Government/Industry Aeronautical Charting Meeting (ACM)
Meeting 18-01
Charting Group
April 25-26, 2018
MITRE
McLean VA 22102

CHARTING GROUP MINUTES

I. Opening Remarks

The Aeronautical Charting Meeting (ACM) was hosted by The MITRE Corporation located in McLean, VA. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, opened the Charting Group portion of the forum on Wednesday, April 25. Valerie acknowledged Co-chair John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, who presided over the Instrument Procedures Group (IPG) portion of the meeting the previous day and expressed appreciation to MITRE and Al Herndon, for hosting the 18-01 ACM.

II. Review Minutes of Last Meeting, ACF 17-02

The minutes from ACF 17-02 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 18-01 meeting was accepted as presented.

IV. Presentations, Working Group Reports and Project Reports

Discontinuation of VOR Services

Vince Massimini, MITRE, provided an update for the Very High Frequency Omnidirectional Range (VOR) Minimum Operation Network (MON) program. Vince reported that to date, 23 VORs have been decommissioned and 15 more are planned for discontinuance in the next six months. Vince stated that the number of VORs identified for decommissioning continues to fluctuate a little, with the latest discontinuance target being 311.

Vince reported that they are in the process of extending the standard service volume (SSV) for the VORs that will remain from 40 NM to 70 NM. He said that they are also working to ensure that the VORs that remain are more robust. Michael Stromberg, UPS, asked about the timeline for the new SSV. Vince said they anticipate changes to the SSV to take effect in the next 12 to 18 months. He also said that there is a sister effort underway to extend the service volume of the DMEs. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, asked Vince for assurance that the change in SSV would be fully socialized and documented well in advance of its implementation. Vince agreed to ensure that.

Rune Duke, AOPA, expressed a concern about AWOS and HIWAS locations that currently transmit over VOR. He said that potential impact of VOR decommissioning on AWOS and HIWAS need to be understood and communicated to pilots. Valerie asked Vince Massimini, MITRE, if they are working with the non-fed weather office on these issues. Vince responded yes and that, in general, an affected AWOS will remain and will be rechanneled to a VHF. Vince commented that HIWAS systems are more complicated. The same weather information available via HIWAS may also be available from flight service if there is an overlapping Remote Communication Outlet (RCO). If that is the case, they will not retain the HIWAS. Vince emphasized that each case is different, needs to be worked individually, and working them will take time.

John Collins, ForeFlight, asked for clarification regarding the naming of the DMEs that will remain and asked if they can be used for flight planning. Vince stated that when the VOR portion of an existing VOR/DME is decommissioned, the remaining DME at that location will retain the same name and location identifier of the original NAVAID and they can be used for flight planning.

Transitioning to Point to Point Navigation

Rune Duke, AOPA, reviewed the issue and provided an update on progress made since last meeting. He again stressed that the implementation of the VOR MON program will result in fewer conventional land-based NAVAID routes available, making point-to point navigation more important. He stated that the goal of the Subcommittee is to look at the challenges to point-to-point navigation, find ways to facilitate it, and present recommendations. The first piece out of the Subcommittee was the submission of a recommendation for improving OROCA, to be discussed later in the meeting (refer to RD 17-02-316). He said that the other issues being worked by the subcommittee have paused for the time being.

Rune then presented a slide regarding the Performance Based Navigation (PBN) National Airspace System (NAS) Navigation Strategy goals. One of those goals is that by 2025, the FAA will complete the transition to

digital delivery of chart data. Rune expressed the following questions regarding this goal: How will this be accomplished? What more needs to be done? Should the ACF help steer this goal?

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, said that there have been internal FAA discussions about adding a separate data aspect to this bi-annual meeting that could specifically address this sort of issue. She asked the audience if there is support for the idea and whether or not another day should be added to the existing three day meeting for that purpose. Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-562, stated that, in his view, the data discussions should be incorporated into the charting and instrument procedures discussions. Rune agreed. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, said that there are already other meetings in place that work with chart data providers. He agreed that there need not be a separate day specifically dedicated to data issues and that data aspects should be discussed in concert with the respective charting/procedure subjects. Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed agreement. Jill Olson, FAA/AJV-553, stated that if data is going to be included, it may have to be written into Order 7910.5 that supports this meeting.

NOTAM Briefing

No briefing was provided.

CPDLC Briefing

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, provided an update on behalf of Gregg Anderson, FAA/AJM-34. Valerie stated that for the terminal implementation of Controller Pilot Data Link Communications (CPDLC), the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) guidance now includes the universal nationwide logon of "KUSA". She said that even though KUSA is now used at all airports in the U.S., the logon information will be retained by FAA/AJV-5 in the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) database and in the Chart Supplement airport entries.

Valerie then discussed Phase 2 of the CPDLC program, which is implementation of enroute services. She stated that enroute CPDLC is currently in testing phase and that Kansas City Center remains on track for fully operational implementation in October 2018. Valerie then showed an enroute chart sample of the proposed depiction of "CPDLC (LOGON KUSA)" along the Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) boundary in association with the existing Center boundary identification text. She said that the plan is for "CPDLC (LOGON KUSA)" to be published in the NASR database as a General Remark in the Center resource for each Center as they are commissioned.

Michael Stromberg, UPS, asked if there will be AIM guidance for enroute CPDLC usage. Valerie stated that Gregg Anderson is working on draft AIM language and hopes to have it published in the fall.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, expressed concern that pilots are going to need more training and education, particularly during the rollout period where CPDLC doesn't exist at every U.S. Center. He suggested a warning note on data driven charts that would alert pilots when they are 10 minutes outside of the boundary, but he said he understands that decision and relevant guidance would have to come from the Centers. Valerie stated that it is intended that the AIM will explain Enroute CPDLC usage sufficiently. She

stated that charts are intended to depict what attributes: i.e., NAVAIDs, airways, airports, procedures, exist in the National Airspace System and not to provide guidance in how to use those charted items. She suggested that a Charting Notice could be published when CPDLC is commissioned at the first Center of the proposed rollout and committed to obtaining text for that Notice from Gregg.

Valerie then asked the audience if a warning note alerting pilots 10 minutes prior to entering a CPDLC equipped Center would be useful on charts or could it be incorporated into the data for the Center so that data-driven enroute applications could make use of it. She stated that the NASR database has the capacity to add a General Remark to the Center resource if it were an Air Traffic requirement and received from the Center.

Lev Prichard, American Airlines, echoed Ted's comments on the need to alert pilots to the availability of CPDLC services and he agreed that the solution needs to be data driven. Gary McMullin, Southwest, pointed out that once the rollout is complete in the U.S., it will be seamless for pilots and notification between Centers will be unnecessary. The notification would then only be relevant for aircraft entering or exiting U.S. airspace. Valerie pointed out that during the rollout it will not be seamless within the U.S. as the Centers will come onboard in a waterfall schedule and not all at once. There was some confusion among the audience regarding whether or not pilots who log into the system on the ground will remain logged in or if they will need the warning in flight. Valerie pointed out that enroute CPDLC is still in testing and there are still many unanswered questions regarding what will be required/expected of pilots. She committed to organizing another meeting of the CPDLC Workgroup to address these questions.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, will set up a meeting with the CPDLC Workgroup to continue discussion of the Enroute application of CPDLC.

Airport Survey and Mapping Briefing

Satya Gunduboina, FAA/AJV-5641, presented a briefing on a proposal to eliminate the airport sketch from Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) in the Terminal Procedures Publications (TPP) and from the Chart Supplement airport entries. Along with the sketch elimination, it was proposed that all hard-surfaced runway public-use airports with public-use Instrument Flight Rules (IFR) procedures would have a published airport diagram. The airport diagrams would be revised to include the airport features that are now included on the sketch, e.g. runway lighting. Satya stated that these changes would enable the FAA Airport Survey and Mapping Team to streamline production processes and generate efficiencies by maintaining fewer charting variations of airport information. It would also free up space on IAPs to allow for the possible future expansion of minimums or for better profile depictions.

In addition to the elimination of sketches for instrument airports from both the TPPs and the Chart Supplements (coinciding with the creation of a full sized airport diagram for each), this proposal suggests the removal of sketches from the Chart Supplements for VFR airports. This portion of the proposal will need to be vetted to general aviation users as these are the only graphic depictions of VFR airports that AJV-5 provides.

Dave Stamos, NGA, commented that the addition a large number of new airport diagrams will result in an increase in pages, cost and weight to the TPP. Dave then said, from a flight instructor perspective, removing the IAP sketch with its final approach track information will impact a pilot's situational awareness, particularly on circling approaches. He also said he would not like to lose the close-in obstacles that are portrayed in the sketch area. Dave emphasized that the airport sketch is a critical tool for pilots and should remain on the IAPs.

Rune Duke, AOPA, said this is the first time that he has heard about this proposal and asked that AOPA be given the opportunity to ask their membership for feedback. Jeff Lamphier, FAA/AJV-5640, responded that the purpose of this briefing is to engage the user community and to gain feedback on this proposal as they are working to develop their automation strategy and that he would welcome the feedback.

Jeff Gingras, Jeppesen, asked if the geo-databased files will be made available to the public. Jeff Lamphier replied, yes, the geo-databased files with the airport information will be made available. Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, pointed out that taxiways and ramps are not in National Airspace System Resource (NASR) database. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, stated that there is a need for better coordination for the source and the dates for changes to airport information and that this coordination should be part of the new plan. Michael Barrett, FAA/AJV-5642, stated that they are in the process of making a baseline standard product where they will combine all the airport information products into one base file, geo-reference them, and put them into a database that will be publicly available. Jeff emphasized that the AJV-5 Airport Mapping Team is not the source for the data and that the files would be produced in the same way today's sketches and diagrams are produced utilizing source.

Valerie recapped the issue and said that the FAA would appreciate user feedback on the proposed airport sketch elimination from IAP charts and the elimination of VFR sketches from the Chart Supplements. She restated some of the benefits to removing the IAP sketch and added that Jeppesen does not include an airport sketch on their IAPs. She noted that Jeppesen users seem able to obtain sufficient situational awareness in utilizing the planview runway patterns and/or the separate airport depiction and suggested that though this may present a training issue for some users, she believes it not insurmountable. Lt. Col Turner, USAF, stated that he agrees with Dave Stamos' NGA position on the need to retain airport sketches on IAPs. Valerie asked them both to provide FAA feedback on what information they need the FAA to retain and why.

Attendees who want to provide additional feedback to the proposal may email their comments to Jeff Lamphier, Airport Survey and Mapping Team Manager, at jeffrey.lamphier@faa.gov

ICAO Aeronautical Information Management Steering Group – Aeronautical Chart Subgroup

George Sempeles, FAA/AOV-110, briefed the audience on topics discussed at the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) Aeronautical Information Management (AIM) Steering Group meeting that had taken place the week prior in Montreal. The objective of this group is to develop Standards and Recommended Practices to support Regions and States with the implementation of their AIM Programs. George reported that ICAO is analyzing chart types and functions to determine which chart types are being produced and

looking at which types are needed. They are also looking at which products can be replaced with digital data and what products should be eliminated. This is part of the “No County Left Behind” initiative.

Catherine Riccio FAA/AOV-110, commented that these are all things that the U.S. and other ICAO States are already doing. She said ICAO is trying to create guidelines for other countries that need to modernize their aeronautical data systems.

V. Outstanding Charting Topics

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

Paul Gallant, FAA/AJV-113, reviewed the issue. Paul stated that when the RD was introduced, there were approximately 110 airspace legal descriptions that needed to be revised. Presently, there are just four locations left, which are on track to be revised by October 2018. There was agreement to close this item.

STATUS: CLOSE

13-01-262 Airport Facility Directory (AFD) Depiction of Traffic Pattern Altitudes

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue. She stated that the revised and clarified Traffic Pattern Altitude (TPA) guidance previously agreed to by the ACF audience was published in the 29 Mar 2018 edition of the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM).

Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, then provided an update on the progress the National Flight Data Center (NFDC) has made verifying TPA information and removing "standard" TPAs from the National Airspace System Resources (NASR) database. Scott commented that once the process had begun, it became clear that it would prove more complicated and time-consuming than originally thought. John Johnson, FAA/AJV-5332, said that NFDC needs to reach out to over 1,800 airports to verify their TPA information. Scott stated that the project has been prioritized and is moving forward with an anticipated completion date by the end of this calendar year.

Rick Mayhew, FAA/AJV-533, reported that since the last meeting, he has reached out to the Office of Airports regarding the proposed changes needed on FAA Form 7480-1, Notice of Landing Area Proposal, to clarify the collection of TPA information. He has had no response as yet, but will continue his communication with the Office of Airports and will report progress at the next meeting. NFDC would like to see the form expanded to accommodate multiple TPAs for differing aircraft types and indications of "standard" or "recommended" TPA entries.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, will coordinate the continued NASR update to ensure that only non-standard TPAs are listed in the database.

ACTION: Rick Mayhew, FAA/AJV-533, will work with the Office of Airports to promulgate changes to FAA Form 7480-1, Notice of Landing Area Proposal, to clarify collection of TPA information.

13-01-270 Stepdown Fix Chart Notes

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue and reported that the revised Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) guidance was published in the 29 March 2018 edition. She said that Rich Boll, NBAA reported

that a couple of minor revisions to the text are needed regarding the deletion of the (H) in the MDA and DA references. Rich Boll, NBAA, said he will send the revisions to Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, for publication.

John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, provided an update on the changes being incorporated into FAA Order 8260.19H. He stated that the changes will be drafted for inclusion in Change 2.

Valerie reported that she will submit a specification change to update the Terminal Procedure Publication (TPP) Legend Profile View page to clarify stepdown fix use after the revised guidance has been published in FAA Order 8260.19.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, to submit revised stepdown fix AIM guidance for publication per input from Rich Boll, NBAA.

ACTION: John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, to report on the status of revised guidance in draft FAA Order 8260.19H.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, to work specification change to update the TPP Legend Profile View page to clarify stepdown fix use after the revised guidance has been published in FAA Order 8260.19.

14-01-279 Naming of FAA Certified, National Disseminated AWOS-3 Systems on Private Use Airports

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue. Valerie stated that since we have confirmation that every AWOS submitted to the National Flight Data Center (NFDC) from the FAA Non-Fed Weather Office is certified and maintained to FAA standards for public use, she was able to move forward with the specification change to add stand-alone automated weather systems (i.e., not associated with a charted public-use airport or NAVAID) to Enroute and Visual charts. They will begin to appear on the charts for the 13 September 2018 effective date. There was agreement to close this item.

STATUS: CLOSE

15-01-295 Charting of Airports for the MON

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the item. Valerie stated that a request has been submitted for a National Airspace System Resource (NASR) update to accommodate the MON Airport designation. It is expected that the NASR enhancement request will be complete by July 2018. Once in place, Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, reported that his team will populate NASR from the list that has been provided by the MON Program Office. In the meantime, he said that he will work with the MON Program Office to establish a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the maintenance of the list until the MON Program Office is sunset in 2025.

Scott then expressed his concern over the long-term ownership and maintenance of the MON Airport designation attribute after the MON Program Office sunsets in 2025. Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-553, stated that

AJV-5 is still working this issue, but he expects that the ownership of the MON Airport designation would likely transition to the FAA Service Centers. He said AJV-5 is working to enhance internal AJV-5 processes that will identify an airport as MON so that instrument approach developers do not inadvertently make a change/deletion to an instrument procedure that negates the MON status. He did, however, state that though he believes AJV-5 needs to have a role in the process, he does not think AJV-5 should inherit the ultimate responsibility for maintenance of the MON Airport list. Tony committed to setting up a meeting with NFDC, the VOR MON Program Office and the AJV-5 IFP Group to discuss the short-term and long-term maintenance of the MON Airport designation.

Valerie asked Vince if the MON Program Office has received any further comments on the MON Airport Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) language. Vince said that he was not aware of any comments or of any forthcoming changes to the AIM, but that he would ask Leonixa Salcedo, FAA/AJM-324, if she had received any feedback.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-553, will report on discussions regarding the short- and long-term (after the MON Program Office sunsets in 2025) maintenance of the MON Airport list.

ACTION: Vince Massimini, MITRE, will report on any forthcoming changes to the existing AIM language.

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, will work on NASR and NFDC Portal updates to accommodate the MON Airport designation. Once in place, he will populate NASR initially from the list provided by the MON Program Office.

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, will work with the MON Program Office to establish a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for maintenance of the MON Airport list until the MON Program Office is sunset in 2025.

15-02-298 Charting GLS DMax (Service Volume)

Joel Dickenson, FAA/AFS-470, reviewed the issue and provided an update on developments since the last meeting. Joel reported that there has been a change in the use of the term DMAX and that it no longer refers to the service volume of the GLS. As a result, the proposed charting solution of using a fix at the service volume limit with the label (DMAX) is no longer appropriate. He is now working to find another charting solution to depict the extent of the service volume.

He suggested the use of a localizer fan symbol that extends to the service volume limit. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, stated that it is a common misconception that the localizer fan symbols depicted on Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) are an indication of the service volume for the ILS. She said that is not the case, never has been and referenced guidance published in the FAA Chart User's Guide. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, agreed with Valerie and said that it is important not to use a symbol that can mean two different things. He suggested that a line, label or fix be used to indicate the service volume and stressed that the indicator of the limit needs to be documented on the procedure source form.

Joel agreed that a visual indication of the service volume limit for GLS is needed and he committed to working on a proposal for graphic depiction on the charts and to determine how it should be documented on the procedure source form.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Joel Dickenson, FAA/AFS-470, will continue to work with the proponent and others to come up with a graphical depiction of the GLS service volume limit and how to document it on the procedure source form.

16-01-301 RVR Locations in FAA Documentation

John Blair, FAA/AFS-410, stated that Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-562, and his team have gathered feedback and have refined the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) generated report so that it contains the majority of the information that was contained in the discontinued ILS Components List. John said that they had received a request to add the ILS classification codes and he said they are working on that enhancement. He said that the plan is to make the spreadsheet available on the AJV-5 and AFS-400 websites on a 28-day production cycle.

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, asked about some missing data in the spreadsheet in the columns labeled DH, VIS, and HAT_HAA. In the VIS column, it seems it is only pulling data for those expressed in Statute Miles and not those in RVR (feet). It is also not populating any data in the DH, VIS, or HAT_HAA columns for ILS CAT IIIa or ILS CATIIIb. Brian said they would have to take that back and look into how they can populate that missing data.

Valerie then asked about the possibility of adding a field for the lowest allowable takeoff RVR value. John replied that the FAA will not be able to support adding that field. He said that in order for a vendor to offer reduced takeoff minimums to their customers, they will have to use the data contained in the spreadsheet to make those determinations themselves. John added that lowest allowable RVR values are heavily dependent upon an aircraft's equipment and OpSpec.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, stated that the lowest allowable RVR values is what they want but understands the reasons for the FAA deciding not to provide that. He said that the new spreadsheet is still providing valuable information.

John shared with the audience an email with additional information for those who would like to understand what goes into calculating lower than standard takeoff minimums. He emphasized that it is not just as simple as plugging the numbers into a formula. He said it depends on the OpSpec and there are a lot of variances, caveats, and conditions. The email demonstrated the complexity.

Kemal Ahmed, NavTech, thanked the FAA for their work on the spreadsheet and said he expects that we will be able to close this item at the next meeting.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-562, will investigate the missing data in the DH, VIS, and HAT_HAA columns of the spreadsheet and repost the result on the ACF website.

ACTION: John Blair, FAA/AFS-410 and Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-562, will come up with a production schedule and dissemination plan for the new NASR-generated spreadsheet.

16-02-309 Publishing of CLNC DEL Phone Numbers in Chart Supplement

Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, provided an update on his action items. He said that the project to add the 200 additional airports CLNC DEL phone numbers into National Airspace System Resource (NASR) is now nearly complete. He has also been working on establishing the standard location for the phone numbers in NASR. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, said that the phone numbers will continue to be shown the Chart Supplement listed in the COMM/NAV/WEATHER REMARKS section of the airport entries. Valerie also showed the audience the update that was made to the Chart Supplement Airport/Facility Directory Legend explanatory text.

Jeff Black, FAA/AJR-B6, presented a status update. He reported that the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) has been updated regarding the use of CLNC DEL phone numbers. Jeff stated in Part II of the project, 25 additional approach control facilities will participate in the program which will result in over 200 additional airport entries that will be updated to include a phone number. The plan is to have these submitted to the National Flight Data Center (NFDC) in time to have them published in the September 2018 edition of the Chart Supplements. For all other uncontrolled airports, pilots will be able to obtain a clearance by calling the overlying Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) Flight Data Unit (FDU). These numbers will be published in the same location. This is expected to begin later in the fall of 2018. He anticipates that the entire project will be complete by June 2019.

Vince Massimini, MITRE, asked if Flight Service will still handle clearances for private airports or non-IFR airports or those not listed in the Chart Supplement. Jeff replied that for private airports, all the clearance responsibilities would go to the controlling center. Scott said that Jeff will be submitting all airports to NFDC, including private airports, and they will all be put into the database and show up in the NASR subscriber files, making the information available.

Lev Prichard, American Airlines, asked how long the current filing and clearance process will remain active. Jeff stated that the current systems will stay active until it rolls over to the Center and the new number is published in the Chart Supplement. Lev said that this is going to be confusing for pilots. Jeff said the goal is to match up the publication with the roll out of the number to try to limit that confusion.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, will continue to coordinate with Jeff Black, FAA/AJR-B6, to enter 200 additional airport's CLNC DEL phone numbers into NASR.

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, will coordinate with Jeff Black, FAA/AJR-B6, to publish the ARTCC phone numbers in NASR for untowered and part-time towered airports.

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, will coordinate with Jeff Black, FAA/AJR-B6, to continue to identify and correct discrepancies in the Chart Supplement entries.

16-02-310 Inclusion of MSA Info for ODPs, SIDs & STARs

John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, reviewed the issue and provided an update. John stated that the issue was taken to the U.S. Instrument Flight Procedures Panel (US-IFPP) Departure Working Group (DWG) for consideration. The DWG will be reviewing the recommendation the first week of May. If there are no objections, it will be forwarded to the IFPP for discussion at the June meeting. He is hoping for concept approval there so that the recommendation can then move forward. John will provide an update of the outcome of the US-IFPP at the next meeting.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, will report on discussions that take place at the June 2018 meeting of the US-IFPP.

17-02-311 TFR Charting: Recommendations of the RTCA Tactical Operations Committee

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553 reviewed the issue and provided an update. She said that she has reached out to the Airspace and Rules Office, FAA/AJV-11, regarding the possibility of publishing and charting "long-term TFRs" as Special Use Airspace that could be activated via NOTAM. She was told that no, this is not a viable solution. Valerie and Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, then reached out to the Systems Operations Security Office, FAA/AJR-24, to ask if that office could reach out to the proponents of the TFRs to ask if they could assign them an end date of permanent. She also suggested that as an alternative to that, the Systems Operations Security Office could be the authoritative source and provide AJV-5 with a memo requesting charting of those areas they deem appropriate for charting. A meeting is scheduled for May 2018 with AJV-5 and the Systems Operations Security Office to discuss possible solutions.

Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223, then spoke about his action to look at the various depictions of currently charted TFRs. Rick stated there are very specific categories of TFRs and they are charted differently because they are different, particularly in the degree of consequence if they are violated. He said that VFR Charting would prefer to continue to show the existing ones the way they are currently charted, and then determine what symbology should be used for the new TFRs that are being requested. Rune Duke, AOPA, stated that he would still prefer that all TFRs are depicted the same way so that pilots will always know what they should be looking for on the charts, but stated that if/when new symbology is proposed, he would like to have the chance to comment. Rick said he will continue to look how TFRs are charted currently, consider how the new ones will be shown and will report at the next meeting.

Scott then provided an update on the progress made on adding sporting event 3 NM rings and Long-term TFRs to Radar Video Maps and Controller Charts. Scott reported that AJV-5 has been working with Air Traffic Services, FAA/AJT, on this item and have provided prototypes for their review. It is currently in internal coordination. Once approved, they can begin implementation.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533 and Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553 will coordinate with Systems Operations Security Office regarding solutions to the sourcing of "long-term TFRs" for charting.

ACTION: Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223, will continue to examine the various depictions of currently charted TFRs and develop a proposed depiction for "long-term TFRs".

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, to provide an update on adding sporting event 3 NM rings and Long-term TFRs to Radar Video Maps and Controller Charts.

17-02-312 Standardized Communications on DPs and STARs

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue. Valerie stated that based on discussions at the previous meeting and on internal discussions within AJV-5 since that time, she will draft an Interagency Air Committee (IAC) specification change for standardized communications on DPs and STARs.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, will draft a specification change for standardized communications on DPs and STARs and report progress at the next meeting.

17-02-314 Charting of ILS Classification System for Category I ILS Approaches

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the issue. Michael Stromberg, UPS, showed the audience proposed Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) language that would provide pilots more information on the specifics of ILS Facility Performance Classification Codes. Michael stated that such information was missing and not easily obtainable by pilots and that he believes the AIM is the best vehicle for providing such information.

John Blair, FAA/AFS-410, said that he does not believe that this type of technical information belongs in the AIM. He said that this information would be for a very narrow audience and that it should be in the airlines OpSpecs. He said that he will take it back to his management but he doesn't expect that they will approve it.

Lev Prichard, American Airlines, disagreed. He said that the AIM is the go-to source for pilots and flight instructors, that most do not know of or know how to access the technical documents John refers to. He voiced that he supports publication of the proposed language in the AIM.

There was a lot of discussion both for and against publishing this guidance in the AIM. Based on the large support in the room for having the guidance placed in the AIM, Valerie asked John to take it back to his management for consideration. John agreed to do so.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: John Blair, FAA/AFS-410, to present the suggested guidance to AFS-410 management for inclusion in the AIM.

17-02-315 Updating Terminal Procedure Publication (TPP) Comparable Values of RVR and Visibility Table

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the history of the recommendation to expand the existing Comparable Values of RVR and Visibility table in the front of the Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) to incorporate interim RVR values contained in TERPS Order 8260.3C but not contained in 14 CFR Part 91.175(h). John Blair, FAA/AFS-410, reported that his office is in support of expanding the RVR table as originally proposed, but retaining the RVR 6000 value of 1 ¼ statute mile visibility, per 14 CFR Part 91.175(h). He said that, at this time, his management will not pursue the formal rulemaking process that is necessary to revise the CFR. He said that if, in the future, it is determined that it is necessary to update the CFR and if more resources are then available to do so, his offices could reconsider.

There was then discussion about whether or not the Comparable Values of RVR and Visibility table published in the Legend of the TPP is regulatory. Valerie stated that the current table in the TPP is taken exactly from the CFR, so is regulatory, but TPP front matter (for example, an expanded table extracted from TERPS Order 8260.3) does not necessary have to be. She explained that most of the TPP front matter guidance is not regulatory. Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-553, suggested to move forward with the specification change to update the TPP table to incorporate interim values not included in the CFR table (retaining the RVR 6000 value of 1 ¼ statute mile visibility from the CFR) and in that coordination process the proposed revision of the table can be vetted to all concerned aspects of Flight Standards, AFS-400, for approval.

Tony commented that in the future he would like to remove the table from the TPPs and either eliminate depiction of the military minimums or incorporate them on the Instrument Approach Procedures 8260 procedure source document.

Valerie said that she was still concerned that the CFR would not be updated. She suggested that perhaps the table could be removed from the CFR, since its contents are covered in the TERPS Order 8260.3C. John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, said it was his belief that either the table has to remain in the CFR or the visibility values need to be part of the published procedure source. Tony suggested that perhaps the table itself could be removed from the CFR and incorporated by reference to the TERPS order. John Blair repeated that any change to the CFR would not, at this time, be pursued by his management.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, will draft a specification change to update the Comparable Values of RVR and Visibility table published in the Legend of the TPP and staff it through FAA/AFS-400 for approval.

17-02-316 Improving OROCA to Meet FAR 91.177 Requirements

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed the history of this recommendation. Valerie stated that since the last meeting, she drafted and received approval for a specification change to support the revision of the existing Enroute Low Altitude Alaska Off Route Obstruction Clearance Altitudes (OROCA) grid size to match that in the lower 48 (1° x 1°). This change will be implemented on the July 19, 2018 effective date Alaska Low Altitude Enroute charts.

Bryan Murphy, FAA/AJV-562, then discussed his investigation into how Minimum IFR Altitude (MIA) and Minimum Vectoring Altitude (MVA) assessments are done to see if the same can be applied to the OROCA assessment. He said AJV-5 does have access to the MIA and MVA obstacles files and his office is looking into options that will accommodate the request that OROCA assessments be made using the same obstacle pools used in MIA/MVA assessment. He stressed that AJV-5 will also have to consider the labor and cost associated with the work before committing to pursue this endeavor.

Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-553, stated concerns regarding whether or not this data would be accurate and timely enough for instrument flight and whether or not NOTAMs can be written on the OROCA values. Brian said they are still looking into the possibility of running the OROCA calculation every day versus every 56 days. Valerie said that she has been looking into the NOTAM piece, but said that it's difficult to determine how that will be handled when we don't know yet if or how we will accomplish this goal.

Valerie questioned what office owns the definition for OROCA and voiced that if this project moves forward and OROCA may be used for off-route IFR flight, the OROCA explanatory language that is printed on the enroute charts will need to be revised. She asked that FAA/AFS-420 look at how this definition should be changed. John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, said that once the other questions are answered and it is determined that we are moving forward with this recommendation, then AFS-400 can work on this language as well as explanatory language for the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) and Pilot Controller Glossary (PCG).

Rune Duke, AOPA, stated that he is happy with the Alaska grid size update. He stressed that with the impact of the VOR MON program, this issue is becoming more important, but said he understands that this is a long-term effort and is appreciative of the efforts made thus far.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-562, will continue to investigate using the MIA and MVA assessment for the development of a new OROCA assessment.

ACTION: Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-562, will continue to investigate the feasibility of running the modified OROCA tool on a daily basis vs every 56-days.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, (if/when the above have been determined to be feasible) will work with the Lynette Jamison, FAA/AJR-B11, to determine what would potentially be the process for publication of NOTAMs for OROCA changes.

ACTION: John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, (if/when the above have been determined to be feasible) will work to determine and publish OROCA definition and sanctioned use.

17-02-317 Nome Selection Panel Extension

Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223, reviewed the issue. Rick said that he has worked with NGA to investigate the use of Tactical Pilotage Charts (TPC) for the gaps in sectional coverage, but it was determined that NGA's published coverage is not available for public use. As a result, his team looked into using the discontinued World Aeronautical Chart (WAC) coverage from CC-8, repurposed for use as an inset on the Nome Sectional Chart. Rick showed the audience the proposed inset. Rick said he would reach out to the proponent of this request to see if this will meet his needs, but he thinks that this new inset provides the coverage requested and should be sufficient. He said the new inset could be published with the next edition of the Nome Sectional Chart in May 2019.

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, said she would leave this item open pending feedback from the original proponent, but as there was general consent in the room for this solution, she will process a specification change to add the inset to the Nome Sectional.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223, will reach out to the proponent for feedback on the proposed inset solution.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, will draft a specification change for the addition of the inset to the Nome Sectional Chart.

17-02-318 Charting of Helicopter Route per RNP NAVSPEC 0.3

Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, provided an update. He briefed that the ACF-sponsored workgroup had met to discuss the subject of RNP values on Helicopter RNAV (TK) routes, including their potential use, aspects of databasing the RNP values and charting. As a result of the workgroup discussion, Mike created and briefed a proposed Concept of Operations for Helicopter RNP 0.3 Routes (see slide 4).

The proposed policy requires that there be a single RNP value per route and that it will be set for the most restrictive value necessary along the length of the route. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, pointed out that adding published RNP scalability values to TK routes would render this concept too complicated. He supports the concept of only one RNP value per route because it will make the labeling of the route much simpler and easier for pilots to understand. Mike agreed and said that if different RNP values are needed along a line of flight, individual routes with their own airway identifiers will need to be created to accommodate that. Mike

mentioned that, depending on the proliferation of this type of route, his office may need to look into obtaining more route numbers to accommodate this concept.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked if the RNP 0.3 route will be excluded from the pilot's database if the avionics don't have the capability to fly it. Mike responded that it is not that simple for helicopter pilots because they do not fly with a tailored database. John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, stated that more investigation is needed in this area to ensure pilots are only flying routes they are qualified to fly.

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, stated that discussions are already underway within AJV-5 regarding an update of the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) database airway resource to add an RNP attribute and mentioned that the single RNP value per airway, rather than an RNP value per airway segment, would significantly simplify that work.

Mike said that his next step is to continue his discussions with helicopter pilots to gain support for the single RNP value per airway idea, work to better define the concept of operations and ultimately propose draft language to relevant FAA Orders/documents to support the necessary guidance required for implementation.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, will report on progress finalizing the Concept of Operations with input from the helicopter industry and the FAA.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, will report on progress to add a RNP attribute in the airway resource in NASR.

17-02-319 Addition of VFR and Visual Flight Segments on Copter Approach & Departure Procedures

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, reviewed this issue. Valerie said that proposed Interagency Air Committee (IAC) specifications documents supporting the ACF-approved clarification of the charting of VFR and Visual Segments on Copter Approaches and Departures have been vetted and approved by FAA/AFS-400. These documents are now in the IAC signature process and are due to be approved in the near future. Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, showed the audience the chart examples of the changes. There was consensus to close this item.

STATUS: CLOSE

VI. New Charting Topics

18-01-320 Publish Center Surface Boundaries in NASR

John Collins, ForeFlight, briefed the new recommendation. John explained that, when filing a flight plan that originates at a point other than an airport, it can be difficult to determine the relevant Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC) for the departure point. He explained that flight plans must be routed to the Center responsible for the airspace and that this is the *surface* ARTCC. John notes that High Altitude and Low Altitude ARTCC boundaries are stored in the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) database and are depicted on charts, but the ARTCC boundaries at the surface are what is needed for the correct routing of flight plans and these are not provided. If/when the flight plan is routed to the incorrect Center, John asserts that the ERAM (En Route Automation Modernization) system rejects the plan, often without the pilot's knowledge. The ambiguity of Center responsibility is particularly prevalent in the vicinity of FIR/Center boundaries. John recommends that ARTCC surface boundaries be entered and maintained in the NASR database. He stressed that surface boundaries need not be charted, but should be databased.

Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, replied that is it certainly possible that the FAA could enhance NASR to add surface ARTCC boundaries (provided a source is designated and documented), but suggested that the problem be investigated further before that step is considered. He believes this may be a problem with the flight plan process because the system should be able to handle filings that do not originate at an airport. He suggested that the FAA office that is responsible for this process be engaged in conversation. John stated that the ERAM system rejects these flight plans automatically, despite the fact that ERAM has the Center surface boundaries. Scott said that AJV-5 will engage with Flight Service and ERAM representatives to try to determine why these flight plans are being rejected. Scott said he is willing to make the information available in NASR, but would like to investigate a simpler solution first.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, to investigate why ERAM is rejecting flight plans that originate at a point other than an airport.

ACTION: Jill Olson, FAA/AJV-553, and Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-562, committed to taking the issue to a meeting of the Community of Interest (COI), to which ERAM representatives are in attendance. (Post meeting)

18-01-321 Grand Canyon VFR Aeronautical Chart Update

Rune Duke, AOPA, briefed the new recommendation. Rune stated that the Grand Canyon VFR Aeronautical Chart was last updated in 2001. He pointed out that there is outdated information on the chart and pilots can no longer have confidence in the data. He asserts that this chart is used heavily by commercial operators and requests the FAA update both sides of the Grand Canyon VFR Aeronautical Chart for both General Aviation and for Commercial Air Tour Operators.

Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223, explained that this chart is not on a regular update schedule and is normally only updated when requested by Air Traffic. He said that his office recognized several years ago that the chart required update and reached out to Air Traffic representatives in the region at that time requesting assistance, but had trouble getting Air Traffic to take action. He said that his office would engage Air Traffic and the Western Service Center again for an update.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, said that there should be a process in place to update this chart on a regular basis. Rich Boll, NBAA, agreed and added that there are regulatory implications to this chart. Rich felt that it should be on a regular revision date schedule.

There was a lot of concern expressed in the audience that this chart has not been kept up to date and overwhelming support for updating the chart as soon as possible.

Brian Durham, FAA/AJV-W22, was in attendance from the Western Service Area (WSA) Operations Support Group (OSG). He volunteered to take this recommendation back to his management to prompt their engagement.

Lt. Col. Turner, USAF, stated that he had recently flown through this area as a general aviation pilot and found it difficult to determine what the actual procedures are. Rune suggested that the FAA should also look at the regulatory language that appears on the chart. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, stated that AJV-5 can communicate these user concerns to the WSA OSG, but said that AJV-5 is not authorized to revise regulatory language or create new ATC procedures. Brian Durham reiterated his assistance as liaison to the Western Service Area OSG.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223, will coordinate with his management and the Western Service Center on an update to the Grand Canyon VFR Aeronautical Chart. He will also look into establishing a regular update cycle.

ACTION: Brian Durham, FAA/AJV-W22, will take the recommendation to update the Grand Canyon VFR Aeronautical Chart to Western Service Area management.

ACTION: Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-5223 and Rune Duke, AOPA, will look into a revision to the regulatory language published on the Grand Canyon VFR Aeronautical Chart.

18-01-322 Recognition of Specific PERM NOTAMs as Authoritative Source

Rune Duke, AOPA, summarized the issue. Rune stated that airport managers generate PERM NOTAMs (with a NOTAM end date of PERM) to communicate permanent changes to airport conditions and attributes, but do not submit these changes through the accepted Aeronautical Data Change (ADC) conduit that is used to publish those changes on the FAA charts and publications. This results in charts not being updated and contributes to the ever-increasing number of NOTAMs pilots and controllers are required to read. Rune proposes that the National Flight Data Center (NFDC) begin to accept certain PERM NOTAMs as

authoritative source to initiate changes in the National Airspace Services Resources (NASR) database that will in consequence result in chart changes to airport information.

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, suggested two possible solutions. The first is to implement Rune's suggestion to have NFDC accept certain PERM NOTAMs as source. The second possibility is to create an improved process for reaching out to the airport managers to ensure that they are initiating the ADC requests. She stressed that airports are already required to do this.

Lynette Jamison, FAA/AJR-B11, provided some background on this problem. She said that Flight Service used to assist airports with generating PERM NOTAMs and with contacting NFDC to initiate the database and subsequent chart changes. When the FAA moved to the Federal NOTAM System (FNS), airport managers were left to do it on their own, and it is Lynette's belief that airports don't have sufficient training on the requirements of the new system. She said the NOTAM Task Force has been reaching out to airports armed with Advisory Circular 150/5200-28 to try to get these data changes to NFDC initiated, but she said the airports have no incentive to initiate an ADC because they can simply use the PERM NOTAMs. Rune said this is why he hopes the FAA can begin to use these NOTAMs as source to initiate the chart changes.

Valerie then asked Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, if NFDC would be open to the possibility of accepting certain PERM NOTAMs as authoritative source to update NASR. Scott responded that he thinks the issue is very complex and there is a need to engage Tech Ops and the Office of Airports.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, stated that he supports the Recommendation. He cautioned however, that there are certain changes that must first be coordinated with flight procedures, e.g., runway length changes, lighting changes, NAVAID out of service, etc., and stressed that the specific types of PERM NOTAMs accepted as source will have to be looked at very carefully. He also mentioned that the publication of the changes on the charts must be coordinated with cancellation of the NOTAM.

Several others in the audience also voiced strong support for this recommendation, both as a way to keep the charts/publications current and to reduce the total number of NOTAMs that need to be assessed by users.

A lengthy discussion followed, regarding how to notify the airport authority of the requirement to follow up their PERM NOTAM with the initiation of a chart change to NFDC. Scott suggested the formation of a workgroup to discuss these issues further. Lynette volunteered to chair the workgroup, which will ideally include Tech Ops, the Office of Airports, the NOTAM Office, NFDC and NATCA.

PERM NOTAM Workgroup			
Lynette Jamison	FAA/AJR-B1	540-422-4761	lynette.m.jamison@faa.gov
Justin Kelley	LIDO	720-257-4807	justin-jerome.kelley@lhsystems.com
Zann Hawkins	LIDO	901-240-5602	william.hawkins@lhsystems.com
Doug Dixon	FAA/AFS-410	202-267-0327	douglas.dixon@faa.gov
Scott Jerdan	FAA/AJV-533	301-427-5088	richard.s.jerdan@faa.gov
Rick Mayhew	FAA/AJV-53	202-267-6441	richard.p.mayhew@faa.gov
Steve Serur	FAA/AJI-151	202-267-7103	steven.serur@faa.gov

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Lynette Jamison, FAA/AJR-B11, will report on progress of the PERM NOTAM Workgroup.

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, will investigate using PERM NOTAMs as authoritative source to revise NASR (including what specific NOTAM type changes are appropriate) and will contribute this information to the PERM NOTAM Workgroup.

18-01-323 Standardizing the Labeling of Parking Areas on Airport Diagrams

Rune Duke, AOPA, briefed the RD. Rune explained the problems pilots encounter as a result of inconsistent labeling of parking area on Airport Diagrams. He briefed that the current process is to chart/label parking areas as provided by authorized source, which has resulted in numerous label types and little standardization with respect to how the areas are to be used. Rune's proposal involves standardizing parking/ramp areas as follows (See slide #5):

- ALTERNATIVE ACCESS RAMP - A ramp area administered by the airport sponsor or a non-commercial entity where itinerant operators can park their aircraft.
- FBO RAMP - A ramp area administered by the FBO or other commercial entity where operators can park their aircraft. No individual commercial names should appear on the government diagrams.
- GENERAL AVIATION RAMP - A ramp area that defines an area of permanent parking for resident general aviation aircraft, i.e., tie-down area.

Rune recommends that these definitions be added to the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Specifications for Airport Diagrams to ensure that these are the only parking labels that can be charted on Airport Diagrams. He further recommends that these definitions/labels be described in the Chart User's Guide, the Pilot Controller Glossary (PCG) and any Office of Airports ACs, Orders or relevant guidance documents.

Lt. Col. Turner, USAF, expressed concerns for added confusion while this changeover to the new terms is taking place. Rune agreed that it may be confusing in the short-term, but over time the benefit would outweigh any confusion encountered during the transition period. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, commented that if this change is approved and is incorporated into the IAC specifications, the FAA would implement the change on a day forward basis and that over time, the charts would be updated to the new language.

Valerie explained that she is not be able to propose changes to the charting specifications until the definitions in the guidance are updated first. She suggested the Office of Airports would be the place to start this process. Rune said the he has been in discussions with the Office of Airports and was told that the guidance must be published in the IAC Specifications, and the definitions in the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) and/or the Pilot Controller Glossary (PCG) before the Office of Airports can make any changes to their documentation. Valerie voiced that in her belief the Office of Airports could and should initiate this process, but said that she would work with Rune to add the definitions of the terms to the PCG. Once that is

accomplished, she will begin work to revise the Airport Diagram specifications to support the use of those terms and initiate changes to the Chart User's Guide. Once those definitions are in place, the AJV-5 Airport Mapping Team will devise internal processes for contacting airports to ensure use of the new terms. After all that is accomplished, she assumes the Office of Airports will do their part to ensure data collection utilizing the newly sanctioned terminology.

Valerie expressed concern over how much chart space the proposed text would take up and asked Rune if he was amenable to shortening the proposed terms by using abbreviations. She suggested that GENERAL AVIATION RAMP be shortened to GA RAMP and ALTERNATIVE ACCESS RAMP to ALT ACCESS RAMP. Rune agreed.

Valerie asked the audience if they agree with the definitions that Rune is proposing. There was some discussion of the terms and suggestions of alternatives, however, Rune explained that he had to find terms that are unique and these were the most accepted terms that he was able to come up with. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, voiced his support, stating that shortening the names would be helpful, but cautioned that consideration should be given to the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) abbreviations that are already in use. Lynette Jamison, FAA/ AJR-B11, echoed that concern as related to the potential generation of NOTAMs for these parking areas.

John Bordy, FAA/AFS-420, suggested that these new definitions be coordinated with Air Traffic, FAA/AJV-8, to ensure there will not be unintended consequences with pilot/controller communications. Rune stated that Air Traffic will be part of the AIM Document Change Proposal (DCP) process for adding these terms to the PCG, so they will have to opportunity to review the proposal.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, and Rune Duke, AOPA, will submit the new parking area definitions for publication in the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) and the Pilot Controller Glossary (PCG).

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, and Rune Duke, AOPA, will coordinate with the Office of Airports to update their relevant documents after the guidance in the AIM and PCG has been published.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, will revise the IAC specifications and the Chart Users' Guide after the publication of the AIM and PCG guidance and after the Office of Airport has updated their guidance.

ACTION: Scott Jerdan, FAA/AJV-533, will work to revise the 7900.2 to support collection of parking areas on airports using these terms after the above have been accomplished.

18-01-324 Magnetic Variation Not Shown on IAPs

Jessica Head, NavBlue, presented the issue. Jessica stated that currently, magnetic variation values for Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) are published in various locations including FAA Form 8260-3 and in NAVAID records in the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) database. She is recommending that the

magnetic variation also be published on each IAP chart. She said that this would align with what other States are doing and would conform to the International Civil Aviation Organizations (ICAO) charting recommendation. Jessica then presented a few proposed depictions for magnetic variation on IAPs.

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, pointed out that bearings on RNAV IAPs are predicated on the magnetic variation of record for the airport served, so publishing these could conceivably be possible. Bearings on ground-based IAPs, however, are predicated on the magnetic variation of record for the various NAVAIDs used in the procedure. There is not a single controlling NAVAID, so no single magnetic variation value could be shown on these charts.

Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-553, agreed with Valerie and emphasized that it is not uncommon for there to be several different magnetic variations used on a single procedure.

John Bordy FAA/AFS-420, added that the FAA takes exception to the ICAO recommendation. He said the FAA only indicates magnetic variation in locations where there is compass instability.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked why NavBlue requests the addition of magnetic variation to IAPs. Jessica replied that their customers have asked for it and that they see value in having it on the charts. Rich then asked the pilot audience if they saw value in having it on the charts. No pilot support for adding magnetic variation to IAP charts was voiced. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, commented customers outside of the U.S. are used to seeing magnetic variation on IAP charts. Jeppesen at one point provided magnetic variation information on U.S. charts, but as it was found to cause too much confusion, Jeppesen decided to remove the information from the charts.

Valerie concluded as there did not seem to be support from the audience for this proposal, and because the U.S. has taken exception to this ICAO standard recommended practice and has no intent to revise this position, this recommendation document will not be pursued.

STATUS: CLOSED

VII. Closing Remarks

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-553, thanked the attendees for their participation and voiced special appreciation to Al Herndon, MITRE for hosting.

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/afx/afs/afs400/afs420/acfipg/

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 meeting 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, FAA/AJV-553, for presentation assistance for the CG portion of the forum, conference support pre- and post-conference, and to Alex Rushton, Contract Support to FAA/AJV-553, for taking the minutes and conference support pre- and post-conference.

Hail and Farewell: After 45 years of service with Jeppesen, Ted Thompson will be retiring this June. His contributions to the ACF and the entire aviation charting community have been immense. Both chairs of the ACF and participants shared their appreciation for Ted, who will be sorely missed.

VIII. Next Meeting

ACM 18-02 is scheduled for October 23-25, 2018, host AOPA, Fredrick, MD

IX. Attachments

a. 18-01 Attendee Roster
b. Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR)