

**Government/Industry Aeronautical Charting Meeting (ACM)
Meeting 25-02
Charting Group
January 12-14, 2026**

CHARTING GROUP MINUTES

I. Opening Remarks

FAA Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) hosted the Charting Group Portion of the ACM on January 12-14, 2026. This meeting was held virtually. Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, opened the meeting on Monday, 12 January. Samer recognized and introduced Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, Chair of the Charting Group, and Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, Chair of the Instrument Procedures Group (IPG). 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 24-02

The minutes from the ACM 24-02 meeting were distributed electronically via the [ACM website](#) and were accepted as submitted with no changes or corrections.

III. Agenda Approval

The agenda for the 25-02 meeting was accepted as presented.

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

FAA's Aeronautical Charting Program

Nate Rahn, FAA/AJV-A210, began the [presentation](#) by introducing himself as the acting manager of the Aeronautical Charting Group within Aeronautical Information Services (AIS). He first acknowledged the attention focused on the national airspace system (NAS) modernization and how this effort will have impacts on the aeronautical charting program. He provided background that included the AIS mission, program history, and a list of the current suite of aeronautical products. He highlighted the challenges that the aeronautical charting program needs to address to put the organization in the best position to support the changing landscape of the NAS. He explained that legacy paper-based formats are inflexible and require time-consuming manual processes. Current digital outputs mirror paper products and don't support dynamic geospatial capabilities. Additionally, the static 28/56-day production cycle is not conducive to on-demand access to aeronautical information. Nate described the future as a shift toward more data-centric services and the end of paper-based boundary limitations. Future products will be layered data that service providers can use, adapt, and add value to. The goal is for AIS to position ourselves to move and assist with industry innovation instead of trying to keep up with it. The focus of the modernization initiatives initially will be on improving internal processes before moving to modernizing the products themselves.

Nate acknowledged the brand-new air traffic control system being developed, the new NOTAM system, the ICAO plan for a more digital future, and our military partners moving away from paper. He said that while a concrete plan for the future of aeronautical charting has not been set, AIS is working on some of the foundational pieces to enable a shift to a more digital future and is looking for feedback from our stakeholders to help guide this change. AIS is soliciting feedback on which products matter the most, how the FAA charting products are being used today, and what format/service will enable innovation. Feedback should be emailed to 9-AMC-AVS-ACM-Info@faa.gov. He said there may be some tough choices that must be made in the months and years ahead about which products the FAA will continue to carry forward. AIS will be standing up internal working groups to discuss potential product changes, and the ACM will be used to socialize changes before they happen. Regarding existing ACM recommendation documents (RDs), the plan is to continue to work on them; however, they will be scrutinized through a new, more focused lens. The goal of AIS is to be proactive and to put the Charting Group in the best possible position to support the changing landscape. Nate sees this as a positive opportunity for us to work together as we move to a more digital future.

Cameron Korrekt, NGA, said, regarding the military going paperless, that when NGA proposed to discontinue the paper DoD flight information publication (FLIP) and other paper products, they received a critical non-concur. The military services recognize the need to modernize, but they would like to continue the paper publication through 2032. Nate agreed that he doesn't see paper charts going away soon.

Rich Boll, NBAA, agreed with modernizing and moving toward digital products and expressed concern that the FAA will go in a direction that will not support the industry. He believes the FAA needs to set up an advisory panel with industry stakeholders, avionics manufacturers, and charting service providers to advise the FAA as this goes forward. Nate agreed and said the plan is to work with our industry partners. Rich added that this topic should be briefed to the Performance-Based Operations Aviation Rulemaking Committee (PARC) steering group.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, asked if, in the future, a NOTAM is issued that changes the procedure mid-cycle, will that procedure get updated and made available immediately, rather than having to wait for the charting cycle date? Nate said that it will be part of what the FAA will be looking at.

Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, echoed Rich's comments about stakeholder engagement and asked if the FAA is providing a standard form to solicit feedback. He said the feedback from Garmin is going to depend on what AIS will be offering in terms of the dataset. There is a lot of use for data, and the goal should be efficiency and cost-

effectiveness. Nate replied that there is no form at this time, just an opportunity to provide some generalized feedback. There may be a solicitation for more specific feedback in the future.

Vince Massmini, Tetra Tech, said he also echoes Rich's comments regarding an advisory panel. He also said that during flight instruction, he encourages new pilots to look at the paper chart and that it is important to teach the nuances associated with the electronic flight bag (EFB), such as magnetic vs true and reliance on the EFB.

Mike Stromburg, UPS-IPA, suggested that pilots who still need paper charts should still have the option to print a basic chart.

Craig Boxrucker, ALPA, echoed Rich's comments about an advisory panel and bringing the information to the PARC.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, added that for this to move forward, the FAA needs to be on the same page internally as well. This includes AIS, Flight Standards, and air traffic control. He also expressed concerns about testing standards, operational specifications, and Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) implications. Nate added that he looks forward to working together, agreed that there is a lot to consider, and noted that this briefing was made to open the conversation.

Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, closed the briefing by reminding the audience to refer to [Slide 9](#) for clarification on the feedback request and to email 9-AMC-AVS-ACM-Info@faa.gov with any input.

AOPA Survey Results

Jim McClay, AOPA, briefed from a [presentation](#). He explained that due to anticipated future changes to FAA charting products as discussed in the briefing that Nate Rahn provided, AOPA conducted a survey of its members regarding FAA chart usage by general aviation (GA) pilots. He said a similar survey was conducted back in 2012. Since that time, GA pilots' use of charts has evolved with the advent of electronic flight bags (EFBs) and other technology. [Slides 3 and 4](#) highlight the details of the survey. Jim then introduced Amanda Comi, AOPA Senior Research Analyst, to brief on the results of the survey. Amanda said some common themes in the responses given regarding reasons for the continued need for paper charts include: 1) for pilot training, 2) for device failure backup, and 3) concerns about global positioning system (GPS) jamming. She briefed that 91% of respondents reported that they use an EFB either solely or in addition to paper charts. 100% of pilots who regularly fly under instrument flight rules (IFR), and 80% of non-instrument-rated pilots said they use an EFB. [Slide 11](#) shows the survey results of the FAA chart usage, noting Sectional Aeronautical Charts as the most frequently used. When asked if paper charts were unavailable, how that would impact their flying, most pilots responded that it would have very little to no impact on how often they would fly. Amanda then highlighted the results from the Alaska respondents. 22% of pilots fly without an EFB in Alaska compared to 9% overall, and 16% fly with only digital charts compared to 46% overall. She added that these pilots can't afford to spend more money without it having an impact on flying.

Jim said the AOPA position is that they acknowledge the need to move beyond paper charts; however, they advise a cautious approach. AOPA would like to see robust industry engagement as this goes forward. They believe that paper visual flight rule (VFR) charts should remain available until they can be accessed in a more advanced digital format. This would also allow VFR pilots more time to become comfortable with digital charts before making the transition. IFR pilots are already almost exclusively using an EFB with digital charts, so starting there would allow the FAA to begin the transition with those operators who are more willing to accommodate the change. The increasing complexity of IFR charts is also a concern that can be addressed through digital charting. Finally, Jim noted that the FAA must continue to provide standards and oversight to the third parties that are providing digital charts. The goal is not to stifle innovation, however, there needs to be guardrails to

ensure that the information being conveyed is accurate and sufficient for what pilots need to see. He said there should also be some provision for providing basic paper charts to be available as a backup.

Rich Boll, NBAA, pointed out that the respondents in the survey, except those who may be using the latest version of Garmin charts, are still displaying paper charts on their EFB. That is not the future. The Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) proposal is moving away from the paper product and going to a data-driven, digitally derived chart that presents the information electronically on the EFB. He stressed that this is not something that can be done in a vacuum. Rich suggested getting the Performance-Based Operations Aviation Rulemaking Committee (PARC), Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics (RTCA), and other groups together to develop the standards for presenting this information. Jim agreed with Rich and added that what the industry calls digital charts is not the vision, and that dynamic data-driven charts are the future.

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, pointed to [AC 91-78](#) and [AC 120-76](#) on the use of EFBs. He also said there is an RTCA special committee in [RTCA SC-227](#), *Standards of Navigation Performance*, studying the minimum operational performance standard (MOPS) for the depiction of navigational information on electronic aeronautical chart displays. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, said he is a member of the [RTCA SC-227](#) committee, and the group has just completed the final review and comment. He added that the new publication, expected in the first quarter of 2026, will include standards for certified data-driven charts. Bill stated his concern is for flight instructors still using paper charts to perform check rides and the need for new pilots to learn without the use of automation. He suggested that new guidance will need to be published to begin to change that mindset.

Vince Massimini, Tetra Tech, added that as a flight instructor, he uses the paper charts so new pilots can learn how to make manual calculations. Mike Stromberg, UPS-IPA, said this shift to digital is going to happen, so we will need to figure out how to teach new pilots without paper. Jim agreed and will take this feedback back because while it is important to teach students using EFBs, it's also important to teach the underlying principles of redundancy in the event of automation failure.

John Collins, Foreflight, noted concerns about the quality of a raster image on a digital display. He said that before getting rid of paper charts, it will be important to ensure there is a standard for presenting data on a digital chart.

Josh Fenwick, Garmin, expressed his desire to support the effort and agrees with the idea of working toward digital IFR charts first. He agrees with others that the VFR charts need improvement before they can go fully digital. He also pointed out that there are a lot of VFR data elements that are not easily sourced. The sooner the digital data is made available to the public, the sooner the public will start getting used to using the EFB solutions for VFR charts.

Rich stated there are issues today with various brands of FMS operating in various ways. This cannot be the case with aeronautical charting. Standards will need to be applied for any electronic device used to display aeronautical data, whether EFB or onboard display.

Nate Rahn, FAA/AJV-A210, emphasized that the FAA is not going to stop producing paper charts soon. He said that before paper charts can go away, there needs to be a solid product to replace them. Right now, AIS is trying to engage with industry so that the FAA can determine what the future looks like. Nate acknowledged that the FAA cannot stop making paper charts and transition to digital until digital technology is improved. In the meantime, the FAA can start moving in that direction by working to have more aeronautical data available, more data-driven processes, switching over to vector formats, and increasing our digital output.

Jim closed by reiterating the need to establish a workgroup with industry and making this subject a significant portion of future ACMs to ensure robust industry engagement going forward.

Aeronautical Data Update

Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, briefed from a [document](#) and began by acknowledging the Charting Group's Modernization goals and the need to provide the data to support those efforts. Tom reported that the long-awaited National Airspace System Resource (NASR) system technical refresh is expected in the January-February 2026 timeframe. Tom said the user interface will look the same and is simply an upgrade to new servers and a new version of Java, and that [eNASR](#) will not be affected.

Tom reported that once the tech refresh is complete, the Aeronautical Data Team will begin scheduling new releases on a regular basis to address the long list of change requests that have been submitted over the years. The first release is planned for a month following the tech refresh. Detailed descriptions of the updates will be provided in the NASR README file.

Tom then provided a [description](#) of the items that will be included in the first release and addressed ACM Recommendations [20-02-348](#) *NASR Improvements For ARTCC Frequencies* and [23-02-384](#) *Improvements to NASR CSVs* that will be discussed later in the ACM. He reported that these RDs are both on the list of upcoming changes for a future release and will be added as quickly as possible. He will be able to provide a better estimate of the timeline at the April ACM.

Tom reminded the audience that the FAA is in the process of sunsetting the legacy .txt NASR subscriber files. This is targeted for the 24 Dec 2026 cycle date. They will be replaced with a set of .csv format subscriber files. Beginning with the 19 Mar 2026 cycle date, .txt subscriber files will no longer contain new data entrants in NASR. New data entrants will be available only in .csv subscriber files. A Legacy .txt to .csv mapping document is available for download via the main [28-Day Subscription](#) page to help ease the transition. If assistance is needed, users can submit an [Aeronautical Information Portal Inquiry](#).

Airport Data Working Group

Steven Madigan, Garmin, briefed from a [presentation](#). He began by explaining that the Airport Data Workgroup was formed after Garmin discovered a significant number of airport data discrepancies in the FAA data set, and that the system today is not equipped to handle the timely correction of those discrepancies. The Workgroup is led by Garmin and has representatives from NBAA, Jeppesen, LIDO, ForeFlight, and Boeing. The goal has been to improve the airport data pipeline, including submission, quality control, and dissemination to benefit both FAA publications and industry products. Steven provided an example of runway surface changes that were never reported to the FAA and, therefore, were never updated on the FAA charts. Steven reported that the problem is a lack of oversight and no requirement for non-part 139 airports to submit most types of airport surface change data to the FAA. He pointed out that the FAA does not solicit updates to the data but relies on the airport sponsors to submit changes. This impacts third-party chart providers because they rely on the FAA for valid, current source data for their products. He pointed to examples of obstacle errors in the Aeronautical Information Exchange Model (AIXM) data behind NOTAMs and explained that some discrepancies can also affect procedural criteria, resulting in ramifications on terminal instrument procedures at the airport. The goal is to track down the source of these issues and solve the problems that cause them.

The Workgroup recommends that the FAA take an active role in maintaining airport data to ensure it stays current. They also recognize the need for increased outreach and education for airport sponsors to ensure they understand the importance of timely and accurate data change submissions. Steven outlined the next steps for continuing monthly meetings and developing a consistent, clear, and straightforward process for airports with known errors to fix those errors. Steven said others are welcome to join the Workgroup, and if interested, please send an email to the ACM mailbox at 9-AMC-AVS-ACM-Info@faa.gov.

Rich Boll, NBAA, added that additional findings indicate that at the non-part 135 airports, there's an expectation that the airport will keep its airport data current and will abide by the guidance of airport advisory circulars. As we begin the transition to a data-driven product, this is going to become a larger problem. We must ensure that the aeronautical data is current, accurate, and usable.

Weslee Combs, MITRE, asked how the discrepancies are discovered, and if it's a charting issue or issues with the underlying data. Steven replied that discrepancies are discovered during the maintenance of the Garmin SafeTaxi product, when fielding internal and external queries on discrepancies, during basic cycle product maintenance, and when performing imagery checks. Steven explained that often when a discrepancy is reported, the specialists who respond are unaware of the issue, which suggests that it's likely a source issue.

Brent Walker, FAA/AJV-A242, praised the concept of the working group and pointed out that [FAAO 7910.4 E, Airport Diagrams](#), spells out that it is incumbent upon the proponents of the airport to send in changes to the FAA.

[NOTAM Modernization](#)

Allen Mackey, FAA/AJM-3300, began the [presentation](#) by introducing himself as the Notice to Airmen (NOTAM) Modernization Program Manager responsible for delivering the new NOTAM Management System (NMS). He explained that the NMS was operational and ready to start onboarding distribution users in October 2025. Safety, reliability, and timeliness are the guiding principles for using this rolling wave strategy which provides a phased and metered approach while transitioning users off the legacy systems. The success of NMS depends on committed participation from each user community in that transition.

Allen explained the users and interfaces that will be transitioned ([Slide 6](#)). The U.S. NOTAM System (USNS) cutover is planned to take place in February 2026 and is currently being communicated to the originating users. The Federal NOTAM System (FNS) transition started in November 2025, and all users will be transitioned to NMS by 1 April 2026. Allen highlighted what is needed from the user community ([Slide 10](#)). He stressed that the transition timeline is tight, and many users still must be transitioned. For questions or assistance, users can email the NMS Team at NOTAMS.faa.gov. Allen encouraged everyone to stay engaged through user forums, training sessions, and stakeholder outreach events.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked to clarify the date that the FNS NOTAM system will go offline. Allen referred to [Slide 9](#) and said that FNS will remain available through the end of Spring 2026. Rich asked if the FNS NOTAM Search will be replaced with a new search website or if it will link to the current one. Allen noted that he was unsure and would have to inquire about that. He noted that users will have access to the new NMS search function on February 14th and encouraged users to enroll in [NMS-API](#).

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, asked if there had been changes issued to pilot guidance documents such as the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM). Allen replied that they have done outreach to some of the organizations to make sure the links get properly corrected. He also said that if any groups would like a briefing, that can be coordinated. Rune requested to continue the conversation, given that the timing to update the AIM and other resources is approaching.

V. New Charting Topics

[25-01-396 Charting of Radial Distances for Class C Airspace](#)

Luca Bencini, ATP/CFI, [presented](#) his recommendations regarding the charting of radial distances for Class C airspace. Specifically, he is recommending that the distances be charted on “directional” Class Cs on visual flight rule (VFR) sectional and terminal area charts (TAC) as is currently done with Class B airspace. Luca explained that the standard Class C design is an inner circle with a radius of five NM, and an outer circle from five to ten NM. More recently, some Class Cs have been expanded to what Luca calls “directional” Class C ([Slide 7](#)). He explained that, given the numerous Class C modifications to non-standard designs already published, along with those currently being amended, and in response to requests from the flying public, he recommends incorporating radial distances into non-standard Class C designs. This would ensure VFR pilots can quickly determine the radial boundaries of the airspace so they can comply with the requirements.

Rich Boll, NBAA, commented that the redesign is basically a Class C that looks like Class B. Class C airspace was supposed to be standard circles to ensure pilots stay in compliance with the regulations. Rich expressed support for the recommendation to add the radial distances.

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, added that airspace design standards are evolving, and pilot guidance and training also need to be part of that evolution. He pointed out that the current charting specification for depicting Class B radial distance is only for TAC charts because every Class B has a TAC chart that is at a larger scale and can provide a more granular level of detail. Class C airspace does not always have a TAC chart. Rune asked if the intention was to add these Class C radial distances to sectional charts and expressed concern about congestion on sectional charts and the readability of the added text. Luca replied that, yes, he is recommending the radial distances be added to sectionals when the Class C is non-standard. Rich said he thinks perhaps it’s time to consider expanding the scope of the TAC charts to include these non-standard Class Cs. He said this is a regulatory compliance issue, and if we have an issue with readability, that’s grounds to consider putting the data on the TAC charts so it will be readable to the pilot. Rune stated that since the radial distances would only be charted for specific Class Cs, they would need to be defined and explained in pilot guidance. Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen, suggested that, whether it is a standard or a non-standard Class C configuration, they all should be labeled with the distance to make it clear for the pilot.

Jim McClay, AOPA, said AOPA has been involved with the Class C airspace redesign committees and has raised concerns that this type of non-standard airspace design is proliferating. Jim agreed with the recommendation and said we need to make it easier for VFR pilots to reference where the airspace boundaries are. Additionally, AOPA thinks the FAA needs to take a closer look at the larger concerns raised with these airspace redesigns. The more complex the Class C airspace, the more challenging it becomes for the pilot.

John Collins, Foreflight, pointed out that, due to the Minimum Operating Network (MON) program, many of the VORs that define the Class airspace are no longer there. Class B or C airspace can now be based on VORs, DMEs, or the airport reference point (ARP), and pilots need to know this information. Michael Stromberg, IPA, also has concerns about using the ARP and said the airspace should be based on a NAVAID. Kevin Kessler, FAA/AFS-420, noted that perhaps the first step is to take a closer look at [FAA JO 7400.2](#) to ensure the standards for the airspace are clear.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, clarified that the recommendation only asks for the non-standard distances to be charted and that the FAA currently only charts radial distances for Class B on the TAC charts, not on the sectionals. Most of the locations with non-standard Class Cs are only shown on the sectional charts where chart clutter is a concern. She said it would be a big ask to expand the TAC chart series to include all the Class Cs.

Katie Murphy, FAA/AJV-A214, said that adding new charts to the current suite of VFR products would be a very heavy lift. An alternative solution could be to add the radial bearings and distances to the sectional chart, but she would want to investigate that due to concerns about adding chart clutter.

Jennifer closed the discussion by thanking Luca for the recommendation. She said this recommendation will be brought forward to the ARRG for further internal agency discussion, and the results will be briefed to the proponent and at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will take this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine any action and report the outcome at ACM 26-01.

25-01-397 Mountain Pass Routes

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, presented the recommendation on behalf of Mitchell Rasmussen, NTSB, who was not in attendance. This RD is recommending the depiction of VFR routes in the mountain corridors of Alaska to improve preflight planning and to assist in situational awareness. This request would be similar to the Canadian method of depicting these corridors. His recommendation suggests the use of supplemental localized regional charts. Jennifer pointed out that AOPA had a similar recommendation, [19-02-341](#), *Review of Mountain Passes on VFR Charts*, submitted by Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, when he was working for AOPA. As a result of that prior ACM topic, we are now charting VFR waypoints and checkpoints on the sectional charts to improve a pilot's ability to locate a mountain pass. Katie Murphy, FAA/AJV-A214, has been working with Mitchell to name a specific pass in Alaska as an official mountain pass so it could be charted and then potentially add a new VFR waypoint to that area. Through email correspondence with Mitchell, he said he would still like to see the inclusion of generalized low-level VFR routes that are built to inform pilots of routes around areas that pose a greater hazard.

Rune stated that a Mountain Pass Workgroup was formed to work on the recommendations for [19-02-341](#). That original initiative was focused on removing unsafe/unused mountain passes from the VFR charts, identifying those mountain passes that should be charted, and establishing VFR waypoints to improve the identification of mountain passes. As a result, there is now a clear process for mountain pass entry and exit identification. He said the FAA has determined that the Canadian method of depicting the routes is something that we largely would not be able to support. This method of identification was removed from the FAA charts back in the 1970s, following NTSB discussion and identifying concerns with the charting and user feedback. Since then, the efforts to have routes identified on FAA charts have not moved forward due to various safety concerns. Rune explained that in this new recommendation, there are no new mitigations that the FAA is going to pursue. He suggested that state-level transportation departments have taken it upon themselves to depict mountain pass routes on their own locally produced charts, to meet local user needs.

Rune then introduced Tom George, AOPA, who led the Mountain Pass Workgroup. Tom pointed out that in many locations, there isn't only one route to get through the terrain. Using the process that was developed, they can now use VFR waypoints and checkpoints to flag several opportunities for navigation without necessarily saying one route is the only way through the terrain. He believes the goal would be to get more experience with the current process and then consider if we need to do something different.

Jennifer summarized the discussion. She stated that the FAA has a mechanism in place for adding mountain passes and VFR waypoints to the VFR charts. She said the idea of adopting the Canadian method is not going to get support from Flight Standards. As a result, she said this item is not going to be accepted for work at this

time. She said future recommendations related to mountain passes can be brought back to the ACM for discussion.

STATUS: CLOSED

25-01-398 Charting of Non-Standard CPDLC Logon Information

Rich Boll, NBAA, briefed from a [presentation](#) and explained that NBAA has been working with the FAA Data Comm Integration Team (DCIT) on issues related to controller-pilot data link communications (CPDLC). He noted that normally, the CPDLC logon changes at the Flight Information Region (FIR) boundary. At several locations surrounding the U.S. NAS domestic FIR boundaries, there are non-standard CPDLC logon requirements. These logon requirements may be because of foreign airspace that is assigned to a U.S. Air Route Traffic Control Center (ARTCC). See examples in [Slides 4 & 5](#). Rather than trying to address each of these situations individually, Rich is recommending that the FAA document the non-standard CPDLC logons in the authoritative source database and ensure they are charted consistently. He also recommends the addition of pilot guidance regarding non-standard CPDLC logon information in the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) and Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP).

John Johnson, FAA/AJV-A313, explained that CPDLC logon information is currently contained in the NASR as a tower remark on the airport record. He said NASR does not currently have a way of storing CPDLC information by FIR boundary or any other kind of boundary.

Doug Miltimore, FAA/AJV-A212, added that, in the situations Rich has presented, CPDLC is an attribute of the airspace or an airway. Rich pointed out it's also an altitude. Doug explained that this recommendation might require a new charting specification because CPDLC is described as an attribute of the entire ARTCC, whereas in these cases, CPDLC would be an attribute of a specific airway. Rich agreed and said, first, this is a data issue. There needs to be a data source, so all chart producers and avionics manufacturers have a reliable, authoritative source for that information.

John clarified his earlier statement and said that there is also CPDLC logon information stored in the ARTCC records in NASR. Rich added that unique boundaries are not established for non-standard CPDLC that don't conform to a facility, an ARTCC, or an airspace.

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, thanked Rich for highlighting issues that the Data and Charting Teams were unaware of. He said the first step is determining a source for the information. Brian agreed with the suggestion of getting a workgroup together to define the need, identify how many instances are out there, and then find the best way to get this information databased in NASR. Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen, agreed that there are unique situations regarding limitations on where and how the CPDLC could be applied, and having this information in an authoritative source would be ideal.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, thanked Rich for his presentation. She said a workgroup with the Data Comm office, the AJV-A Data Team, and Enroute Charting will be set up to discuss these issues and Brian can report back at the next meeting.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, will report on the results of CPDLC Workgroup discussions.

[25-01-399 Charting of Communications on SIDs and STARs](#)

Rich Boll, NBAA, began the briefing by referring to a previous ACM Item [17-02-312](#), *Standardized Communications on DPs and STARs*, and informed the audience of ACM support for the automatic depiction of ATIS and APP CON on STAR charts and DEP CON on DP charts. Other communication types would be depicted only when specifically requested on the procedure source document, prefaced with the command word "CHART." Rich explained that currently, the facility still has the leeway to say what's charted. As a result, there has been an inconsistent application of this change, and many locations are still depicting numerous other frequency types. Rich recommends that the option for the facility to request to chart additional frequencies be removed from [FAAO 8260.19](#), *Flight Procedures and Airspace*, and the [FAAO 8260.46](#), *Departure Procedure (DP) Program Orders*.

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, said the Terminal Charting Team is in support of this recommendation and would like to see stricter guidance added to the orders.

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, noted that before deciding to make a change to the criteria to make it more restrictive, he would like to hear from ATC stakeholders and others in the audience regarding the proposed change. Rich said that if ATC has a valid reason for requesting additional communications on the chart, they can use the waiver process to request it.

Michael Stromberg, UPS-IPA, and Steven Madigan, Garmin, voiced support for this recommendation.

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, noted that the communications are not updated when the procedure is undergoing an abbreviated amendment, so that may be the reason some of the charts Rich is pointing out have additional communications charted. He also pointed out that if we do take away the flexibility to add additional communications, it may result in additional work for the Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) group to coordinate with the ATC facility.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, closed by stating that this recommendation will be brought forward to the ARRG for further internal agency discussion and the results briefed to the proponent and at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will take this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine any action and report the outcome at ACM 26-01.

[25-01-400 Publish ATCAA Boundaries](#)

John Collins, ForeFlight, began the [presentation](#) by informing the audience that the FAA does publish air traffic control assigned airspace (ATCAA) status on the [SUA & ATC Assigned Airspace Website](#), but the polygon shapes and ATCAA names are not published. Without that information, this data cannot be used by flight planning software for routing to avoid flights through an active ATCAA. John is recommending that the FAA publish the ATCAA polygon boundaries and names either in NASR or in a downloadable file on an FAA website. He explained that they have received several complaints from pilots about being rerouted, with no indication that a more efficient route could have been flown.

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, replied on behalf of Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, who has been investigating this recommendation, by stating that the initial research suggests that there may be a solution. However, there will need to be more internal coordination before committing to distributing the data. He said the Aeronautical Data Team can take an action to do that research and will report back at the next ACM.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said NBAA is in support of this recommendation and that pilots are encouraged to file their flight plans correctly and avoid special use airspace (SUA). He said in the business aviation community, they typically operate at altitudes where they are not accustomed to encountering military operations, so having this information would be helpful for flight planning. He said it also caught his attention that several of these areas are at lower altitudes, and that raises concerns for VFR operations. This is rather obscure information, particularly if it's not with the flight plan providers, so it is important to have this information available to pilots.

John added that some ATCAAs go up to 60,000 feet and are used for activities such as putting high-altitude drones in the upper airspace. When these activities are taking place, the entire block of airspace is blocked off.

Jim McClay, AOPA, expressed support and added that they have received inquiries about ATCAAs because pilots don't seem to know what they are. He said that it is a separate education piece to this issue, but he does agree that this information needs to be made available to pilots for flight planning.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, closed by stating that this recommendation will be brought forward to the ARRG for further internal agency discussion and the results briefed to the proponent and at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will take this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine any action and report the outcome at ACM 26-01.

[25-01-401 Quality Alert Metrics](#)

Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen, began by noting that if or when an error happens, different agencies, states, and third-party providers, etc., all handle it differently. One company may issue an alert for a 5-foot altitude error, and another company may not unless it is greater than 100 feet and may call it something other than an alert. The point is, there is inconsistency, and Aaron wants to determine if the FAA and industry are interested in establishing criteria and metrics for quality alerts with the goal of improving safety and reliability in aeronautical navigation. He said he wanted to get feedback from the ACM but recognizes that it may be more appropriate for discussion within the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), International Air Transport Association (IATA), or Radio Technical Commission for Aeronautics (RTCA).

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, explained Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) processes for quality assurance. She noted that up until recently, AIS was International Organization for Standardization (ISO) certified, which required that we have quality standards and documented processes and audits occurred annually to ensure they were followed. There is still a quality management system in place that complies with the process recommendations in [ICAO Doc 9839](#), which assists partner states with the planning and implementation of a quality management system. We routinely conduct internal audits, and those results provide confidence that AIS processes are being carried out as planned and are effective. When there is a specific error found in our data or in our products, we have mechanisms in place to issue a NOTAM or a safety alert. Aaron asked how an error is defined. Jennifer replied that while there is no specific documentation to quantify that, each instance is examined, and it's determined whether a NOTAM and/or safety alert needs to be issued.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked Aaron if there was a specific example that he was referring to that brought this concern to the surface. Aaron replied that there was no specific example, but this is more for consistency. Rich asked if Aaron was talking about the Jeppesen charting alerts that are issued when a mistake is found. Aaron said yes.

Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, added that from the NASR data discrepancy perspective, the Aeronautical Data Team does their best to ensure they match their source. If a discrepancy gets through, no matter how small, we want to know about it, and we will fix it in NASR and issue a safety alert.

Steven Madigan, Garmin, added that this affects Garmin as well, and the discussion in the ACM so far seems to have been about the FAA. Steven asked Aaron to clarify the original intent of the recommendation. Aaron replied that the intent was to start the initial conversation here with the FAA, then talk with the air navigation service providers (ANSP). He suggested that ICAO or RTCA might be a more appropriate venue for that discussion. Steven then asked about the recommendation to provide quality alert metrics. He said that it is a really difficult thing to quantify. Aaron agreed that there are a lot of variables involved and that bringing it to the ACM was just to start the discussion.

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, added that this topic has come up at the ICAO level and that the world's ANSPs are looking at the FAA's process for resolving data discrepancy issues. Brian suggested that it might be appropriate for Aaron to bring this topic into the ICAO discussion.

Jennifer thanked Aaron for the recommendation and discussion. She stated that since there's no recommendation for change to FAA products or services, the item will be closed at the ACM.

STATUS: CLOSED

[25-01-402 Airport Remarks Format](#)

Steven Madigan, Garmin, began by providing a background for how airport remarks are submitted to the FAA via the Airport Master Record (AMR) or via the [Airport Data and Information Portal \(ADIP\)](#). Current guidance recommends that the remarks be abbreviated to aid in system processing. Unfortunately, this results in a nearly unreadable data set that is full of inconsistent abbreviations. Steven pointed to several examples currently published in the Chart Supplement. He said the FAA does publish a list of common abbreviations; however, airports are not required to abide by the list when the data is submitted. This recommendation proposes that airport notes be generated and submitted in plain, machine-readable, conversational English to increase readability, reduce pilot workload, and modernize the dataset. Steven explained that the request is not for the FAA Chart Supplement team to do this work. The intent is to change the regulations so airport sponsors are required to submit the remarks to the FAA in a more user-friendly format.

Michael Stromberg, UPS-IPA, expressed support. He noted that as the FAA becomes more data-centric, the space constraints associated with paper charts are no longer going to be an issue.

Rich Boll, NBAA, noted that there are a variety of different ways of abbreviating items. This needs to be standardized so everything matches. Rich asked if NASR ingests these notes verbatim from the AMR.

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, explained that the Chart Supplement team takes the information verbatim from NASR, so any changes would have to be to the source data.

John Johnson, FAA/AJV-A313, stated that many of the contractions that are in NASR go back many years. In 2018, the Aeronautical Data Team developed a work process that requires them to follow the contractions published in [FAAO 7340.2](#). This has been implemented day-forward, so the manual work needed to update the contractions is still underway. He explained that his team also works with the FAA Office of Airports to standardize the airport remarks that they submit. To help with the standardization of the remarks in ADIP, he said the Office of Airports is looking at utilizing artificial intelligence.

Colleen Kubont, FAA/AAS-120, added that the Office of Airports worked with the Aeronautical Data Team to develop a new tool that automatically applies all the contractions. The goal is for the tool to be deployed this summer. The tool will help any submitter of airport master data to have the right contractions. Rich asked if this tool could be used to scrub existing data. Colleen replied that the option will be available to airport proponents in ADIP for any remarks that are sourced on the AMR.

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, added that as the Office of Airports captures the data using consistent contractions, that will help ensure the data gets into NASR consistently. Regarding the original ask to provide airport remarks in plain language, he thinks compliance with [FAAO 7340.2](#) is going to help with this because once the FAA is consistent, third-party users can use the FAA Order to decipher airport remarks for their users and get it to a human-readable version.

Jim McClay, ALPA, said AOPA supports this recommendation, and he doesn't think the FAA should still be using these contractions and abbreviations in 2026. He said it's one thing to use them for frequently used and understood terms, but many in use today are not intuitive. He said, based on the earlier discussion of transitioning from paper to digital products, concerns regarding increasing the length of the entries are becoming less relevant.

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, pointed out that NOTAM search can display a NOTAM with contractions or a plain language version. This is an example where there are opportunities for a plain language version when going digital. Rune cautioned that the expansion of the airport remarks across all airports that we list in the Chart Supplement could lead to an increase in length that we should investigate before going down that road. Ultimately, if the discussion is about a digital database that has plain language, that would be very beneficial and a good topic for more discussion.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, closed by stating that this recommendation will be brought forward to the ARRG for further internal agency discussion and the results briefed to the proponent and at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will take this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine any action and report the outcome at ACM 26-01.

[25-01-403 Julian Dates in the Chart Supplement](#)

Steven Madigan, Garmin, began by explaining that Julian dates are provided on the Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) charts today to indicate the last graphical update date of the chart. The date helps ensure that all charting data is valid and current. This information is useful to Garmin. Unfortunately, Julian dates are not provided anywhere within the Chart Supplement publication. The only date provided is the effective date range of the entire book, which is on a set 56-day update cycle. As a result, it is nearly impossible to ensure whether there have been any changes to specific data. Steven recommends that a Julian date be added to each airport entry in the Chart Supplement that is updated every time any data within that entry is updated.

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, responded with a [presentation](#) and explained that currently, the Chart Supplement lacks a system to identify and flag changes in airport data. The production database that populates all the information in the airport entries is refreshed with NASR data every cycle, overwriting existing entries. Odie proposed an alternative solution to publish an additional XML file to capture all the data points in the Chart Supplement Airport/Facility Directory section every 56-day cycle. This will allow for a comparison with the previous XML to identify changes between cycles. Odie provided examples on [slides 10 & 11](#).

Steven said that he thinks this is a great solution. Odie said the goal is to have a fully functional prototype to share by the end of the year.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, thanked Odie for the presentation and for finding a digital solution to this RD. She said this item will remain open for Odie to report on progress at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, will report on progress to create a prototype XML file for the Chart Supplement Airport/Facility Directory.

[25-01-404 Unused Marker Beacons in NASR](#)

Steven Madigan, Garmin, presented a recommendation regarding unassociated marker beacons in the National Airspace System (NAS). He explained that although the marker beacons appear operational in NASR, they are not in use on any procedures. He said that when this happens, it can cause confusion between the navigation database and the chart. Steven is recommending that when a marker beacon is no longer part of any flight procedures, it should be removed from NASR. Another option would be to provide a new NASR status field for facilities that haven't been decommissioned but are no longer in use.

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, said this seems like a communication breakdown. He speculated that when the marker beacon was taken off the procedure, perhaps FAA Technical Operations were not notified, which in turn did not generate the appropriate data action. Brian asked if Steven had a list of the orphaned records. Steven said that he can provide that list. Brian said the Aeronautical Data Team can take an action to investigate this issue and determine if these records can be removed from NASR. He will also work to close the loop on the communication problem that led to this issue.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked Steven if the unused marker beacons are still operational. Steven said he reached out regarding one of these facilities and determined that it was still operational despite not having been on a chart for some time. Rich pointed out that if they are not being used, they should be turned off so they are not costing taxpayer money.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, thanked Steven for his recommendation and Brian for his input. She will add an action for Brian to provide an update at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, will provide an update on the Aeronautical Data Team's investigation into unused marker beacons in NASR.

[25-01-405 Runway End Safety Areas](#)

Jeff Sedin, ALPA, briefed from a [presentation](#). He explained that at some locations, runways do not have enough space to establish a runway end safety area (RESA). Declared distances may be used at these locations to allow planes to use shorter runways until mitigations can be implemented to add a RESA. This is not optimal because some airports that cannot accommodate the standard 100 foot RESA, using declared distances may limit some aircraft from operating on those runways. In the interest of safety, when an airport has a non-standard RESA, ALPA recommends the addition of a chart note for the associated distances. They also recommend that the FAA annotate non-standard RESAs on the Airport Master Record for all Part 139 certificated airports and provide a

consolidated list of all the locations. Jeff explained the safety benefits and said this information is important for the calculation of takeoff and landing performance.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said that RESAs have been a problem for a long time and thought Congress had mandated that Part 139 airports be brought up to standard. Rich suggested that part of the issue is that RESAs are not always required to be a standard 1,000 feet, depending on the category of aircraft. Rich also added that RESAs are never used in aircraft performance calculations. Rich explained that in the early 2000's, the Declared Distances Workgroup added the runway declared distance information to the airport facility directory and expanded guidance in the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM). Those distances are only applicable to transport and commuter airplanes and may not play a factor in general aviation aircraft. If an airport publishes runway declared distances and the operator is flying a transport category or a commuter category airplane, the performance calculation should account for the runway declared distances, including any landing distance available. In response to Rich's question on the Congressional rule mandate, Jeff noted that many airports put in engineered materials arresting systems (EMAS) or came up with other alternate means of compliance.

Rich noted his concern with documenting an associated distance for a non-standard RESA because that distance is different depending on the category of aircraft. He suggested that a remark could be added in the airport/facility directory entry to state only that the runway has a non-standard RESA, and suggested adding something to the AIM to explain what the standard RESAs are.

Bill de Groh, APA, noted RESAs are not part of takeoff and landing performance calculations, which doesn't change the published landing distance available (LDA). Bill expressed concern that providing the associated distances might be misused; however, he does support publishing an indication that a runway has a non-standard RESA.

Craig Boxrucker, ALPA, noted that the concern was not necessarily the calculated value, but rather the runway conditions. He said that having that added information adds an extra margin of safety at the end of the runway and is helpful in providing the pilot with the opportunity to consider other options.

Michael Watkins, FAA/AJI-1W30, from FAA Runway Safety acknowledged that the congressional mandate was to create runway safety areas at Part 139 airports. He said the challenge with charting RESAs is that many pilots don't know the difference between a Part 139 and a non-Part 139 airport. If non-standard RESAs at Part-139 airports are charted, it might create an impression that if it's not identified as non-standard, then it does meet the criteria. He also explained that RESAs were never intended to be used in calculations for performance, but were established so that if an excursion occurs, the likelihood of serious injury is lessened. He added that any issues related to RESAs should be worked with the FAA Office of Airports.

Jennifer asked Michael if he had an opinion on whether a note in the airport facility/directory section of the Chart Supplement would be appropriate. Michael said he is unsure because it creates the implication that if there isn't a note, there's a standard RESA, and that may not always be the case. He does agree that there is still a gap because some locations don't have a standard RESA, and the pilots who are operating there may not be aware of that.

Chris Criswell, FAA/AAS-120, indicated that the Office of Airports Engineering Division has been working with Jeff on this issue. Jeff asked Chris if there was a consolidated list of Part 139 runways where they could go to find this information. Chris noted that there is a RESA tool within the [Airport Data and Information Portal \(ADIP\)](#) that contains that data. Jennifer asked Chris if his office is already working on this issue or if it is something that should remain on the ACM agenda. Chris replied that this is being worked outside of the ACM.

Steven Debban, FAA/AAS-110, explained the Office of Airports' objections to putting RESA information on airport diagrams. He said it implies that pilots are going to have to calculate their undeclared distances. He is

unsure what pilots are going to do with this additional information and thinks it will introduce a lot of ambiguity. He said his office agrees with the points made by Michael Watkins and that his office is willing to continue to discuss these issues outside of the ACM.

Jennifer closed this item from the ACM agenda with the understanding that it is already being worked with the Office of Airports. She said this can be reintroduced at the ACM if a charting solution is recommended.

STATUS: CLOSED

25-02-406 VOR Checkpoints in Chart Supplement

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, began on behalf of the proponent, John Sandvig who was not in attendance. She explained that the proponent is recommending that VOR receiver checkpoints that are currently only listed in the associated data section of the Chart Supplement be added to the Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD) entries.

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, reported that an assessment for this request was conducted by the Chart Supplement team and he explained that the VOR test facilities (VOT) that are listed in the same associated data section are currently included in the A/FD entries. The entries contain only the VOT frequency. He said his team could consider implementing the same practice for VOR receiver checkpoints.

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, added that the requested information is already published in NASR and can be easily retrieved from the subscriber files. He thinks that this may satisfy the recommendation without having to make a change to the Chart Supplement.

Jennifer agreed and suggested that, before moving forward with a change to the Chart Supplement, AIS should reach out to the proponent to see if a digital solution would satisfy this request. Odie agreed to discuss this issue with Mr. Sandvig. He said if it is determined that a change is needed in the Chart Supplement, he can initiate that work and create a prototype.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, will reach out to the proponent of this issue to discuss the outcome of the ACM discussion and report back at the next ACM.

25-02-407 IAP Profile Distances after FAF

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, began the [presentation](#) by explaining that the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) 4 Specification for Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) charts states to depict the distances in the profile between each component. To accurately calculate the distances and to avoid double rounding, they use the distances on the procedure, which are provided to the hundredths, then round. Sometimes the rounded segments on the profile may not add up to the unrounded distance. This results in receiving aeronautical inquiries that question this discrepancy (see [Slides 3-5](#) for examples). To address these concerns, the Terminal Charting Team is recommending that only one distance be charted after the final approach fix rather than showing the distances between every component.

Dan Waker, FAA/AFS-420, asked if the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) explains this issue. Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed support for this recommendation and added that the AIM does not explain the rounding issue. He does not think there is value gained in putting the individual segment lengths when a pilot is only interested in the distance from the threshold.

Kevin Kessler, FAA/AFS-420, asked if the distances were defined in the Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) legend and to explain that this is an approximate distance. Krystle said it is not currently explained; however, she thinks these questions will still come in even if they are explained.

Dan asked if the pilot was using the distances to calculate some sort of timing, or to get to the step-down fix. Rich replied that pilots are not using the distance shown in the profile view. Bill de Groh, APA, added that we are only talking about changing the distances inside the FAF to the threshold. Outside the final approach fix (FAF), those distances may help facilitate descent gradient assessments.

Lt Col Travis Wilkes, USAF Flight Standards, said he is a flight instructor at the United States Air Force's Advanced Flight School, and he does not support this recommendation. He explained that, on a conventional procedure, when the timing is to the missed approach point (MAP), pilots need that distance to locate the MAP. If pilots are confused as to what those distances are and how to use them, I suggest expanding upon that information in the AIM. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, agreed with Travis and noted that there needs to be an explanation in the TPP and/or the AIM to note that these distances are rounded. John Collins, ForeFlight, agreed that he also thinks it is important to know the distance to the missed approach point. Rich noted that he agrees that if the missed approach point is not coincident with the runway threshold, it's good to know how far the runway is from the threshold. Several others in the audience also agreed that they do not support this proposed change, however, there was support for documenting this in the TPP Legend, Chart Users' Guide, AIM, or Instrument Procedure Handbook.

Jennifer thanked Krystle for the recommendation and for the audience feedback. She said the consensus of the group is that we should not proceed with changing the way profile distances are depicted, however, pilot guidance should be published to document the current practice. This item will be closed on the ACM agenda, and the pilot guidance piece will be taken back for consideration.

STATUS: CLOSED

[25-02-408 IFR Visual Departures](#)

Brian Eliot briefed from a [presentation](#) on behalf of the San Carlos Airport Instrument Flight Rule Visual Departure Study Group. He began by introducing the term *instrument flight rule (IFR) visual departure*. He explained that the term refers to departures that incorporate a visual segment from takeoff until a point in the air after which the IFR clearance is provided. Brian pointed out that they have identified four or five procedures that have been developed at locations with precipitous terrain or nearby IFR airport traffic conflicts that require the pilot to initially maintain visual flight rules (VFR) either for separation from IFR traffic and/or navigate VFR via surface landmarks. He said they are starting to see increasing numbers of these types of departures in the national airspace system (NAS).

Brian then explained the history of the SQL Visual Departure Procedure that is published in the Special Notices section of the Chart Supplement. He explained that the FAA has determined they cannot publish this procedure in the Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) because it does not meet design criteria. As a result, they must be delivered, read back, and corrected verbally regularly. He said pilots do not expect to have to brief a Special Notice as part of IFR departure planning. These procedures are also titled differently, are more difficult to locate, and have different cartographic standards than departure charts in the TPP. This proposal recommends that these graphics in the Special Notices should be standardized, named, and published in the TPP. He recommends they could be charted similarly to Charted Visual Flight Procedures (CVFPs). He provided examples of how Jeppesen charts these today, and how if the FAA did the same it would reduce pilot and controller workload, improve compliance, reduce pilot deviations, and reduce frequency congestion.

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, said there have been internal discussions about this recommendation, and the FAA sees this as being very similar to a previous Recommendation Document, [21-01-359 Visual Departures and Noise Abatement Procedures](#). First, he said there is not a large population of these procedures. Second, what level of energy would the FAA want to put into developing criteria and standards for a new category of procedures that, as of right now, has an option for publication? Rune added that these VFR examples are separate and distinct from departure procedures that have an obstacle clearance design standard and are published in the TPP. They are not instrument procedures but are initiated by ATC at the local level. They are labeled as VFR, they state, 'maintain VFR,' and they're accomplished using visual maneuvers. Flight Standards continues to view these notices as a means of sharing a local procedure with the community. Rune acknowledged that there are six recommendations, and it's probably a value to look at those individually with ATC. Rune did question whether they are categorized correctly as noise abatement procedures. Brian asked if Rune could confirm that the FAA doesn't think that the population of these procedures is going to grow. Rune replied that that is correct, there are no indications from air traffic that they are anticipating more of this type of procedure.

Dan Waker, FAA/AFS-420, said he has been working with ATC on some of the safety of flight issues related to these procedures. He explained that from ATC's perspective, this is a VFR departure to an IFR pickup, where they have added a VFR path. He sees problems with the SQL procedure that need to be addressed, particularly the inappropriate use of a waypoint. He said he wants to make sure the correct language is being used because we don't want to use IFR language and give the pilot the perception they're getting IFR service on a procedure that is intended only for VFR. He said he would be open to having a discussion outside the ACM on some of these issues.

Mike Mellsen, FAA/AFS-410, noted that he and Rich Boll, NBAA, worked on one of these procedures for Sun Valley, Idaho (SUN). He said the problem is that they are not standardized, and there are too many inconsistencies. While he understands that these are not IFR procedures and are primarily generated by air traffic, he would like to see some standardization. Rich added that these were put in place at locations where there is an inability to utilize a normal IFR departure, and that these are VFR procedures departing under VFR, and an IFR clearance is not activated. If there is any confusion about that, it needs to be addressed. Rich said that it would be helpful to have more standardization and consistent titling so that there is no confusion on the intent of these procedures.

Bruce Williams, CFI, expressed support for the discussion regarding standardization to make this information more understandable and readily available to pilots.

John Collins, ForeFlight, added that ForeFlight does associate these procedures on the airport page. He said the titling is important and these procedures should follow the model that is used with other VFR departures.

Nicholas Piper, NavCanada, added that there is a foundation in visual climb over airport (VCOA) and helicopter point-in-space criteria that includes a visual maneuvering area towards a point. He sees value in similar criteria for fixed-wing aircraft, particularly as an alternative to a situation where VCOA might not be feasible. Brian agreed and said they did look at the VCOA and the point-in-space approaches with a visual segment as being comparable to this.

Matt Fisher, NATCA, added that ATC would like to see these procedures remain available. Standardization helps ensure that it addresses some of the concerns discussed. He emphasized that these are an efficiency gain in the locations where they provide an opportunity to get off the field without disrupting operations at a major airport located close by. He said at San Francisco International Airport (SFO), they have a tremendous benefit. Matt also pointed out that at SQL, there is an excellent Letter to Airmen and YouTube videos on this procedure. He said the FAA has gone to great lengths to educate the flying public at SQL on the benefits and use of this procedure.

He recognized that there may be some safety concerns with the procedure, and he agrees with addressing those.

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, added that from the perspective of the Chart Supplement, a special notice is used as a venue to disseminate this information locally to whoever might need it. The FAA does not participate in any development, maintenance, or accuracy of these notices, and the graphics are submitted print ready. During the Chart Supplement Modernization Initiative, they had a lot of discussions on ways to help standardization, but the challenge was determining which office would enforce the standards since the procedures are developed at the local level. He pointed out that at Anchorage International Airport (ANC), there are a lot of VFR procedures, and they have developed their own standards.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, thanked Brian for his recommendation. She summarized that the FAA stands by the prior decision that they do not support adding these procedures to the TPP. There was agreement that standardization is needed, however, that's not within the scope of the Charting Group. Jennifer said that this recommendation will be brought forward to the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) for further internal agency discussion and the results briefed to the proponent and at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will take this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine any action and report the outcome at ACM 26-01.

VI. Outstanding Charting Topics

18-02-327 IAP Chart Modernization

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, stated that this item is still in the action pending category. He explained how these changes are interconnected with other efforts, including the airport diagram modernization effort. He said the plan is still to move forward with this initiative, however, there are a lot of significant criteria changes and pilot guidance updates that will be necessary, so it is going to take time. Rune explained that while this initiative fits with some other directive updates that his office is working on, the process for moving directives forward has had some changes over the last year, and the FAA must prioritize certain work, including procedure review work. Rune informed the group that while there is not a target date for publication of the criteria changes related to this effort, it is still on the list of items to be worked.

Vic Naso, FAA/AFS-420, reiterated the need to continue investigating the criteria changes that will be necessary and said that once that is complete, then target dates for implementation can be discussed.

Rich Boll, NBAA, thanked the FAA for the continued work and acknowledged the future of aeronautical charting briefing provided earlier in the meeting. He said the members of the working group agreed that the chart format needs to be improved, whether they are delivered via the printed Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) or electronically through an electronic flight bag (EFB). Benefits to these changes have been identified, they've gone through the safety review process, and no hazards were identified. There is still industry interest in encouraging the FAA to continue to work on this with the utmost urgency.

Rune thanked Rich for reemphasizing the importance of this effort. He agreed that the FAA needs to take advantage of the recommendations that are all agreed upon and continue to move them forward.

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.

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

Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, reminded the audience that Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, briefed this topic during his [ACM 25-02 Aeronautical Data Update](#) briefing presented the previous day.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, summarized by confirming that this item is on the list of future changes to NASR following the technical refresh. She said that an update on the timeline of changes will be provided at the April meeting.

STATUS: OPEN - ACTION PENDING

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

[21-01-351 Non-Air Carrier Runways in the Chart Supplement](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that Joshua Ivy, FAA/AAS-320, has replaced Alberto Rodriguez, FAA/AAS-320, as the Office of Airports point of contact for this issue.

Joshua reported that a new data element has been added to the Airport Data and Information Portal (ADIP), and the verbiage was changed slightly to better fit the needs of industry. It is now on the airport master record as “Available for Part 121/380 Ops”. The data element generates a remark, and as a result, the standardized note has begun to show up on airport diagrams and in the Chart Supplement Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD) entries. The airport diagram remark states “Not for Part 121/Part 380 Air Carrier Use or Foreign Air Carrier Equivalent”. The note in the Chart Supplement states “No Part 121/Part 380 Ops” in the airport’s runway entry.

Steven Madigan, Garmin, asked if, once these notes are populated on the airport diagrams and in the A/FD entries, the intent is to then remove the legacy airport remarks. Joshua said there may be some cases where the remark will need to remain because it conveys more in-depth information. Steven then asked if there is a plan to put this into NASR. Joshua replied that, yes, there is a plan to put the information in NASR in the form of a checkbox to indicate air carrier runways.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked to confirm how the verbiage ended up referring to Part 380 Operations. Joshua replied that his team looked at the Part 139 regulations, and for Part 380 operations that do meet the seating requirements, they do have to go to a Part 139 airport and then land on a Part 139 runway. For unscheduled operations with more than nine passenger seats, it qualifies as a Part 380 operation. Rich said that the Foreign Air Carriers were left out in reference to Part 129, in that the Foreign Air Carriers operate under Part 129, not Part 380. Joshua indicated that it was a good point and might have been an oversight. Joshua asked if Rich is recommending adding Part 129. Rich said the appropriate CFR reference should be 14 CFR Part 129. Rich suggested that Joshua coordinate with Flight Standards and NBAA to confirm the right CFR references are being used.

Jennifer summarized the conversation and reported that the item will remain open for further investigation into the appropriate language for the published notes.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Joshua Ivy, FAA/AAS-320, will report on the discussions regarding changes to standardized Part 139 runway notes.

[21-02-362 Graphic Circling Restrictions on IAPs](#)

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, stated that this item is in the action pending category and that the intent is to continue to work to add graphic circling restrictions to the instrument approach procedure (IAP) charts. He said that both form and criteria changes will be necessary. He reminded the audience that the Safety Risk Management (SRM) panel on the concept has been completed, but there will need to be another SRM panel on the criteria changes, and as of now, there is no target publication date for those changes.

Kevin ‘Timbo’ Carter, NGA, pointed out that if this were implemented, the runways would be shown in three locations on the chart: the planview, the sketch, and the graphic circling restriction box. He said that adding this new information box to the planview could be difficult on congested charts and could add chart clutter. He asked the Terminal Charting Team if there was ever consideration for putting this information in the sketch area. Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A223, stated that in the last prototypes, made over two years ago, the circling restrictions were depicted as a separate boxed graphic. She said they never looked at showing the restriction in the sketch

box. She said if that were pursued, it would need to align with the Chart Modernization initiative that will reduce the size and simplify the information shown in the sketch. She said if that's something that the industry would like to see, prototypes can be created for ACM 26-01. Kevin agreed that it would be appropriate to implement this in the sketch in conjunction with the Chart Modernization effort.

Regarding tying this effort to the IAP Chart Modernization, Rune referenced notes from prior ACM discussions where there was consensus not to tie these two recommendations together. However, he stated that it could be revisited. He cautioned that it gets complicated when the criteria changes are implemented at different times. In the past, the intent was not to tie them together because the graphic circling restriction changes could potentially happen sooner than Chart Modernization. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, suggested that the FAA take this back for internal discussion to see if any adjustments need to be made to the graphic circling depiction or the implementation plan.

STATUS: OPEN - ACTION PENDING

ACTION: Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, will report on internal discussion regarding changes to the plan moving forward for the depiction of graphic circling restriction.

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](#)

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, said he conducted two Workgroup meetings since the last ACM. He explained the discussion centered around the charting of Special Use Airspace (SUA) other than prohibited areas. Air traffic is responsible for ensuring separation from the airspace before clearance on that procedure is issued. Procedures are not allowed, by criteria, to go into a SUA, so that is built into the instrument flight procedure (IFP). Therefore, the Workgroup concluded that there is no need to have SUAs other than the prohibited areas depicted on the chart. If other airspace is going to be requested for charting, it will require a waiver to Flight Standards policy. He said all prohibited areas will be charted and that they will no longer need to be specifically requested on the procedure source document. Dan shared the [draft FAAO 8260.19 language](#).

Dan said he is looking at making this change using a Notice to get the change out faster than waiting for an Order change. He said he will coordinate that timing with the charting office.

Matt Fisher, NATCA, informed the audience that his predecessor, Bennie Hutto, NATCA, expressed some reservations with this solution at the last ACM. Since then, he and Bennie have spoken to Dan and now understand the need for this change and do and see the benefits.

Steven Madigan, Garmin, expressed gratitude for the progress on this issue. He requested clarification on the procedure development side. When a proponent requests the charting of an SUA, and they are given a waiver to support charting it, how will it be documented, and will an indication of the waiver be made on a procedure packet to document the exception? Dan answered that all that information will be in the waiver package. Steven asked how industry will know that a waiver was issued for something to be charted when the waiver packets do not become part of the full package that gets released on the IFP Gateway. Dan said that on departures, the waiver is listed on the FAA Form 8260-9. He said he will need to make a change to ensure the waiver is listed on the other 8260 Forms.

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, reminded Steven about [23-02-385](#), *Perpetual Access to Procedure Packets*, and that the IFP group is looking at adding the 8260-9 forms to the IFP Gateway.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, stated that this item will remain open pending the publication of the draft criteria. An Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Specification change also needs to be written, stating that prohibited areas will be depicted on all applicable charts.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, will report on publication of Flight Standards criteria changes regarding the charting of Special Use Airspace on Instrument Approach Procedures.

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will report on the status of the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Specification change for the depiction of Prohibited Areas in the Terminal Procedures Publication.

[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 FAAO 8260.19 language](#) that was presented. He said Flight Standards has gotten consistent feedback that these areas can be removed from the charts. Dan explained that the draft criteria include language not to request the depiction of special conservation areas or marine sanctuary areas. He said an environmental study is conducted in these areas and the procedures are designed to protect them if that is deemed necessary. If these areas are going to be requested for charting, it will require a waiver to Flight Standards policy.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, stated that this item will remain open pending the publication of the draft criteria and a determination on the plan moving forward to remove the areas that are currently charted.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, will report on the publication of Flight Standards 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.

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, expressed an understanding of industry's concerns regarding the published procedure amendment effective dates and explained the FAA's continued research into providing a solution. Unfortunately, the implementation of the current Procedure Amendment Effective Date definition has been in effect since 2009, and to go back and change that now is not feasible. Jennifer suggested that perhaps there is another solution that could be part of the database rather than a date on the chart. The Charted Instrument Flight Procedure (CIFP) Team looks at every new and amended procedure to determine any coding impacts. She suggested that the list of updated procedures in the database could be published. Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, said he has talked about this with his coding team, and they are still investigating the feasibility of that solution.

Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed his disappointment and referenced the 2007 ACM [07-02-198](#) Recommendation. He said that it was a significant effort to ensure that what was in the database matched what was on the chart, particularly when procedures change. Rich advised that with this decision, Advisory Circulars (AC) and other pilot guidance will need to be updated to explain that the Procedure Amendment Effective Date cannot be used to

validate the database. It may have been interpreted in other FAA offices for other purposes, but that's not what it was intended or communicated to the pilots.

John Collins, ForeFlight, added that the change in the meaning of the Procedure Amendment Effective Date has limited its usability, but it is not unusable. John suggested a day-forward approach to get the meaning back to its original purpose. He said pilots will not look at a list, so that is not an appropriate solution.

Steven Madigan, Garmin, added that from a data-house perspective, a rollup of the Procedure Amendment Effective Date and the amendment number can indicate a change to notes, altitudes, paths, minima, essentially any combination of things. He said the intent with this recommendation is to align the amendment number and the Procedure Amendment Effective Date with specifically path or altitude-related coding changes. Steven expressed concern that this would require redefining what an amendment is, and if a chart note change is made via a P-NOTAM, which don't always have direct FMS implications, they are potentially no longer amendments. This seems like a much larger change than we may be making it out to be. The whole system is built around the Procedure Amendment Effective Date.

Rich suggested the audience reference the 2007 recommendation and the Working Group minutes. He explained that the original intent of the Procedure Amendment Effective Date was specifically to address the flyability of an instrument flight procedure using the FMS database.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, acknowledged that this item requires further agency discussion and has impacts on the Federal Register process, the NOTAM system, and the FMS. He expressed that he believes the ask is fully understood, including the intent in the original 2007 recommendation. Dan added that, from a safety perspective, what the FAA is doing today is not unsafe. There may be instances where the Procedure Amendment Effective Date is telling the pilot that there's been a change on the IFP that is not related to anything in the FMS.

Rich agreed that while it's not unsafe, he referred to several Advisory Circulars and pilot guidance documents that would need to be updated to explain that the Procedure Amendment Effective Date cannot be used to validate the database.

Pat added that he had initially thought that since we had the information regarding procedures with coding changes internally, we just had to figure out how to get that out to pilots and talk about publishing a list. He understands that it isn't the solution and said more internal discussion is needed. He stressed that this will not be a quick fix.

Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen, noted that at Jeppesen, they evaluate amended procedures for a coding change, and the date they publish aligns with that. The result is that the dates on their chart may not align with FAA dates.

Dan requested to clarify that Jeppesen is not using the amendment number and Procedure Amendment Effective Date that's published on the source form and is creating their own. Aaron clarified that Jeppesen does use the Amendment number from the procedure source form but lists the Procedure Amendment Effective Date based on the AIRNC database. This date may not align with what is on the procedure source form.

Kevin "Timbo" Carter, NGA, requested to clarify with Rich if the intent of the original recommendation was for the procedure design specialist to know whether the change would impact the coding. Rich replied that the mechanisms were supposed to be in place through the Orders for that to be the case. Dan suggested that he doesn't think the criteria gets into that level of detail.

Pat informed the group that for every procedure that the FAA amends, his team does a database coding check. If there are any coding changes, the CIFP is updated.

John Collins quoted [AIM 1-1-17b.5\(k\) Note 3](#), “Requires current database or verification that the procedure has not been amended since the expiration of the database.” He said that ForeFlight deals with a lot of General Aviation pilots who rely on that provision and don't necessarily keep their databases current. If the Procedure Amendment Effective Date is prior to the change in the current database, the FMS allows that procedure to be used. John reiterated that the intent of the date was a simple way of determining whether the procedure in the database can be used or not. Dan informed John that he still has that, but there are other things that could impact the date that don't impact the database.

Joel Dickenson, FAA/AFS-410, reminded the audience that if the plan is to fly IFR using the FMS navigation database, that database needs to be current. There's one exception, and that is if you know your scheduled flight is going to fly over the Aeronautical Information Regulation and Control (AIRAC) change date. The Advisory Circulars advise to fly with a current database. If you're a commercial operator, you'll need to have procedures in place to verify the accuracy of the data if you fly over that AIRAC cycle changeover date.

Rich stated that the addition of the Procedure Amendment Effective Date was to support the guidance in the Advisory Circulars for verifying the validity of the database.

Jennifer closed the conversation by stating that she will take this back for further discussion and report back in April.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, 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-A223, [presented](#) the new language in the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) 4 specification for Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) that states that on a procedure with radius-to-fix (RF) legs, all track-to-fix (TF) bearings will be shown on the entire final approach segment. This will allow for easy differentiation between RF and TF legs. She said clarifying text was also added to the Chart Users' Guide.

Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed his appreciation for the work. Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, asked if it would be the same for departure procedures (DP). Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that this is not an issue because on DPs, the bearings are never omitted on TF legs, and RF legs are depicted with just a distance and no bearing.

Kevin “Timbo” Carter, NGA, noted that the reason it needed to be in the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) 4 Specification is that there is an allowance on IAPs to not repeat the bearing on the final approach course segment. That exception does not exist for other types of procedures.

Jennifer closed the briefing by acknowledging the added clarification and informed the audience that all actions are now complete, and this item can be closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

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

Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, reminded the audience that Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, briefed this topic during his [ACM 25-02 Aeronautical Data Update](#) briefing presented the previous day.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, summarized by confirming that this item is on the list of future changes to NASR following the technical refresh. She said that an update on the timeline of changes will be provided at the April meeting.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, will report on the Aeronautical Data Team's investigation into adding the additional data elements to the NASR database.

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

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, briefed that the FAA will start providing the FAA Form 8260-9 as part of the Navigation Database Resource (NDBR) tab on the Instrument Flight Procedures Information Gateway no later than March 2026. Pat explained that the current process involves putting all the package information on the coordination website for flight inspection and for the public, and when taken down, the FAA Form 8260-9 is removed, and the package is prepared to be sent to the National Register. Going back and adding everything in would be a huge strain. Pat proposed that day-forward they will make available the 8260-9 forms, all the information on any waivers, and the data used to build the procedure. When information is needed for procedures that don't have any data on the NDBR site and haven't received a full amendment in some time, an Aeronautical Inquiry Portal should be submitted to request the FAA Form 8260-9. He pointed out that if the procedure is very old, and there hasn't been a full amendment, there may not be an 8260-9. Pat emphasized that, while valuable, the FAA Form 8260-9 is not the source for the procedure and discourages using the FAA Form 8260-9 to look for a mistake on the chart.

Pat reported that they are working toward a new on-demand process for how the Form will be accessed on the Gateway and suggested a process where users can request the Forms, and they will be generated on-demand from the data, rather than downloading the .pdf forms.

Steven Madigan, Garmin, began by recognizing that this is huge progress and commended the FAA. Steven pointed out that when industry looks at the coordination site, it's not just the FAA Form 8260-9. It is also the maps, the traffic flows, all other information that's on the Gateway prior to publication that they would like access to. He asked if they would only be adding the FAA Form 8260-9, or if they are talking about bringing all the information over to the NDBR.

Pat replied that he was focused on the FAA Form 8260-9, because that's where most of the answers to the queries that they receive come from. He said the FAA can investigate providing everything that went to the flight inspection, and if that's the request, this topic will need to remain open for further investigation.

Steven suggested that the FAA Form 8260-2s are published on another part of the FAA's website, and they're not hard to get, but the Terminal Instrument Procedure (TERPS) maps, the surface valuation maps, and associated information would be useful. He suggested that when industry or a private individual requests the data, it should be uploaded to the NDBR for the public. Steven then asked for some more details regarding the new system Pat discussed. Pat replied that the focus right now is to make sure that the database reflects everything the user will need. Nothing is changing today, and when that product is ready, everyone will be involved to ensure we meet the stakeholders' needs. Regarding maps, he said the FAA is moving towards .kmz files for flight inspection rather than paper charts, so they are looking into uploading the .kmz files as well.

Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed appreciation and highlighted to the audience the number of questions that come in from the field that NBAA can answer simply by looking at past TERPS maps. Rich expressed a desire to see the

.kmz files on the NDBR and will make sure that there is a formal request for that information. Rich requested to clarify that the .kmz files contain the same obstacle data and other information that is included on the TERPS maps. Pat replied that the .kmz files are generated by TARGETS, so if they show up in TARGETS, it's selectable as a feature to display on the .kmz. Rich asked about the possibility of having the final TARGETS file available on the NDBR tab. Pat said he would have to take that back for further discussion.

Matt Fisher, NATCA, agreed that having the TARGETS file would be very helpful, however, the files are very large. Matt then asked if the data that is planned to be stored could include the history of the printed chart. He said that it is helpful in certain circumstances to be able to look at the different iterations of a chart over the years. Pat replied that the work on this issue was intended to ensure access to the current procedure. To get copies of historical charts, you would have to submit a request through the Freedom Of Information Act (FOIA).

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, summarized the discussion and stated that more investigation will be needed into what additional documents can be made available on the Gateway. This item will remain open for further updates at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, will report on the status of perpetual access to IFP procedure packets.

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that the change to the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) specification for the charting of weather camera locations on VFR Sectional and Helicopter Route Charts has been approved. Implementation on the charts is planned for the 19 March 2026 publication date. She then explained that this change highlighted a redundancy because the Alaska weather cameras are already published on visual flight rule (VFR) charts and are also listed in the associated data section of the Chart Supplement. Rather than adding a new weather camera section for all the Continental U.S. (CONUS) locations, a specification change has been processed for the removal of the redundant weather camera location information from the Alaska Chart Supplement. Once the locations are charted on the VFR charts, the weather camera locations that are currently listed in the Alaska Chart Supplement will be removed.

Jim McClay, AOPA, expressed support for the change and asked what the new weather camera symbol will look like. Jennifer replied that when located on airport, weather cameras will be identified with the little blue circle with WX inside the circle. Off airport, it'll have the same symbol, but it'll also have an annotation that says 'WX CAM'. Jim added that, based on Nate Rahn's earlier briefing and the eventual transition to digital charting, it would be helpful if this information could be delivered as a data layer that could be overlaid on the chart. Jen replied that while the FAA is not there yet, we can take note of that request.

Jennifer said this item will remain open to report on the implementation of the weather camera locations on VFR charts and for the removal of the weather camera tabulation from the Alaska Chart Supplement.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, 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](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Specification change has been approved for the removal of the requirement to chart the 67:1 slope obstacles, spot elevations, and the highest obstacle from the Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) charts and Airport Diagrams. Obstacles specifically requested on the procedure form, except for Adverse Assumption Obstacles (AAO), will continue to be charted on IAPs. Day forward implementation began with the 12 June 2025 publication date.

At the last ACM, concerns were raised about communication and outreach to the pilot community regarding these types of changes. Jennifer reported that a [Charting Notice](#) was issued on 8 April 2025. Also, a new paragraph with descriptions and a hyperlink to FAA published safety alerts, charting notices, and data product notices was added to the Aeronautical Information Manual [AIM, para 9-1-3](#). She said that Flight Standards did not support issuing an FAA Safety Team Blast in this case because a Safety Risk Management (SRM) was performed and no hazards were found. She said this change was also communicated in the 'What's New' page of the 12 June 2025 version of the Chart Users' Guide, where a description of the change is provided along with a link to the charting notice.

Steven Madigan, Garmin, added that from a pilot's perspective, this was a very valuable change. He explained that they have had some issues come up regarding the removal of obstacles and how that impacts their ability to geo-reference their charts. He asked if a new ACM topic should be submitted to address this. Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A223, said opening a new topic is not necessary. Terminal Charting geo-references their .pdf files and has no issues. Krystle offered to talk with Steven offline about finding a solution to the issue. Steven agreed and proposed closing this item.

Jennifer stated that all actions are complete, and this item will be closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

[24-01-389 Removal of Taxiways on IAP Airport Sketches](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that the removal of taxiway information from the Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) airport sketch began with the 12 June 2025 publication date. She reminded the audience that only locations that have published airport diagrams will have the taxiways removed from the airport sketch. A [Charting Notice](#) was issued on 24 February 2025 to announce the change.

Brent Walker, FAA/AJV-A242, added that as of the 22 January 2026 publication date, the Airport Mapping Team has removed the taxiway information from 574 airport sketches out of 742, or 77.4%

Jennifer thanked Brent and his team for their work and said this item could be closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, recapped the discussion from the last ACM regarding expanding NOTAMs to alert pilots to when an airport is no longer Minimum Operational Network (MON) qualified. First, she needed to ensure that this effort would not duplicate work underway with the Performance-Based Operations Aviation Rulemaking Committee Global Positioning System Disruption Action Team (PARC GDAT). Rich Boll, NBAA, reached out and determined that nothing is being worked by the PARC GDAT related to reporting or charting the

status of VOR MON airports. Jennifer said she did learn about a new tool, the Navigation Operational and Planning Agility Suite (NOPAS). NOPAS is an automated tool that the FAA tasked MITRE to develop to monitor GPS signal degradation events. Though not yet available to the public, in the future, this tool could possibly provide the information needed regarding the VOR MON airport status.

Jennifer said she then requested help on this issue from the VOR MON Program Office. She asked if NOTAMs could be expanded to indicate which procedure is impacted. Questions arose about how Technical Operations would know which facility supports a MON approach, and they indicated concerns about added complexity to the process. This aligns with the concerns that Dale Courtney, FAA/AJW-2630, expressed at the previous ACM when he said that a NOTAM alone would not solve this issue.

Jennifer said she then started to investigate expanding the Chart Supplement MON Airport Listing to include the MON procedures. The problem with this solution is that it would first require that all the data be added to NASR. This is not a simple ask and could take some time, but it is possible as a longer-term solution. In the meantime, there is a list that's maintained on an internal site. It's a list of MON airports and includes the MON qualified procedure. She suggested that perhaps providing this list on website could satisfy this request, at least in the short term.

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, stated that he had taken action to look at the NOTAM order for a possible solution. After looking into it, he said he does not think NOTAMs will be the solution. A NOTAM is issued to a specific procedure, but there is no way for a pilot to know if that is the MON procedure. A more appropriate solution would be to document it on the procedure source form and have a note or symbol on the chart that could then be referenced in the NOTAM. This solution would require a criteria change.

Matt Fisher, NATCA, stated that ATC facilities have very little understanding of what is and is not a MON approach. In the event of a GPS outage, ATC must determine what approaches pilots can use to get on the ground. Having a chart symbol would be tremendously beneficial to be able to quickly identify what approaches are viable and what approaches are not. Matt expressed support for this proposal.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, stated that the MON airport is identified on the enroute low chart, and guidance is published that defines MON airports for both air traffic and for pilots. He does not agree that there needs to be a charted symbol. He said if something occurs in the NAS that prevents that airport from continuing its MON qualification, i.e., a NAVAID goes out, then something needs to occur to alert pilots to that for flight planning. Therefore, the focus should continue to be on a NOTAM solution. Pat clarified that when a NOTAM is put out on an IAP, it says "Procedure N/A". A pilot has no way to know if that procedure is the one that is MON qualified. Dan said there are a couple of different ways an airport loses its MON status, and if the airport loses its MON qualification, there is currently no way to signal that to pilots for flight planning.

John Collins, ForeFlight, agreed that without knowing all the criteria that go into qualifying a procedure as MON, it is difficult to determine whether a particular procedure can be used as a MON procedure. John reported that his last analysis found six airports that are designated as MON; however, due to outages, they are not currently MON-capable. He strongly believes that pilots need a MON indication.

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, referenced [AIM, para 1-1-3 f](#) and clarified for the audience that what determines VOR MON procedure eligibility is that it needs to be an ILS, a localizer, or a VOR approach at a suitable destination, generally within 100 nautical miles of any location within the continental United States, and the selected approaches would not require ADF, DME, radar, or GPS.

Dan added that, based on the definition and the information the FAA has provided, a pilot should be able to look at every conventional procedure at a MON airport and determine which procedures are MON without an indication on the chart. John noted that pilots are not trained to make those determinations.

Dan stated that he agrees that, in the case where there is a MON symbol on the enroute chart and the VOR is out, the VOR procedure is unusable, and the airport is no longer MON qualified, an alert must be sent to the pilot. Dan expressed disagreement that something needs to be put on the approach chart to indicate that it's the MON approach. Dan stated that guidance is clear in the AIM and pointed to human factors and feedback about how pilots don't look at chart notes. Dan suggested a NOTAM for the MON status and suggested this was all that was necessary.

Art Griffenkrantz, FAA/AJV-E240, stated that the premise of the MON network is to provide a tertiary backup system in the event GPS goes down, radar goes down, or air traffic is unable to provide services to get aircraft to a specific IAP. Numerous other procedures within 100 miles are published that can be flown either with DME, radar, or other services. As we move towards decluttering and making charts more readable, we are removing other backup information. The level of effort that would be required to add this information to IAPs goes against what the initiative is for.

Bruce Williams, CFI, compared the situation to having alternate airports. NOTAMs say, "this airport is/these IAPs are N/A for IFR alternate purposes". Bruce suggested issuing a similar type of NOTAM when a facility that makes an airport MON goes offline.

Matt Fisher, NATCA, said that from a GPS interference and a real-time tactical standpoint, having that designator is helpful, but it is still dependent on the aircraft's equipage and what other pieces of navigation are available. There may be viable approaches when radar is available, approaches that are not dependent on GPS or RNAV. Initially, he thought symbology sounded very helpful, however, it may distract from the fact that a procedure is viable and usable when there's GPS interference and not in a true MON scenario. Matt believes there needs to be an education piece for the air traffic workforce so they know what approaches are viable so they can help the crew in real time.

Lt Col Travis Wilkes, USAF Flight Standards, suggested that when using an electronic flight bag (EFB) for flight planning, the temporary flight restrictions (TFR) and the significant meteorological information (SIGMET) are digitally displayed. He suggested that perhaps a digital solution for indicating MON status is a way forward.

Jennifer thanked everyone for their expertise and noted that the FAA will continue to investigate a solution. This item will remain open for an update at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will report back on further investigations into issues related to VOR MON status.

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that the ACM Recommendation Review Group met to discuss this topic and there was consensus not to accept this item for work. Representatives from the Flight Procedures and Airspace Group and the Flight Operations Group agreed that the VFR traffic pattern direction should not be added to airport diagrams or IAPs for the following reasons. First, pilots are expected to reference the Chart Supplement, as it is the primary source of this information. Second, the situation where this right pattern issue comes up with actual circling is likely infrequent and is not a safety of flight concern. Third, sometimes the circling on the IAP conflicts with [14 CFR 91.126 \(b\)](#), but the IAP takes precedence over the CFR. Finally, there is an Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) change in process that addresses the regulatory concerns brought

here by the proponent of this issue. The AIM changes will be discussed as part of the IPG Recommendation [22-01-366](#).

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, said [22-01-366](#) is the *'Circling N/A' Areas That Conflict With FAA Legal Counsel Limitations on Class G Right Traffic*. The Flight Operations Group and the Flight Procedures and Airspace Group published an AIM change and worked with air traffic to update compliance in the FAA JO 7110.65 to add consistency to the terminology.

Jennifer said that for the reasons stated above, this item will be closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) concurred with the recommendation, and since that time, the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) charting specification changes have been signed, and implementation occurred for the 27 November 2025 publication date. Additionally, there is an Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) update in work to remove the sentence that says "The takeoff departure procedure will be listed first, followed by any applicable DVA."

Jennifer stated that all actions are now complete, and this item can be closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that an Interagency Air Committee (IAC) charting specification change has been approved for the removal of departure ATIS, clearance delivery (CLNC DEL), and controller-pilot data link communications (CPDLC) frequencies from Instrument Approach Procedure (IAPs) charts when the information is already depicted on the corresponding airport diagram. If there is no airport diagram at that location, that communication data will remain on the IAP. Day-forward implementation began with the 02 October 2025 publication date.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, asked to clarify whether there was any applicable documentation criteria referenced in FAAO 8260.19 that needed to be updated to support this change. Jennifer replied that this was a specification update only, and no criteria updates are needed.

Jennifer stated that all actions are now complete, and this item can be closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

VII. Closing Remarks

Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, and Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, 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 26-01 is scheduled for April 20-23, 2026.

IX. [Attendance Roster](#)