

**Government/Industry Aeronautical Charting Meeting (ACM)**  
**Meeting 24-02**  
**Charting Group**  
**October 9-10, 2024**

**CHARTING GROUP MINUTES**

**I. Opening Remarks**

FAA Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) hosted the Charting Group Portion of the ACM on October 9-10, 2024. This meeting was held virtually. Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, opened the meeting on Wednesday 7 October. Samer recognized and introduced Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, Chair of the Charting Group, and Jeff Rawdon, FAA/AFS-420, Chair of the Instrument Procedures Group (IPG). Jeff announced that this is his last ACM as the IPG chair and introduced Gary Petty, FAA/AFS-420, who will take over the role for the April ACM.

Samer provided an overview of the purpose of the ACM, his role as the facilitator, and explained how he planned to manage the meeting and participation.

**II. Review Minutes of Last Meeting, ACM 24-01**

The minutes from the ACM 24-01 meeting were distributed electronically via the [AIS ACM website](#) and were accepted as submitted with no changes or corrections.

**III. Agenda Approval**

The agenda for the 24-02 meeting was accepted as presented.

#### IV. Presentations, ACM Working Group Reports, and ACM Project Reports

##### Chart Supplement Update

Alex Rushton, FAA/AJV-A241, presented an [update](#) on the Chart Supplement Modernization effort. He began with an update on the accomplishments thus far. He then explained that, due to program restraints, it was decided to suspend the modernization effort indefinitely. Some initiatives have been reassigned as regular work, including the addition of the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) effort and the update to the Chart Supplement definition and description.

Alex listed the achievements of the Chart Supplement Modernization initiative. The FAA published the new [Order 7920.2, Notices in the Chart Supplement](#). The updates for the Chart Supplement definition and description have been processed in the applicable Orders, publications, and FAA websites. The XML information has been enhanced. Additionally, over 25% of the Chart Supplement Notices now have OPR information, IAC 8 was overhauled and published, and over 125 notices were removed.

Alex reported that the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) specification change for the removal of foreign data in the Chart supplement is in process. Once it is approved, FAA/AJV-A will release a Charting Notice that identifies the content that will be removed. It is anticipated that the removal of the content will begin in the first half of calendar year 2025.

At ACM 24-01, there was a request to look at evaluating how to track changes to graphic notices that are published in the Chart Supplement. Alex said the team is still investigating this and expects to be able to provide an update at the next ACM.

Bill DeGroh, APA, asked for more clarity on the suspension of the modernization initiative. Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, explained that they have limited resources at this time, and the resources they have had to be reallocated. It was determined that some of the modernization items could continue to be worked, and others will have to be put on hold until they can be looked at again in the future.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250 thanked Alex and Odie for the update and stated that this topic will remain on the agenda for an update at the next meeting.

##### Noise Abatement

Kent Duffy, FAA/APP-410, presented an [update](#) on noise abatement information in the Chart Supplement. Kent explained the project is working to standardize how noise abatement information is communicated. The goal of this effort is to identify and provide a primary source for finding noise abatement information. His team developed a Best Practices guidance document to be used by airports when submitting entries for publication in the Chart Supplement. The FAA will also work to revise existing noise abatement entries in the Chart Supplement in accordance with the Best Practices.

The Best Practices document was published for industry review in April 2024 and 155 comments were received. [Slides 6-8](#) provide an overview of the comments. The next step is to complete the comment adjudication then finalize the document by the end of 2024. Kent said they plan to incorporate a process for periodic review and updates. They will also begin outreach to airports with legacy noise abatement entries so they can begin the update process.

John Collins, Boeing/Foreflight asked if the designation of a calm wind runway is only identified in relation to a noise abatement procedure, and if that designation be part of the noise entry. Kent replied that it depends on the reasons for a calm wind runway, but if the airport does designate one, it could be added to the noise entry.

## [Airport Diagram Open Data](#)

Brent Walker, FAA/AJV-A242, opened the [briefing](#) by explaining the Airport Mapping Database (AMDB) features. Brent explained that there are nine feature classes: Taxiways, Aprons, Buildings, Hot Spots, Special Movement Areas, Stopways, Airport Beacons, Wind Indicators, and Runways. Brent indicated that some of the feature classes are currently published in the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) database, however they are published without the location data. The AMDB will include the location information.

Brent then outlined the workflow where data from imagery and NASR is the input and CAD software is used for the output of a published PDF airport diagram. The data captured is to support a published airport diagram. [Slide 5](#) is an example of a data capture overlaid with imagery.

On October 7<sup>th</sup> a [Data Product Notice](#) was posted that included sample data for 3 airports. This will give the user community a chance to review that data. Brent said currently, they have captured 14% of published airport diagrams in the AMDB. They have focused on capturing the larger airports first. The goal is to release more data each 56-day cycle.

Steve Madigan, Garmin, expressed appreciation for the effort and asked if the goal was to eventually put this data out NAS-wide and in ARINC compliant format. Brent replied that the data will be released airport by airport. John Myers, FAA/AJV-A260, explained that this is data that the team captures today to produce the airport diagrams. The thought was they could share this data for other users that may also find value. The goal is not for the data to be in ARINC format.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, asked about the criteria for when a helipad is charted on an airport diagram. Brent responded that the helipads are charted when the data for them is published in NASR. There is a submission process to get a helipad published on the charts. Bill asked to confirm that if he sees a helipad on satellite imagery, it may not necessarily be shown on the chart. Brent said yes, however if his team sees an uncharted helipad on imagery, they will reach out to the airport to get the supporting data for charting. Bill then pointed out how he had come across several pavement taxiways that did not have letter designators. He asked if the FAA would code that in a special way to show that there are no designators. John said it would be designated as unknown "unk" in the data.

Amy Kynard, FAA/AJM-3360, asked who is most likely to use this data. Brent said that is not known at this time. Amy then stated that her team works the maps for NOTAM manager and is interested in the apron information. She said she looked at the apron data and some of it does not match what she has in NOTAM manager. Brent replied that his team has been coordinating with the FAA Program Management Organization and the Federal NOTAM System office to help support NOTAM manager.

Aaron Jacobson, Boeing/Jeppesen, asked if there is construction at an airport, will the open data be updated with the construction progress, or will it stay in sync with the published airport diagram. John stated that the data is aligned with the airport diagram date. There is no current plan to update the data outside of the production cycle.

## [ARTCC Boundary Data](#)

Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A311, began the [briefing](#) by explaining that this change came out of ACM item [18-01-320](#) which was a recommendation to publish Center surface boundary data for flight filing purposes. The short-term fix was to provide the requested data on the [AIS website](#) and in the CVS and .txt files. Since that time, the Aeronautical Data Team has been cleaning-up the boundary data to ensure it is defined by georeferenced points. Part of the issue that they are working to resolve is that there has been a confusion of terms because there is low and high charting and there are also low and high ARTCC boundaries. The plan is to take the low

boundary in the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) database and redefine it as the ground boundary. This will align NASR with the CSV and .txt files and accommodate NOTAM requirements and flight filing. The only difference users of this data will see is that there will be a shift in the low boundary since it is now the ground boundary. An effective date has not been set yet, but a NASR README file will be released to announce this change.

John Collins, Boeing/ForeFlight, mentioned that he was the original requestor for this data and said he uses the website to determine the ARTCC needed for flight filing, particularly for off-airport operations. When this change occurs, he said it will make sense to continue to publish this data on the [Center Surface Boundaries](#) website until users have fully transitioned to using the NASR data. Tom said he will take that back for consideration.

Gary Fiske, FAA/AJV-P310, asked if the ground boundary will account for the underlying TRACON boundary. Tom explained there are a lot of other issues related to this topic. This specific change is considered a simple cleanup of published NASR data. Regarding all the other boundaries that are out there, they are used by the FAA for other purposes, but they are not put into NASR. The boundaries in NASR are used for three purposes: NOTAMs, flight filing, and charting. Gary said his concern is where the ARTCC boundaries meet and how they may not align with the TRACON boundaries which could result in inaccurate flight filing. He said only providing the ground boundaries may not capture the real picture. Tom pointed out that since they started publishing the CSV files with the ground boundaries, the problems with flight filing have been going away. As a result, they decided to put that data in NASR to also help with NOTAMs because the NOTAM office is having the same problem. Colleen Kubont, FAA/AAS-120, said she looked at this issue and found that some of these other boundaries are not regulatory and are based on Letters of Agreement so those could not be captured in NASR. Gary said he just wanted to point out that only providing the ground boundaries will not tell the whole story. Tom agreed that his team will have to look at the gaps that this change may create. He said there are larger discussions going on regarding all ARTCC boundaries. NASR is not going to be able to cover them all, but the hope is that this change will help.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked John Collins if this is an issue with the pilot on the ground or with the flight plan service providers directing the flight plan to the correct ARTCC. John replied that the surface boundaries are what are used to route flight plans, particularly for off-airport operations. Gary said it will depend on the altitude which the pilot is filing from. John disagreed and said filing using the surface boundary works for flight filing. Tom said the long-term goal is to use ERAM data to align all the data sets together.

JJ Biel-Goebel, Wisk, asked if this is an interim solution until Common Support Services-Flight Data (CSS-FD) is implemented in 2028. He explained that CSS-FD will allow the filing of flight plans digitally and they will then be routed to the appropriate ERAM. Tom said he is not familiar with CSS-FD. Tom closed his briefing and said he appreciated the questions and conversation.

## V. New Charting Topics

### [24-02-392 Traffic Pattern Direction on IFR Charts](#)

Alex Meed, private pilot, [presented](#) his new RD. He explained that he is recommending that the FAA add traffic pattern direction to Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) and/or enroute low charts. His presentation provided an example from Gillespie County (T82). He showed how, on the circling procedure, a pilot would have to make a decision about which way they are going to circle. He pointed out that the VFR Sectional chart and the Chart Supplement indicate that this airport has a right pattern for runway 14. He said IFR pilots flying circling approaches need to know traffic pattern directions for safety among VFR traffic. He said pilots also need the traffic pattern direction for regulatory compliance. According to 14 CFR 91.126 (b) and confirmed by several subsequent legal interpretations, pilots must circle in the direction of the VFR traffic pattern.

Alex explained that IFR pilots need information on IFR charts. He suggested that the information can be added to all IAPs with circling minimums as a note, as an annotation to the airport sketch, or as a circle diagram representation similar to the MSA ([slide 13](#)). On the IFR enroute low charts, he suggested it could be added to the airport data block like is done on the sectional charts ([slide 14](#)).

Jeff Rowden, FAA/AFS-420, said there is a related item in discussion in the Instrument Procedures Group portion of the ACM ([22-01-366](#)) regarding circling in Class G airspace. He said this has been addressed with updated guidance for the Aeronautical Information Manual and that should help clarify some of these issues. With respect to the request to add a chart note for traffic pattern directions, Jeff pointed out that adding those notes would require documentation on the procedure source document. He said it would be unlikely that his office would agree to include that as a chart note on the forms because there are many procedures that already have voluminous chart notes. Alex said he understands those concerns, however, he would still prefer a graphical representation on the IAP if possible. Jeff then explained the ongoing IAP Chart Modernization effort that will simplify the airport sketch on the IAPs so the recommendation to provide an indication on the sketch will not align with that effort.

Rich Boll, NBAA, explained that each chart product has its specific use, and the Chart Supplement goes hand in hand with the Terminal Procedures Publication. He agrees that Alex's recommendation makes some good points, however he is not sure it is appropriate to have an indication on the IAPs. He does not want to add more clutter to the charts for something that is rarely used, and the information is already available in the Chart Supplement. He suggested adding an indication to the Airport Diagram. Rich said that Jeppesen charts this info on their airport diagram. Alex said that would be helpful, however he would prefer the information on the IAP since the airport diagram is designed for use on the ground. Rich said he does not have an issue with adding it to the enroute low charts if others would find that helpful.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, agreed with Alex that pilots need this information. He said he does not think it should be on the enroute chart, but that it should be charted somewhere accessible to IFR pilots.

John Collins, Boeing/Foreflight, stated that the comment that circling is rare may not be totally accurate. He supports adding it to at least one of the three suggested locations.

Michael Stromberg, UPS/IPA, said he likes the idea of adding this as a note. He understands that the section gets cluttered, however, it's a good spot for it.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, pointed out that VFR traffic patterns are for all category aircraft and IFR holds have different constraints than VFR holds. Rich said the rule makes no distinction between VFR or IFR. There was a larger discussion regarding confusion with conflicting guidance in 14 CFR 91.126. Alex said the reason brought

the recommendation here is that he was looking for a charting solution to this problem. He said he is open to exploring the rule-making piece if that is what needs to be done.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/ AJV-A250, polled the audience to gauge support for a charted indication of traffic pattern direction. 84% of the audience was in favor. Jennifer stated that she would take this topic to the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) for discussion and report back at the next ACM.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will bring this issue to the ACM Recommendation Review Group for discussion and will report back at the next meeting.

**[24-02-393 DVA Location in TPP](#)**

Major Travis Wilkes, USAF, [presented](#) his recommendation regarding the published location of Diverse Vector Area (DVA) information in the Take Minimums section of the Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP). He suggested moving the DVA information so it is published above the Takeoff Minimums for a given airport. He said that the DVAs are currently published after the Takeoff Obstacle Notes and since that information is often lengthy and can stretch to a second page, the existence of a DVA for that airport can be missed. He explained that DVA information is critical in preparing for departure. Having the information in the new location will also make it easier for a pilot to compare climb gradient requirements. [Slide 6](#) shows the recommended arrangement. He pointed out that a minor adjustment would also need to be made to the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) because it currently states that the DVA information is published below the Takeoff Minimums section.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, said he agrees with the recommendation to move the DVA information.

Doug Willey, ASO, informed the group that the commercial side is also having issues with this. He agrees that this it is easy for the DVA information to get lost. He asked if the reason they put the Obstacle Departure Procedure (ODP) first, is because that is the default procedure in the absence of ATC instruction per [14 CFR 91.175](#). Major Wilkes said the AIM doesn't state that flying the ODP is a requirement, however it is his understanding that the ODP is the default procedure the aircrew can fly if another clearance is not received.

Gary Fiske, FAA/AJV-P310, said he thinks this is a good idea. He pointed out that they are working to get rid of DVAs and also to educate controllers on when to use the DVA versus the SID.

Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that, in the absence of ATC instruction, the ODP is mandatory according to the CFR. Regarding the location, the addition of DVAs came later so he thinks that is why it was added at the end. He does agree that moving it would increase pilot awareness, however, the pilot has an obligation to read all instructions from top to bottom.

Kevin Keszler, FAA/420S, pointed out that, if this change is made, it will not happen overnight and there will be a period where some will have it at the beginning, and some will have it at the end. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, stated that she thinks the TPP change will be relatively simple and pointed out they would not need new source forms. She thinks the change could be made relatively quickly, however, she would not want to make the change until after the AIM is updated.

Michael Stromberg, UPS/IPA, said there is already an initiative in work to remove most of the takeoff obstacle notes. He asked if that would solve this problem. Jennifer replied that, over time, that effort will help, however the reduction of the takeoff obstacle notes requires updates to the source forms so that will take a long time to

complete. Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, said this change could be done in one cycle once the specification change is approved.

Bill de Groh, APA, said he would at least like to see the DVA information located above the takeoff obstacle notes. Krystle explained that the Takeoff Minimums and DVAs are published on separate source forms, so they need to continue to be published in the TPP as separate sections.

Dan Wacker FAA/AFS-420S, said he thinks most DVAs will be going away in the future. He said he would also like to ensure there are no safety concerns that would result from moving the information.

Rich said that by putting the DVA at the top, it may diminish the importance of takeoff obstacles and takeoff minimums.

Jennifer said this item will be taken to the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) for further discussion.

#### **STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will bring this issue to the ACM Recommendation Review Group for discussion and will report back at the next meeting.

#### **[24-02-394 Charting Cycle Misalignment](#)**

Doug Wiley, ASO, provided a [presentation](#) on charting cycle misalignment. He explained that there are differences between government and commercial charts that result in questions from pilots, airlines, ATC, and airport operators. He is requesting that the FAA give this problem attention and look for ways to improve. He then listed reports that have been filed demonstrating this problem ([slide 3](#)). He showed several cases where the published FAA airport diagram depiction is different than what the pilot sees in the Flight Management System (FMS). Doug is recommending that the FAA create a national system for collecting, managing, and distributing source data to mitigate charting cycle misalignment between the information provided from the FAA and commercial flight information companies. This would ensure that the products are on the same cycle as the data.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said he has also come across this problem. He said this issue is that the airport moving maps are updated more frequently than the Jeppesen and FAA airport diagrams. The problem is not with the data, but how the data is implemented.

Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen/Boeing, informed the group that the Jeppesen airport diagram is published to align with the FAA airport diagram. That way, if there are any NOTAMs issued, they can be used against that airport diagram. They don't update the airport diagram until they get an update through the appropriate channels, e.g., National Flight Data Digest (NFDD). He said there can be a lag between a taxiway being opened on the ground and the airport diagram showing it as open. If they have all the source documents for a construction project, Jeppesen will use the 10-8 pages to show the construction area, but the airport diagram will remain the same until the data is submitted. For their Airport Moving Maps (AMM) they use satellite imagery and engineering diagrams. That is why there can be a mismatch.

Rich said it's important to ask why we are using taxiways that are not yet depicted on the airport diagrams. He thinks airport officials should not open the new pavement for use until the products are published.

Brent Walker FAA/AJV-A242, explained that Airport Mapping publishes airport diagrams on a 56-day cycle. They have internal cutoff dates for their source data. For example, for the Sept 5<sup>th</sup> 56-day cycle date, the cutoff for accepting an aeronautical chart change (ACC) for an update to the airport diagram was July 24<sup>th</sup>. Rich asked if

that cutoff date is relayed to airports. Brent said, yes, his team will look at the data that is submitted through the ACC portal and they let the airport know when that data will be published. Rich pointed out that since the airport will know when the changes will be published on the airport diagram, they should not open new pavement until that date. Aaron stated that there are instances where the data is submitted for a new taxiway and it's at that point that the airport opens it for use using a NOTAM. They often do not wait until the new airport diagram is published. Rich said this a real problem and he would like to assist ALPA with bringing this discussion to the FAA Office of Airports. They need to communicate to airports that new taxiways should not be opened until the updated chart is published. Aaron also offered his assistance.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, confirmed that this is not a charting issue for the ACM to solve. Rich and Doug agreed and said it is more of a communication and education issue. Jennifer then closed the briefing by thanking ALPA for the briefing, and said she is glad we were able to discuss it here and find a way forward.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

### [24-02-395 Redundant Communications Data on Terminal Charts](#)

Steven Madigan, Garmin, presented a briefing recommending a review of the communication frequencies that are charted on Instrument Approach Procedure (IAPs) charts. Given the proliferation of every airport having an airport diagram, he said it makes sense to take a fresh look at the communications published on IAPs because some of them may no longer serve a purpose. Specifically, he is recommending the removal of departure ATIS, CLNC DEL, and CPDLC. He said having Departure ATIS on an arrival chart is unnecessary. Having CLNC DEL and CPDLC on an approach chart when they are already listed on the airport diagram is not necessary since they will not be using during the arrival phase of flight. This extra information results in additional clutter on already-cluttered approach charts. Each class of terminal chart should only show the specific frequencies that apply to crews using that chart. He recommends the removal of charted communications that do not make operational sense. He also pointed out that at some of the busier airports there can be several tower and ground control frequencies published which amounts to a lot of chart clutter.

Michael Stromberg, UPS/IPA, said having multiple ground and tower frequencies charted is useful in case some of the frequencies are not in use. He said he does agree that departure ATIS and CLNC DEL are not needed on an IAP.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said he agrees. He also does not know why CPDLC or CLNC DEL would be on the approach chart. Now that we are moving toward every airport having an airport diagram, we should consider removing those frequencies once an airport diagram is published. If those unused frequencies were removed, it could free up space to make the tower and ground control frequencies easier to read. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, said CPDLC was added to IAPs because it was new and there was a need for pilot awareness. She agreed that it may no longer be necessary now that its availability is more widespread and now that every airport will have an airport diagram. She clarified that only removing it from locations that have an airport diagram published would need to be part of the implementation plan. Rich also said he does not see a need for a departure ATIS on an IAP unless the reason for having it is in case one of the frequencies is down, the other can be used.

John Collins, Jeppesen/Boeing, said that CPDLC has been added to the Chart Supplement Airport/Facility Directory section. He said that is the appropriate place for that information. That is information that is used in flight planning and filing so he doesn't not think there is a need to indicate CPDCL on an IAP or on the airport diagram. Steve agreed.

Jennifer said this item will be taken back for further internal discussion. She will update the group at the next meeting.



**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will coordinate internal FAA discussion and report back on progress at the next meeting.

## VI. Outstanding Charting Topics

### [18-01-323 Standardizing the Labeling of Parking Areas on Airport Diagrams](#)

Mike Rottinghaus, FAA/AAS-110, reported that revised [AC-150/5340-18H](#) was published 30 September 2024 and includes the requested terms. He has also initiated action to update the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) and Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) and he expects the changes to be published in February 2025. It was determined that updates to the Pilot/Controller Glossary (PCG) are not necessary since there are no other types of parking terms included in that document. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, said that since the use of the terms is not mandatory, updates to airport diagrams will be made when the terms are requested by the airport. Mike also pointed out that the effort was mentioned in the [FAA Reauthorization Act of 2024](#) as part of the effort “to ensure the clear and consistent use of terms to delineate the types of parking available to general aviation pilots”.

Jennifer stated that all actions are now complete or awaiting publication, so she asked if AOPA, the original proponent of this issue, is okay with closing this item. Jim McClay, AOPA, replied that AOPA supports closing this item. Jennifer thanked Mike for his work and this issue is now closed.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

### [18-02-327 IAP Chart Modernization](#)

Victor Naso, FAA/AFS-420, reported that he has been working to identify the criteria and form updates that will be necessary to accomplish the IAP Chart Modernization changes. He said he has determined that updates will be necessary in FAA Orders 8260.19 and 8260.3, the Aeronautical Information Manual, the Instrument Procedures Handbook, the Terminal Procedure Publication, the Chart Users’ Guide, and the Airman Certification Standards. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, asked if he is at the point yet where he can share the draft criteria changes. Victor said it has not progressed to that point yet.

Jennifer then stated that she is holding off on processing the needed specification changes until the criteria is closer to completion. Jeff Rowden, FAA/AFS-420, asked if it is necessary to wait for the criteria changes if we know the desired end state. Jennifer replied that a draft of the specification changes was initially worked, however, the timeline for the criteria updates is unknown, so it doesn’t make sense to move forward with the specification changes until the timeline is known.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked for assurance that this initiative is going to move forward. Jennifer replied that she does not anticipate any roadblocks at this point. She pointed out that the IAC specifications are shared with NGA and all changes require approval, so there is still work to be done, but hopefully nothing that will derail the project. Rich suggested that since this sounds like it may be a long-term process, he would be comfortable moving it to a briefing item at this point. Jennifer said rather than a briefing, she would like to add a new Action Pending section to the agenda. That way a full recap does not have to be provided at every meeting, but there will be an opportunity to provide an update when progress can be reported.

Dan Wacker FAA/AFS-420, stated the safety review had only been completed for the chart changes, not for the criteria changes that will be needed. That will have to be accomplished and then the order changes will all need to go through coordination, so this effort is going to take time.

**STATUS: OPEN - ACTION PENDING**

**ACTION:** Vic Naso, FAA/AFS-420, will report on the FAA Order and pilot guidance updates necessary to implement the IAP Chart Modernization recommendations.

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250 will report on the status of the IAC Specification change for the IAP Chart Modernization recommendations.

### **19-01-333 LED Lighting at Airfields**

Matt Harmon, FAA/AFS-410, provided a [briefing](#) on the LED lighting recommendation. Matt said the original recommendation to add a new symbol to the Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) charts to indicate LED was going to require too many changes and take too much time and money to accomplish. Instead, the decision was made to publish a text remark in the Chart Supplement Airport/Facility Directory entry that indicates LED approach lighting systems (ALS) is in use. The standard note will be placed in the Airport Remarks section. He said the FAA transition to LED ALS has already begun and the collection of the data is in progress. Users can expect to see the new note beginning with the December 2024 or February 2025 charting cycle. The list of airport and runway ALS' that have been converted to LEDs will continue to be maintained on the [Enhanced Flight Vision Systems \(EFVS\)](#) website. Matt recommended that this issue could now be closed.

Steve Madigan, Garmin, asked why it was decided to put this information in the airport remarks. He said it would be more appropriate in the Runway section so it wouldn't get lost in the large block of airport remark text. Matt said he understands that concern, however Aeronautical Information Services said the easiest and quickest way to get the information into the Chart Supplement is to add it as an airport remark.

Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that NBAA is one of the largest users EFVS and since approach lighting is a briefing item when flying an instrument approach, he still thinks having an indication on an IAP is appropriate. He said he does, however, understand the reasons for not doing that at this time. For certificated pilots that are required to use EFVS, he asked how this information is being communicated and if pilots are made aware that LED systems are being installed. Matt replied that yes, the EFVS group within FAA/AFS-410, is working to ensure pilots are made aware of this effort. Rich then asked how the Part 91 operators are getting this information. Matt said they are reaching out to that group as well with informational papers, EFVS website information, and outreach. Rich asked if an FAA All Information for Operators (InFO) could be published to explain this change and to let pilots know where they can go to get the necessary information. He said being able to point to a specific FAA document makes it much easier for NBAA to send out communications to their membership. Matt agreed with the idea and said he would take it back to his management. Rich then asked if guidance will be added to the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) on this topic. Matt replied yes.

Aaron Jacobson, Boeing/Jeppesen, asked if the remark in the Chart Supplement will be a general note, or if it will be runway specific. Matt replied that it would be a general note and not runway specific. The runways can be identified using the [Enhanced Flight Vision Systems \(EFVS\)](#) website. Aaron then asked, how the pilot will be able to identify this note exists in the big block of airport remarks. He asked if there is a way to make it stand out. Jeff Lamphier, FAA/AJV-A240, explained that the FAA cannot currently put the remark in another location because the cost associated with a National Airspace System Resource (NASR) change. To get the needed information out quickly, it had a standard remark placed within NASR and subsequently within the airport remarks section. For the placement within the airport remarks, the Chart Supplement team will decide where it should be placed and will add that to the priority list in their Standard Operating Practice (SOP).

Rich then spoke to Aaron about the Jeppesen practice of pulling out airport remarks and placing them on the 10-9 chart. Rich asked if this remark will be pulled as well. Aaron said yes, that is the plan. He would also like to add the runway specific information from the website to their product.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, concluded the discussion by stating that work on this issue is complete and the topic can be closed.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

#### **20-02-348 NASR Improvements for ARTCC/RCAG Frequencies**

Tom Carrigan FAA/AJV-A311, reported that National Airspace System Resource (NASR) enhancements are still on hold so there is nothing new to report on this topic. He said that there is a NASR build on the schedule for April 2025, but the ARTCC/RCAG update is not part of that build. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, said she would like to move this item to an Action Pending section of the agenda. FAA/AJV-A will report on this topic once progress is made on the NASR enhancements.

**STATUS: OPEN - ACTION PENDING**

**ACTION:** Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, will report on the status of the request to improve the database of ARTCC frequencies in the NASR database.

#### **21-01-351 Non-Air Carrier Runways in the Chart Supplement**

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, reported that there have been ongoing meetings with the Airport Mapping Team and the Office of Airports on this topic. The final details of this recommendation are still being worked internally. She said to expect a more thorough report at the next ACM.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Alberto Rodriguez, FAA/AAS-320, will report on the progress of the Non-Air Carrier Runways Working Group as it continues to investigate the data and publication requirements for the identification of Part 139 runways.

#### **21-02-362 Graphic Circling Restrictions on IAPs**

Victor Naso, FAA/AFS-420, reported that his office is continuing to investigate the criteria changes necessary to add graphic circling restrictions to IAP charts. He said there are updates to FAA Order 8260.19 and FAA Form 8260.3 that are going to be necessary to accomplish this change and that process takes time. He reminded the group that the Safety Review for the chart changes has been completed and no hazards were determined. Once the criteria and form changes are determined, another safety review will be conducted on those updates. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, stated that the specifications changes are waiting until the timeline for the criteria changes is known. She said she will move this item to Action Pending and an update will be provided at the ACM when progress can be reported.

**STATUS: OPEN - ACTION PENDING**

**ACTION:** Victor Naso, FAA/AFS-420, will report the investigation of the FAA Order 8260.19 and FAA Form 8260.3 changes necessary to graphically depict circling restrictions.

**ACTION:** Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, will draft an IAC Specification change for graphic circling restrictions pending the criteria and form changes.

## [22-01-368 Special Use Airspace on IAPs](#)

Daniel Wacker FAA/AFS-420, presented a [draft](#) of his proposed changes to the FAA Order 8260.19 criteria. The draft language states that only prohibited and restricted areas will be requested for charting, and only when their depiction is required for safe operation.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said NBAA will non-concur with not publishing prohibited areas. Prohibited areas are necessary for situational awareness. He also thinks that if a prohibited area is requested for charting, it should be shown on all Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) at that airport. He said NBAA concurs with the rest of the draft changes. Joel Dickinson, FAA/AFS-410 agreed that situational awareness is important, however, he thinks having this information on the IAP is unnecessary. We chart based on everything working operationally and the pilot following the rules. When that is the case, the extra information is nice to know, but it is not necessary. Dan said the criteria allows for exceptions to be taken, but there must be a valid reason for having the area depicted.

Bill de Groh, APA, said he also has concerns with not showing prohibited areas and APA would also non-concur with that change.

Benni Hutto, NATCA, thinks the option needs to be left open to depict prohibited areas on the chart and that air traffic control (ATC) should be included in the criteria as part of that decision. Gary Fiske, FAA/AJV-P310, agrees that ATC should be part of the coordination process and he does think that prohibited areas need to be depicted on IAPs for situational awareness.

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, said he thinks it should be left up to ATC to make the call on charting depending on if they think aircraft will be impacted. He thinks the criteria should provide guidelines for when it is appropriate to request charting. He does not agree that Flight Standards should have to approve it before it can get charted. Dan disagreed and said it should be more than just ATC making the call. He then said after this discussion, he is leaning toward making prohibited areas a requirement.

Dan requested the formation of an ACM workgroup to investigate the necessary criteria changes. Requests to join the workgroup can go directly to Dan Wacker or an email can be sent to the ACM mailbox ([9-amc-avs-acm-info@faa.gov](mailto:9-amc-avs-acm-info@faa.gov)).

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, will report on the Special Use Airspace ACM Workgroup discussions.

## [22-01-369 Wildlife, Seashore & Similar Areas on IAPs](#)

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, referred to the related [22-01-368](#) discussion and the [draft criteria](#) that was presented. He said it is the same concept that was discussed regarding prohibited areas; however, Flight Standards has gotten consistent feedback that these areas can be removed from the charts. He said the updates to the criteria will go through the Safety Review process. Steve Madigan, Garmin, said he would like to be part of any discussion that comes out of this topic.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, will report on the Flight Procedure and Airspace Group investigation into possible criteria changes regarding the charting of wildlife, seashore, and other similar areas on instrument approach procedures and what steps, if any, should be taken to remove currently charted instances.

### [22-02-375 Charting Depictions of Stopways](#)

Jennifer Hendi, AJV-A250, reported that the specification change for the use of the chevron symbol has been approved. Implementation of the new stopway depiction will begin with the 31 October 2024 publication cycle. A [Charting Notice](#) was issued on July 10, 2024, announcing the change to the symbology. The Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) legend and the Chart Users' Guide have been updated. There are 48 airports total that will have chevron symbology applied to the airport diagrams. Jennifer said that all actions are now complete, and this item can be closed.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

### [23-01-378 VASI/PAPI Locations](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250 reported that since the last ACM, the Aeronautical Data Team has published the visual approach slope indicator/precision approach path indicator (VASI/PAPI) data. This is not all the VGSI data in the National Airspace System (NAS), however, it is all the data that we have the complete and verifiable source for. This information is available on the FAA's Aeronautical Data Site via a new [Visual Glide Slope Indicator \(VGSI\)](#) information page. Jay Leitner, American Airlines, replied that he has used the .csv file multiple times, and is very happy with this outcome. He said he supports the closing of this item.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

### [23-02-379 Charting of Coincident Waypoints and Paved Runways on VFR Charts](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250 reported that the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Requirement Document was signed on June 17, 2024. Visual Charting has begun day-forward implementation. All actions are now complete, and this item can be closed.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

### [23-02-380 Contour Lines on IAPs](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250 reported that the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Requirement Document was signed on June 17, 2024. Terminal Charting will begin a day-forward implementation starting with the 31 October 2024 effective date. Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, informed the group that a [Charting Notice](#) was issued on September 5, 2024, announcing the change. Jennifer said the Chart Users' Guide will also be updated with the 31 October production cycle. She will also file a difference to ICAO Annex 4 next time it is sent for review. All actions are now complete or scheduled for completion, and this item can be closed.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

### [23-02-382 Procedure Amendment Effective Date](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, reported that since the last ACM there has been more discussion between FAA/AJV-A and FAA/AFS-420 on this topic. She said we do not have a universal way forward yet and that she is planning to arrange further discussion that will include industry.

Rich Boll, NBAA, thanked Jennifer and asked her to include ALPA in the future discussion. He said he thinks we need to come up with a solution, otherwise we have a lot of documents that need to be changed.

Steve Madigan, Garmin, stated that he'd like to be involved in the discussions as well. Aaron Jacobson, Boeing/Jeppesen, John Collins, Boeing/Foreflight, and Darrell Pennington, ALPA, also requested to participate. Rich stated that he still thinks the original purpose of the date is important. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, said we need to consider how important this information is in a data driven world.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will report on FAA/Industry discussions regarding the procedure amendment effective dates and will report back at the next meeting.

### [23-02-383 Identification of Radius to Fix Legs on IFPs](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, reported that the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Requirement Document is still in process. The change is to clarify that if a procedure has any RF requirement, all TF legs are charted with a track value. If there is no RF requirement, track values can be left off. Clarification will also be added to the Chart Users' Guide. Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, added that all IAPs already show the legs in this manner, we just need to catch up with clarifying the guidance in the specification.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, asked if we need to consider this same issue for Departure Procedures (DPs) and Standard Terminal Arrival (STAR) Charts. Krystle said the specification documents for DPs and STARS do not allow for the option to not show repeated course values, so this topic was correctly only introduced for Instrument Approach Procedures.

Jennifer stated that this issue will remain open to report on the status of the IAC Specification change.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will report back on the progress of the IAC Specification changes.

### [23-02-384 Improvements to NASR CSVs](#)

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A350, briefed that the Aeronautical Data Team is continuing to investigate adding the additional data elements to the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) CSV files. He said that the FAA does not have this data currently in the database so this addition will require a NASR update. The Aeronautical Data Team is also researching other ways to provide the requested data. Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A311, added that this item is being tracked for a NASR change, but there is not yet a timeline for completion. Brian will report back at the next ACM.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A350, will report back on the Aeronautical Data Team's investigation into adding the additional data elements to the NASR CSV files.

### [23-02-385 Perpetual Access to Procedure Packets](#)

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, said the Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Group is still investigating this request. He said they have committed to start providing the 8260-9 forms. He said they are looking to eventually providing a system where customers will be able to pull the information they need, but that is going to take time to accomplish. He said he is hopeful he will have more progress to report at the next meeting.

Steve Madigan, Garmin, said it is great news that the 8260-9 forms are going to be made available. He asked if other information, such as the developers notes or waivers, will also be made available. Pat said he doesn't see a problem with leaving the whole packet on the coordination website. He said the work will be to add all the data from the past. He reiterated that the end goal is to have a system where all the data will be provided, however they are running into issues with the FAA firewall.

John Collins, Boeing/Foreflight, asked if there is an alternative means to access the old data. Pat replied that customers can still use the Aeronautical Inquiry Portal to request data in the meantime.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, will investigate perpetual access to IFP procedure packets and will report back at the next ACM.

### [23-02-386 ATC Non-Visibility Areas](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, reported that this recommendation was on hold while the FAA looked at the current process for handling ATC non-visibility areas. After further internal discussion, it was determined that there is already a sufficient process in place. The submitter has since withdrawn this recommendation and the item is now closed.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

### [24-01-387 Weather Camera Locations on VFR Charts](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, reported that since the last ACM, the Visual Charting Team worked with Westen Curry, FAA/AJR-B200, on this topic. An Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Requirement Document for the charting of weather camera locations in the continental United States (CONUS) is currently in process. Jennifer said she expects this change to be signed and implemented by the next ACM.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will report back on the progress of the IAC Specification changes for the charting of weather camera locations on VFR Charts in the CONUS.

### [24-01-388 Removal of 67:1 Obstacles from IAPs](#)

Vic Naso, FAA/AFS-420, reported that the Safety Risk Management (SRM) Panel was conducted in June 2024 and no hazards were found. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, reported that after the SRM was complete, an Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Requirement Document was written for the removal of 67:1 slope obstacles on Instrument Approach Procedures (IAP) and the removal of the highest obstacle on IAPs and Airport Diagrams (AD). She said the specification change is still in process.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, asked if this change will result in a difference with the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO). Jennifer replied that ICAO Annex 4 states that obstacles required to be shown are those provided by the procedure specialist. Therefore, we will still be in compliance with IACO because we will continue to chart the obstacles that are requested on the procedure source document.

Dario Pierandrei, LIDO, asked if the obstacle data that is being removed will still be published in another location. Jennifer said that the obstacles are only being removed from the charts, not from the obstacle



database. Dario then asked if the recommendation is only referring to man-made obstacles. Jennifer said they could be man-made or terrain.

Bill then asked about the implementation plan. Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, said it will be a day-forward process. They will work one airport at a time, and update as many as they can for each production cycle. She said they will issue a Charting Notice before implementation begins. Bill said the outreach is going to be important. He suggested the FAA put out something that would reach a larger audience, perhaps through the [FAA Safety Team](#) website.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said he agrees with Bill that more communication is needed. He said the FAAST updates get a lot of visibility. Jennifer said she can take that back for consideration.

John Collins, Boeing/Jeppesen, said he thinks pilots do not refer to the Charting Notice website and are unaware that it exists. He asked if there are any references to the Charting Notices website in the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM). He suggested that something should be added to AIM paragraph 9-1. Jennifer said she will take that back for further consideration.

Jim Grant, FAA/AJV-A350, then provided an overview on how to use the [Safety Alert/Charting Notices](#) website. He demonstrated how one can subscribe to receive an email alert when a new notice is added.

Jennifer thanked everyone for the input and noted that this item will stay open for an update at the next meeting.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will report on the IAC Specification change for the removal of 67:1 slope obstacles.

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will report on further discussions regarding communication and outreach to the pilot community regarding this upcoming change.

**24-01-389 Removal of Taxiways on IAP Airport Sketches**

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, informed the group that the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Requirement Document for the removal of taxiways, aprons, and hardstands from Instrument Approach Procedures airport sketches is in process. This item will remain open for an update at the next meeting.

Amy Kynard, FAA/AJM-3360, asked if, as this change is implemented, a note will be added to the airport sketch to alert users to refer to the airport diagram for taxiway information. Jennifer replied that there will not be a note, but a Charting Notice will be issued prior to the start of implementation in order to alert users of this upcoming change.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will report on the IAC Specification change for the removal of taxiways, aprons, and hardstands from Instrument Approach Procedures airport sketches.

**24-01-390 Self-Serve Fuel**

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, said Drew Goldsmith, FAA/AAS-120, was unable to attend, but he did provide an update to share. He said that the Office of Airports has incorporated this discussion topic into the State Inspection Training Courses and additional outreach forums. Jennifer stated that this will make it easier for airports to know how to request a fuel symbol at their location. Jennifer said this completes the action from the

last meeting. John Collins, Boeing/Foreflight, the proponent of this issue, expressed his appreciation for this effort and stated that he supports closing this item.

**STATUS: CLOSED**

**[24-01-391 MON Airport Symbol on IAP Charts](#)**

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, informed the group that a discussion was held at the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) meeting. There was agreement among the FAA lines of business that it would not be appropriate to chart a MON symbol on IAPs. The issue at hand is more related to finding a way to alert pilots that an airport is no longer available as a MON airport. At the ARRG, it was reported that the FAA is looking again at how the MON program is being handled. There is an executive-level steering group that has an ongoing action that came from the PARC GPS Disruption Action Team (GDAT) recommendations. It was determined that this issue should not be worked at the ACM because of the ongoing actions within that steering group.

John Collins, Boeing/Jeppesen, disagreed with the conclusion that there are not charting implications. He still thinks it is important for a pilot to know what approach and what facility makes an airport MON qualified. If it's not going to be charted on the IPA, another idea is to include additional information in the Chart Supplement MON airport list to indicate which procedures qualify that airport as MON.

Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that he was on the GDAT and said NOTAMs for the VOR MON were addressed in that group, however, specific guidance is still being worked. He said he agrees with John that the list in the Chart Supplement should be expanded, and it should also be easier to find. Rich then asked how difficult it would be to remove the MON indication from the enroute chart when a NOTAM is issued, and the airport is no longer MON qualified. Guy Copeland, FAA/AJV-A210, reported that adjustments can be made to the chart if the source data in the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) database changes, however, chart changes are not made from NOTAMs.

Dale Courtney, FAA/AJW-2630, said that chart action should not be taken based on a NOTAM. Having a NOTAM that states a VOR is out of service does not tell the whole story. The intent for having the MON airport attribute on the chart was to make pilots aware of airports they have access to with conventional type navigation.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, said that he thought it was agreed in the ARRG that this would go to the VOR MON program office for work. Jennifer agreed but said the first step is to ensure the ACM is not stepping on the work of the GDAT. Dale replied that the work of the GDAT is not going to assist in this effort. Dan restated that this topic should go to the VOR MON program office.

Michael Stromberg, UPS/IPA, stated that a pilot should be able to ask air traffic control (ATC) if the MON procedure is available. Rich then asked Bennie Hutto, NATCA, how well ATC is briefed on the MON airports in their regions. Bennie replied that more than likely, ATC is not going to know if an airport is MON qualified. Gary Fiske, FAA/AJV-P310, agreed and said that this is not a controller issue. Rich said this confirms why the MON information for pilots needs to be kept up to date.

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, said the Instrument Flight Procedures group does have a list of the procedure that qualify as MON. He agrees that pilots cannot determine which procedure is available from the information on the enroute chart. He said there is a need for the NOTAM to indicate if the VOR MON approach is impacted. He said this issue will need to go back to the VOR MON Program Office.

Rich informed the group that he will reach out to the GDAT membership to determine if this falls within their scope. A decision of where to go from there can then be made. Jennifer said she will work with Rich on the next steps and potentially put together a workgroup to include ACM members, FAA Tech Ops, and the VOR MON

Program Office. Jennifer asked the audience to please send a message to the ACM mailbox if interested in being part of the workgroup.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, will report back on further investigations into issues related to VOR MON status.

## **VII. Closing Remarks**

Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, and Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A250, thanked the attendees for their participation and input on the issues discussed.

Notices of the official minutes will be announced via email and provided via the ACM website. The website links (CG and IPG) are provided below:

- [Charting Group](#)
- [Instrument Procedures Group](#)

Please note the action items for each issue. It is requested that all individuals with assigned action items be prepared to provide verbal input at the next meeting or provide the Chair, Jennifer Hendi, with 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.

## **VIII. Next Meeting**

ACM 25-01 is scheduled for April 21-24, 2025.

## **IX. [Attendance Roster](#)**