated, but that she is unable and doesn't believe it appropriate for the charting offices to anticipate user needs and solicit these many communication systems for their suitability for publication as public-use systems on FAA products.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, to provide an update on publication of revised AIM guidance regarding TWIP.

15-01-293 STAR Terminus Point Standardization

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue and showed several new prototype STAR charts requested by the audience at the last ACF. The [first set of prototypes](#) showed STAR terminus identifiers and the suggested procedure source document revisions to support the charting. The [second set of prototypes](#) also included terminal altitudes associated with the terminus identifiers.

There was strong consensus in the room *against* the depiction of terminus altitudes shown in association with terminus identifiers.

ACF consensus exists for charting terminus point idents, boxed, on STAR procedures when specified on the procedure source document. Valerie will draft an IACC specification document to support this.

Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, stated that he will draft language for FAA Order 8260.19 for the STAR terminus information to be included on FAA Form 8260-17.1, in the Additional Flight Data section as proposed in Valerie's presentation.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, to make revisions to FAA Order 8260.19 to accommodate STAR Terminus Point Identifiers.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, to draft an IACC Requirement Document for the depiction of STAR Terminus Point Identifiers.

15-01-295 Charting of Airports for the MON

Vince Massimini, MITRE, and Chair of the MON Airport Workgroup [discussed](#) progress made since the last ACF. Vince reported the ACF-sponsored MON Airport Workgroup had met twice since the last ACF. The group recommended that “MON Airport” would be the terminology used in NASR (as a General Airport Remark) for publication and they recommended that the list of MON Airports be published in the NTAP or in the AIM. The group agreed that access to the list of MON Airports would be for pre-flight planning only and would primarily be useful to ATC in a widespread GPS outage. It was agreed that MON Airports will be uniquely denoted where charted on IFR Enroute Charts only, will be identifiable in the airport entry section of the Chart Supplement by the presence of the airport remark “MON Airport”. Vince demonstrated the negative MON symbology proposed to accompany the airport identification text on enroute charts and it was well received by the ACF audience. (See [Slide #10](#)).

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, asked Vince if the group still desired the listing of MON Airports to be published on the inside back cover of the Chart Supplements. Vince agreed as did the audience that this would make the entire list readily available digitally to all users.

Valerie asked Vince about the source for the “MON Airport” designation. Who is committed to provide (and provide updates to) the listing to NFDC so that the General Airport Remarks can be added to the NASR database? Vince replied that responsibility for “MON Airport” designation resides with the VOR MON Program Office and that coordination has already begun between that office and NFDC regarding publication of the remarks in NASR. Valerie expressed concern about the maintenance of this airport attribute in the long term, after the MON Program is complete and that office disbanded. Vince replied that the VOR MON Program Office would be in existence at least until 2025, at which time the responsibility will need to be transferred, along with other long-term responsibilities created by the program.

John Collins, GA Pilot, inquired if the category of aircraft was part of the decision in the designation of a MON Airport. Vince responded that the designation has to do with the availability of terminal instrument approaches that do not require GPS, but NOT with respect to the specific aircraft that can fly those approaches.

Rune Duke, AOPA, commented that AOPA saw a lot a value in both having access to the full list of MON airports on the ground and in showing them on the enroute charts and voiced support for the directions proposed.

Valerie summarized stating that she would begin writing an IACC Specification change to support the charting of MON Airports on the enroute charts and for publication of the complete MON Airport list on the inside back cover of the Chart Supplements. The MON Airport list will thus become a part of the digital Chart Supplement files available online. She will also work with Vince to coordinate source flow from the VOR MON Program Office to NFDC. Vince will work with the VOR MON Program office to coordinate publication of the listing into the NTAP and/or AIM.

MON Workgroup		
Name	E-mail	Phone
Vince Massimini (WG Chair)	svm@mitre.org	703-883-5893
Leo Eldredge	Leo.eldredge@tetrattech.com	571-359-0053
Valerie Watson	Valerie.s.watson@faa.gov	301-427-5155
Ted Thompson	Ted.thompson@jeppesen.com	303-328-4456
Leonixa Salcedo	Leonixa.Salcedo@faa.gov	202-267-9901
Dale Courtney	Dale.courtney@faa.gov	202-267-4537
John Moore	John.moore@jeppesen.com	703-505-0672
Jeff Gingras	Jeffrey.gingras@jeppesen.com	303-328-4489
Michael Wallin	Michael.wallin@faa.gov	202-267-6494
John Kernaghan	Jkernagh@its.jnj.com	610-996-2977
Brad Rush	Brad.w.rush@faa.gov	405-954-0188

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, to draft a new Requirement Document for the IACC Specifications.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, and Vince Massimini, MITRE, will coordinate with NFDC and the VOR MON Program Office to begin the process of populating NASR with the MON Airport designations.

[15-02-296 Charting of Unmanned Free Balloon Activities and Amateur Rocket Activity Areas](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue and reported that she provided guidance to Paul Eure, FAA/AJV-113, regarding the electronic submission process for submission of Special Notices in the Chart Supplement.

Paul Gallant, FAA/AJV-113, reported that not much progress has been made since last ACF. Paul stated that they are going to begin work on putting together Special Notices for publication in the Chart Supplement. They also plan to begin coordination with Flight Standards regarding the development of charting criteria.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Paul Gallant, FAA/AJV-113, to provide an update on the publication of Special Notices and on discussions with Flight Standards regarding charting criteria.

[15-02-297 Charting of HILPT Maximum Holding Altitude](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, briefed the issue and [showed chart prototypes](#) with various ways of depicting the Maximum Holding Altitude on a Hold-in-Lieu holding pattern. The prototype depiction that gained a consensus of approval depicted the word “HOLD” preceding the block altitude (with over and underbars to indicate max and min altitudes) as a leadered note in the planview (See [Slide #4](#)), but it was recommended that both the minimum and maximum altitudes be placed in both the planview and the profile.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, asked how the maximum holding altitude would be documented on procedure source. Ted emphasized that he prefers to see it documented on the FAA Form 8260-3 (procedure source) form rather than only on the 8260-2 (holding pattern source) form where it resides currently. Valerie agreed with Ted that if this is to be charted consistently and correctly, it should reside on the procedure source document. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, agreed that the altitude will need to be documented on the applicable 8260-series Form and will take action to revise the guidance.

Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-5441, commented that criteria will need to be written so that the procedure design specialist knows when to apply the maximum holding altitude for charting.

Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, stated that he would draft language for FAA Order 8260.19H to support documentation of the maximum holding altitude.

Valerie stated that she will look at the IACC specifications and, if a modification is required, will draft the change to support the agreed-upon charting when specified on the procedure source document.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, to review IACC Specifications and, if a modification is required, will draft the change to support charting.

ACTION: Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, to draft new language for FAA Order 8260.19 to support documentation HILPT maximum holding altitude.

[15-02-298 Charting GLS DMax \(Service Volume\)](#)

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue and [showed a prototype](#) approach chart depicting the identification of DMax. There was ACF consensus in support of the chart depiction.

Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, [showed the language](#) that he has drafted for FAA Order 8260.19H. This language received support and Tom will move to finalize it.

Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-5441, asked if DMax is documented in the AirNav database and asked how a procedure specialist will know where the antenna is located on the airport. Catherine Graham, FAA/AFS-470, confirmed that the DMax information is reported on the Airport Datasheet that can be pulled from AirNav.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, to draft an IACC Requirement Document for charting of DMax on IAPs.

ACTION: Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, to proceed with ACF-supported draft FAA Order 8260.19 language to support procedure documentation for DMax publication.

VI. New Charting Topics

16-01-301 RVR Locations in FAA Documentation

Kamal Ahmed, Navtech, briefed the issue. Kamal recommended that the airport Chart Supplement entries contain the complete RVR sensors available for use on a given runway. The RD states that currently only those RVR sensors physically situated on a specific runway are listed for that runway, but that other RVR sensors (for instance those on a parallel runway, or designated for a use on the opposite runway) may be available and *should* be associated. RVR location information is necessary in the calculation and publication of minima on instrument approach procedures.

After presenting his RD, Kamal relayed a recent discussion with Rick Mayhew, FAA/AJV-5331, and said that he learned that RVRs are now being published differently in NASR and that some of the information Kamal is looking for is now being databased in a more useful way. Kamal felt that the FAA could go a step further by publishing the geographic coordinates of the individual RVR sensors and by depicting them on airport diagrams.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, agreed that the lack of more detailed RVR sensor data, coupled with the removal of a related parcel of RVR/ILS data once made available by the FAA, is also an issue for Jeppesen. Ted stated that in the past, FAA Flight Standards (AFS-410) maintained and made publicly available a spreadsheet called the ILS Component List that served as a primary source for RVR information. He stated that because this list is no longer available (it was removed approximately 2 years ago), it has become difficult for Jeppesen to derive and publish lower than standard minimums. Ted stated that Jeppesen would like to see either this spreadsheet reinstated and made publicly available, or for the FAA in some other way provide a consolidated listing of RVR installations and applicability to runways for airports where U.S. OP SPEC Lower-Than-Standard operating minimums are permitted for air carriers.

Dale Courtney, FAA/AJW-292, said that he had a copy of the spreadsheet, but that it is not current. Dale stated that NASR has all the necessary RVR information. Ted responded that the data in NASR is fragmented and disagreed that NASR provides all the information that is needed.

Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, suggested that AFS take responsibility for providing the data and possibly resurrecting the ILS Component List once maintained by AFS-410. John Blair, FAA/AFS-410, agreed to take the recommendation to AFS-410 management, express the industry need and seek support for his office providing the information. John shared that in the past, some 5000 users regularly accessed the ILS Component List and he acknowledged its popularity. He stressed that it would be helpful if he could provide to his management exactly what information is needed and why. Representatives from Jeppesen, Lido and others agreed to meet with John at a break during the ACF and provide him detailed input.

Dale restated his belief that all the necessary information is already contained in NASR and suggested that NASR may be able to generate a report to support the need. Jill Olson, FAA/AJV-553, suggested that a scrub of NASR be completed to determine if all the information is already in the database and if a report can be generated. Jill committed to working with AJV-5 management to determine the possibility.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: John Blair, FAA/AFS-410, and Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, to discuss the ILS Component List with AFS-410 management.

ACTION: Jill Olson, FAA/AJV-553, will work with AJV-5 management to determine if all RVR information exists in NASR and if a report fulfilling the use of the ILS Component List can be generated.

16-01-302 Cold Temperature Restricted Airport SIAP Segment Depiction

Rune Duke, AOPA, [reviewed the history](#) of Cold Weather Temperature information appearing on the IAPs and current cold weather correction practices. He stated that AOPA has received a great deal of negative feedback with regard to usability of the current process. Pilots are finding issues with the accessibility of the information because they have to utilize multiple sources to get all the information they need. For complete information, pilots must consult the Notices to Airmen Publication (NTAP) for changes, which is a document not normally referenced by pilots and not easily accessible.

Rune stated that AOPA recommends the FAA provide all temperatures and applicable segments in a single location on the approach chart. Providing all of the information on the IAP chart would give the pilots easy, one stop access to the information. Since the Cold Temperature Error Table is provided in the TPP, pilots would no longer have to go to the NTAP for additional information. He also recommended that Fahrenheit temperatures be removed from the IAP since Celsius is the only temperature pilots use in calculating cold weather altitude correction. Further, AOPA recommends that the Cold Temperature Restricted Airport note be sourced on the applicable 8260-series Form procedure source rather than in the NTAP and via National Flight Data Digest (NFDD). The FAA could then issue a P-NOTAM for changes to Cold Temperature notes until charts could be updated.

Catherine Graham, FAA/AFS-470, commented that she had discussed the proposed recommendation within FAA/AFS-470, and was in support of adding the segment temperatures and for the removal of Fahrenheit. She stated that the other items AOPA is recommending would have to be taken back to AFS-470 for further discussion.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, voiced that his organization has also received numerous complaints regarding the publication of cold temperature information. Pilots want all the segment information on the chart so they do not need to consult a second resource. Ted also echoed his support for removal of Fahrenheit and believes that it could/should be removed from all temperature chart notes. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, will look into the removal of Fahrenheit from ALL 8260 chart notes that currently cite both Celsius and Fahrenheit.

There was some discussion about whether pilots are using the information in the NTAP and applying the temperature adjustments correctly. Gary McMullin, Southwest Airlines, voiced that there is a lot of confusion regarding the interpretation and application of the language in the NTAP and suggested the matter be reassessed by the PARC NAV Workgroup. Rune expressed concern about delaying at least the actions of segment publication on the charts. It is possible that the PARC could take years to reach a solution and pilots have current problems applying cold temperature correction that need immediate attention. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, agreed that due to clear ACF consensus to add the segments and remove Fahrenheit temperatures, those recommendations should be pursued as soon as possible. She agreed with

Rune that the FAA should not delay those steps while the PARC addresses potential revision to NTAP and AIM language. She committed to drafting a specification change to support procedure segment references in the notes and to delete references to Fahrenheit, but stressed that the specific text of the notes would continue to exactly reflect the NASR Airport Remark. If the notes on the charts are to be revised, Valerie clarified that AFS-470 is required to submit those changes to NFDC for publication via memo and hold to the pre-coordinated maximum of 175 procedures affected per 56-day ARINC cycle. Catherine will relay that message to her management.

Discussion then shifted to Rune's recommendation to document the cold temperature notes on the procedure source documents (i.e., FAA 8260-series Forms) rather than publish them via NFDD airport remark. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, stated that placing this information on the 8260-series Form was discussed at length years ago in the Instrument Procedures Group portion of the ACF (of which he is the Chair) and it was rejected. At that time, it was decided that sourcing the cold temperature notes on the 8260-series Forms would be too cost- and labor-prohibitive due to the procedure amendment requirement for every addition/deletion/change to the notes. Ted Thompson stated that he would prefer the note sourced on the 8260-series Form for clarity, for tracking purposes and because this is the only note on an instrument procedure NOT sourced on the 8260-series Form. AOPA, NBAA, and Jeppesen all voiced that they would rather see the note on the 8260-series Form.

Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-5441, stated that he does not believe the cold temperature notes should be on the 8260-series Form because this is not a TERPS issue and the 8260-series Form is primarily a TERPS record. He believes the adjustment is an aircraft equipment issue and stated that currently AJV-5 chart automation and databases do not support the data. Rune repeated the importance of making the note a procedural item so that a procedure NOTAM would be issued if/when there is a change. He stressed that pilots check NOTAMs, but they do not check the NTAP or read the NFDD, if they even know they exist. It was also pointed out that cold temperature adjustment adherence is now mandatory, not merely a recommendation or suggestion, and this regulatory aspect may lend justification for it being on the regulatory procedure source document rather than published along with other non-regulatory data in the NFDD. Tony and Jill Olson, FAA/AJV-553, will investigate the feasibility of adding the cold temperature notes to the 8260-series Forms.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, to update FAA Order 8260.19 to remove references to Fahrenheit from procedure notes citing temperature (other than cold temperature notes which are NOT currently documented in Order 8260.19).

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, to work with AFS-470 to draft an IACC Requirement Document for the addition of segment specifics and for the removal of Fahrenheit.

ACTION: Gary McMullin, Southwest Airlines, to report back on discussions within the PARC NAV Workgroup regarding possible changes to the NTAP language.

ACTION: Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-5441, and Jill Olson, FAA/AJV-553, will investigate the feasibility of sourcing the Cold Temperature note on the 8260-series Form.

[16-01-303 Terminal Area Charts \(TAC\) and Charting IFR Arrival/Departure Routes](#)

Rune Duke, AOPA, [briefed the issue](#). Rune stated that AOPA is recommending three things:

1. The primary airport's IFR arrival/departure routes should be added to the TAC and/or flyway chart for the six TACs that do not currently have this information depicted.
2. AIS should work with Air Traffic to ensure significant IFR arrival/departure routes to satellite airports in high-density airspace are charted on TACs.
3. The FAA should review the ten TACs that currently do not have flyway charts to determine the feasibility and value of adding the supplementary flyway chart.

Rune commented that the suggestion was in part from a recommendation made by the RTCA (Radio Technical Commission on Aeronautics) Technical Operations Committee.

Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223, stated that he would discuss the recommendations with AJV-5 management and report back at next ACF.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223, will discuss the recommendations with AJV-5 management and report back at next ACF.

[16-01-304 Depicting Non-Standard Maximum Holding Speeds](#)

Michael Stromberg, Air Wisconsin, briefed the issue. Michael [presented examples of non-standard holding speed depictions](#). He compared the FAA depiction with the Jeppesen depiction and showed that Jeppesen depicts altitude information for non-standard speed holding patterns. Michael stated that, in his experience, pilots using FAA charts can easily misinterpret the speeds and incorrectly apply it to all altitudes.

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, stated that the FAA charts speed restrictions on holding patterns when they are non-standard, but do NOT depict standard altitudes. The altitude standards are clearly explained in the AIM and in the TPP Legend.

Rune Duke, AOPA, inquired if there had been any safety reports regarding this matter. The audience was unaware of safety reports related to misunderstanding of these holding altitudes.

Valerie commented that in her opinion the issue is more a matter of pilot training than charting and that it would be a mistake to add undo clutter to a chart to add information clearly explained elsewhere. It was agreed to close this item.

STATUS: CLOSED

[16-01-305 Cold Weather Temperature Compensation at Military Authority Locations](#)

Frank Fortunato, Air Force Flight Standards Agency, briefed the issue, stating that though he is aware that military locations are included as part of the MITRE cold temperature study, they are not published as part of the NTAP list. This recommendation requests that military locations be considered for publication in the Cold Temperature Restricted Airport list in the NTAP.

Lt. Col. Jennifer Scott, USAF, emphasized that this is not for military needs but for civilian authorized and regulated aircraft that fly in to military facilities.

Catherine Graham, FAA/AFS-470, agreed to take the recommendation to her management for discussion.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Catherine Graham, FAA/AFS-470, will discuss the recommendation with AFS-470 management and report at the next ACF.

[16-01-306 Availability of Airport Ground Parking/Ramp Diagrams](#)

Kemal Ahmed, Navtech, briefed the issue. Kemal [provided background](#) on the challenges facing chart producers with regards to securing the necessary data to produce airport taxi charts and airport diagrams with the detailed information that their clients require for low visibility movement operations at U.S. airports. He showed how current FAA Airport Diagrams do not contain parking information, latitude/longitude information for parking stands, detailed ramp layouts, taxi lanes and other detailed airport infrastructure. Kemal pointed out that ICAO Annex 4 stipulates that states provide this information. Kemal stated that in order to meet their clients' needs, Navtech must independently solicit data from individual airports to secure the necessary information. The information they receive is not standardized and is not always current. Kemal is asking the FAA to provide this data.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, expressed his support for Kemal's recommendation and stated that Jeppesen experiences the same difficulties with securing current and detailed source data for production of their LVO/SMGCS (Low Visibility Operations/Surface Movement Guidance and Control System Operations) charts.

Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, [reviewed the FAA's past attempts](#) to establish a process and funding to collect, verify and maintain LVO/SMGCS data. He would like to see this effort restarted, but reported that currently the funding does not exist.

Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, commented there has recently been a push for NASR to be the repository for airport surface movement data, but NFDC is not willing to accept that data if there is not a mechanism in place for that data to be maintained.

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, commented that at present, the FAA doesn't have or publish the data and has filed a difference to ICAO Annex for not charting this type of detailed aerodrome chart. Valerie added that aside from the lack of source, AJV-5 could not currently show this level of detail on FAA-produced airport diagrams as the size constraint of the TPP would make them illegible. In the future, when the data/charting

becomes strictly digital, expanded and highly detailed airport/aerodrome chart files are likely to be produced.

Kemal understood the current FAA limitations and though not pleased, agreed to close the issue.

STATUS: CLOSED

VII. Closing Remarks

Valerie Watson, AJV-553, thanked the attendees for their participation and voiced special appreciation to Darrell Pennington and ALPA for hosting the ACF.

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:

- Charting Group – http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/acf/
- Instrument Procedures Group – http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/avs/offices/afs/afs400/afs420/acfigp/

Please note the attached Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) listing for action items. It is requested that all OPRs be prepared to provide verbal input at the next Forum or provide the Chair, Valerie Watson (with an informational copy to Alex Rushton, Contract Support), a written status update. These status reports will be used to compile the minutes of the meeting and will serve as a documented statement of your presentation.

Appreciation to Jennifer Hendi, AJV-553, for presentation assistance, for pre- and post-conference support and assistance with capturing the meeting minutes, to Alex Rushton, Contract Support to AJV-553, for pre- and post-conference support and taking the meeting minutes and to Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, for sharing his accurate and detailed meeting notes.

VIII. Next Meeting

ACF 16-02 is scheduled to be held on October 25-27, 2016, hosted by Pragmatics at their Reston, VA location.

ACF 17-01 is scheduled to be held on April 25-27, 2017, tentatively scheduled by ALPA at their Herndon, VA Headquarters.

IX. Attachments

- a. 16-01 Attendee Roster
- b. Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR)