

**Government/Industry Aeronautical Charting Meeting (ACM)
Meeting 26-01
Charting Group
April 20-23, 2026**

CHARTING GROUP MINUTES

I. Opening Remarks

II. Review Minutes of Last Meeting, ACM 25-02

The minutes from the ACM 25-02 meeting were distributed electronically via the [AIS ACM website](#) and were accepted as submitted with no changes or corrections.

III. Agenda Approval

The agenda for the 26-01 meeting was accepted as presented.

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

[FAA's Aeronautical Charting Program](#)

Nate Rahn, FAA/AJV-A2, began the [presentation](#) by providing a recap of the briefing he provided at ACM 25-02. He said since then, the focus has been on determining the future of the aeronautical charting program and prioritizing modernization. He highlighted the vision for the program and explained how Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) plans to position the organization to support a more digital future by delivering standardized geospatial data formats and enabling customizable, on-demand products. He emphasized that AIS will continue producing paper charts for the foreseeable future while also working to meet growing digital requirements.

Nate explained that since the last meeting, AIS relocated from Silver Spring, Maryland, to FAA Headquarters in Washington, D.C. The move placed significant demands on the organization and limited its capacity to focus on activities beyond maintaining its core mission. Now that the relocation is complete, AIS will focus on the identified modernization priorities for 2026. These priorities include: (1) establishing a working group under the ACM to discuss the future of the Terminal Charting program, (2) developing a prototype for a data-driven visual chart, and (3) developing a prototype for a digital version of one volume of the Chart Supplement. Nate said Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, will provide a briefing on the Chart Supplement modernization. Nate acknowledged that there has not been significant progress since the last ACM but said AIS is positioning itself to modernize the aeronautical charting program.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, thanked Nate for the update and asked anyone interested in participating in the discussion on the future of the Terminal Charting program to submit their name to the ACM mailbox (9-AMC-AVS-ACM-Info@faa.gov).

[Aeronautical Data Update](#)

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, provided a briefing on behalf of the Aeronautical Data Team (ADT). He reported that the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) technical refresh is tentatively scheduled for mid-May 2026. This update will have little impact on NASR users but will strengthen the system and improve reliability. Once the technical refresh is complete, ADT can begin scheduling new releases to address the backlog of NASR change requests.

Brian said the next release will include format changes to the subscriber files and recommended reviewing the NASR README file and forthcoming Data Product Notice for details about the enhancements. The first release is expected to include the following changes: (1) increasing the designator and description field sizes for Preferred Routes; (2) adding a four-digit Pavement Classification Rating (PCR) data field; (3) adding a new "unusable" column to AWY and ATS subscriber files; (4) renaming High Altitude Preferred Direction Routes and Low Altitude Preferred Direction Routes to High Altitude Single Direction Preferred Routes and Low Altitude Single Direction Preferred Routes (HSD/LSD); and (5) adding a new "Special Route" the ATS airway designation to accommodate the new ZK routes. Brian said another technical refresh is planned for early fall 2026.

Brian then provided updates on ACM Items [20-02-348](#), *NASR Improvements for ARTCC/RCAG Frequencies*, and [23-02-384](#), *Improvements to NASR CSVs*, which are on the agenda later in the meeting. He said both items are priorities internally and externally and will be addressed as soon as possible. Regarding ACM Item [25-01-400](#), *Publish ATCAA Boundaries*, Brian said a path forward has been identified and the data is planned for release in the CSV subscriber files. The target effective date is September 3, 2026.

Brian added that the next set of NASR changes described above will be the last release in which ADT makes format changes to the TXT subscriber files. After that, the data will transition to CSV format only to better support aeronautical data delivery. The final release of the TXT subscriber files will be for the January 21, 2027 AIRAC cycle, which will be released at the end of December 2026. After that effective date, the FAA will sunset the TXT-formatted subscriber files. Brian suggested users visit the [28 Day NASR Subscription - Effective May 14, 2026](#) site and review the 3rd bullet, which links to the instructional [Legacy TXT to CSV Mapping Document](#).

Chart Supplement Data Product XML

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, briefed from a [presentation](#). He explained that this initiative began in response to an ACM request for a way to identify changes in the Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD) section of the Chart Supplement. The proposed solution is to publish an additional XML file that captures the data points in the A/FD section, allowing users to compare them to the previous edition to identify changes.

Odie emphasized that this effort is not intended to redefine, reorganize, or reformat existing A/FD data fields, nor is it meant to replace the NASR subscriber files. The XML will be provided in addition to the existing PDF files and will allow users to extract data for easier integration into external systems. Odie presented examples of the XML file ([Slides 7 and 8](#)). The goal is to produce a functional prototype for external testing and feedback by the end of fiscal year 2026.

Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, expressed enthusiasm about the initiative and asked whether the information in the back of the Chart Supplement would be included. Odie said the initial focus is on the A/FD section but that adding information from the back section could be considered later. Joshua added that it would be useful in the future to include noise abatement procedures and visual departure information, along with the airports to which they apply.

Colleen Kubont, FAA/AAS-120, noted the usefulness of the CSV Change Reports files that are linked to [the 28 Day NASR Subscription](#) site.

Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen, expressed appreciation for the effort and asked about the timeline for the effort and how industry can participate. Odie said he will provide a status update at the next ACM. He also said he may form a working group and asked anyone interested in participating in the discussion to submit their name to the ACM mailbox (9-AMC-AVS-ACM-Info@faa.gov).

V. New Charting Topics

[26-01-409 Spaceport Symbol on VFR Charts](#)

William Flowers, CO Air and Space Port, briefed from a [presentation](#). He explained that the rocket symbol used on VFR charts to identify spaceports is frequently misinterpreted, especially by the general aviation (GA) community. Some pilots assume the symbol indicates a military installation or that the facility has limited public access. As a result, GA pilots may avoid using these dual-use facilities. In addition, information describing spaceports tends to characterize them solely as active launch sites with ongoing launches or hazard areas, rather than recognizing that many also operate as fully functional public-use airports.

This recommendation suggests that the FAA update the current spaceport symbol so that it reflects the specific operational capabilities of each facility instead of using a single standard symbol. William suggested the symbol could distinguish between vertical launch sites, horizontal launch sites, or locations that support both. In addition to revising the symbol, he recommended updating relevant FAA regulatory documents to provide clear guidance on the types of operations conducted at spaceports and the criteria that define a spaceport.

Alvin Brunner, FAA/AFS-752, said he was surprised that pilots would be nervous to fly near a spaceport when no Special Use Airspace (SUA) is present. He believes the rocket is an appropriate symbol to use for locations with vertical launches. He also said there is no need to depict horizontal launches and that those locations can be shown simply as an airport.

Paul Behan, NATCA, explained that spaceports can support many types of launches. Distinguishing between them on the charts would result in several different symbols. However, he said he doesn't see the need for that and has not observed confusion with the rocket symbol. If launch operations are taking place, the airspace, airways, or airport may be unavailable during that time, and that would be communicated through a NOTAM or Temporary Flight Restriction (TFR). Therefore, he suggested the symbol may not be necessary. William disagreed and said that, at a minimum, more pilot guidance should be published.

Jim McClay, AOPA, said he has also not heard of confusion about the rocket symbol and believes any issues should be addressed through pilot education. When no launch is scheduled, the facility operates as a regular airport, so the rocket symbol may not add much value.

Mark Mentovai, Manhattan Flight Club, said the rocket symbol itself does not discourage him, but the airport name gives him pause. The naming convention is not explained in the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM). He suggested considering renaming the airport. William agreed. Paul Behan added that more airports are starting to include "spaceport" in their names, and it may be time to address that in the AIM and the Pilot/Controller Glossary (PCG).

Rich Boll, NBAA, suggested that pilots may avoid planning to use these facilities due to the risk that a launch could be scheduled and the airspace closed.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, said he doesn't think the symbol should be on the chart and that a note in the Chart Supplement Airport/Facility Directory entry would be sufficient.

Christian Hull, FAA/ASZ-010, Office of Commercial Space Transportation, said his office is aware of need to review these issues and agrees that naming conventions should be standardized.

The audience generally agreed that pilot guidance should be updated to ensure consistency, particularly regarding facility names. Opinions were mixed on whether the symbol should remain on charts. Some participants believe it helps raise awareness, while others consider it unnecessary. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-

A223, said the recommendation will be presented to the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) for further internal discussion. The results will be reported to the proponent and at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will present this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine possible actions and report the outcome at ACM 26-02.

26-01-410 VOR Gaps

Rick Niles, MITRE, briefed from a [presentation](#). He explained that because the VOR Minimum Operational Network (MON) program ended earlier than planned and flight checks revealed coverage limitations, gaps in VOR coverage remain. A safety panel recommended creating a way to inform ATC and pilots about known gaps and outages in VOR MON coverage.

The first recommendation is to add areas with no low-altitude VOR coverage to the National Airspace System Resources (NASR) database. The FAA Technical Center stated it can identify these gaps and submit and maintain the information for Aeronautical Information Services.

The second recommendation is to depict VOR service gaps on Low Altitude Enroute charts using shaded polygons. He provided several examples of the proposed chart depictions and asked whether there is value in making this information available to pilots. If so, he asked whether providing the data alone would be sufficient or if it should also be shown on Low Altitude Enroute charts.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, said pilots need access to this information, but does not believe it should be depicted on charts. He said the data should be stored in NASR and should also be available digitally through the FAA weather briefing service.

Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, agreed that the data would be valuable to industry. However, he suggested that the FAA consider publishing the data through the [Aeronautical Data Delivery Service \(ADDS\)](#) instead of NASR because ADDS handles geographic shapes more effectively.

Vince Massimini, TetraTech, said most pilots are not concerned about coverage at 5,000 feet and that adding this information to charts could be confusing. He asked whether a tool could be developed to show pilots VOR coverage at their planned altitude.

Rich Boll, NBAA, also opposed adding this information to charts. He noted that VOR coverage can change and that pilots might rely on charted information instead of checking NOTAMs. He suggested providing the information as a data layer in electronic flight bags (EFBs). He also expressed concern about altitude restrictions and said pilots need to know the lowest usable altitude to ensure they have coverage when departing.

Alex Ruston, FAA/AJV-A313, said aeronautical charts are intended to depict airspace, and adding this information would be a departure from that purpose. He also noted that if the data were stored in NASR, an authorized source would need to commit to maintaining it. NASR's storage limitations would also need to be considered. Rick responded that the FAA Technical Center already has a tool to calculate the data and has committed to serving as the authorized source.

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, asked whether the coverage gaps account for NAVAID restrictions and expanded standard service volumes. Rick confirmed that both are included.

Mike Stromberg, UPS, said he supports providing this information through EFBs. He suggested that if the FAA shares the methodology used to calculate the data, industry could use the information already stored in NASR to compute the gaps independently. Rick said he would take that suggestion back for consideration.

Sy Pinkert, ALPA, said he shares the concerns about chart clutter and potential pilot confusion. However, he noted that the data could also be useful for dispatchers during GPS jamming or spoofing events.

Rich added that if the information must be published in a 56-day product, it could be included in the Chart Supplement.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, said the recommendation will be presented to the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) for further internal discussion. The results will be reported to the proponent and at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will present this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine possible actions and report the outcome at ACM 26-02.

[26-01-411 IAP Georeferencing Data](#)

Steven Madigan, Garmin, briefed from the [Recommendation Document](#). Garmin requested that Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) investigate establishing an additional data delivery each chart cycle that would contain the georeferencing data used for the digital Terminal Procedure Publication (d-TPP) chart set. At a minimum, the requested data would include the projection used and the geographic coordinates for each corner of the chart. Ideally, it would also include the coordinates of the edges of the chart's planview.

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, said AIS is already researching this request and brought it to the ACM to gauge industry interest in the product. Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, explained that when Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) are converted into PDFs, the georeferencing coordinates are embedded in the file. However, coordinates for the planview neatlines are not included.

Mark Mentovai, Manhattan Flight Club, said he has found a way to extract the data from the PDFs. He explained that the information can be exported from the PDF into a CSV file and offered to explain the method offline. Krystle asked what data could be extracted. Mark said the projection and standard parallels can be retrieved, and the planview neatlines are also accessible.

Ray Lewandowski, TCAU1-ZAU, asked whether there had been consideration of using GeoJSON instead of CSV format. Steven said he would be open to that if it is a better delivery format.

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, asked if NGA charts offer georeferencing that differs from FAA charts. Kevin "Timbo" Carter, NGA, said their terminal charts are not georeferenced in the final output (GeoTIFF). The output files are designed for printing, and all georeferencing is removed when the PDF is created.

Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed interest in GeoJSON and asked whether NOTAM information could be incorporated. Ray said that may be possible in the future. Rich said terminal charting should consider this format.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will present this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine possible actions and report the outcome at ACM 26-02.

[26-01-412 Parachute Jumping Areas in the Chart Supplement](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, presented the [recommendation](#) on behalf of Randy Collier, Aerologic, who was not in attendance. Jennifer explained that the proponent is concerned that some aerobatic areas and Parachute Jumping Areas (PJAs) listed in the Chart Supplement and depicted on VFR Sectional Charts may no longer be valid and should be removed. He requested that Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) develop a method to periodically verify whether these aerobatic areas and PJAs are still active.

Brian Murphy, FAA AJV-A310, said this data is provided by the responsible air traffic control (ATC) facility. If the information is published in NASR and on FAA products, AIS has no reason to question its accuracy. The ATC facility is responsible for maintaining its published data, and AIS assumes the information is correct unless notified otherwise.

Rich Boll, NBAA, referenced ACM Recommendation Document [04-02-170](#), which determined that the U.S. Parachute Association was expected to provide the FAA with an annual list to help keep the data current.

Becky McDowell, FAA/AJV-A311, said the Aeronautical Data Team does receive inquiries about older PJAs. She noted that aerobatic areas tend to be more current because they were added to the database more recently. She said her team can contact the ATC facilities to ensure they understand their responsibility to maintain this data.

Matt Fisher, NATCA, said a policy document should be developed for ATC facilities to explain the requirements for validating the data. He agreed that a significant amount of outdated information may still be published.

Brian said that if his team is provided with a list of locations that may need validation, they can investigate them. Jennifer said she will contact the proponent to determine whether he has a list of the locations in question.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will present this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine possible actions and report the outcome at ACM 26-02.

[26-01-413 Unmanned Aircraft Activity Chart Symbol](#)

Carmen Simboli, Amazon Prime Air, briefed from a [presentation](#). He explained that Prime Air averages more than 180,000 UAS operations per delivery center location. There have been numerous instances of aircraft entering these areas despite NOTAMs warning of UAS operations. He recommended that the FAA begin adding a UAS chart symbol at commercial UAS delivery center locations when requested by the operator. Adding the symbols to VFR charts would provide situational awareness for the aviation community and supplement the NOTAMs that are currently issued.

Carmen also requested an accompanying note near the symbol stating “High density UAS operations below 400 feet in the vicinity”. As an alternative, he suggested using different color UAS symbols based on distance from the location. This approach would alert pilots to multiple commercial operators within a certain radius without adding significant chart clutter.

JJ Biel-Goebel, Wisk Aero, asked how many symbols Carmen expects would be charted as these operations expand throughout the National Airspace System (NAS). Carmen said the symbols would be a short-term solution that will address the issue for approximately two years. As operations expand, additional methods will be needed to improve awareness.

Alvin Brunner, FAA/AFS-752, said he supports eliminating UAS NOTAMs because UAS operations are now integrated into the NAS and pilots should already expect them. He noted that drones operate widely below 400 feet and are required to yield to manned aircraft. He also pointed out that many UAS have onboard detect-and-avoid (DAA) systems. He supports the short-term idea of charting a symbol in areas with high levels of activity and agrees that different symbols could indicate different levels of operations. Carmen said he also supports eliminating NOTAMs.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, asked for confirmation that none of the UAS operations occur within two miles of the departure end of a runway. Carmen confirmed and said that when operating in controlled airspace, they must follow established no-fly zones.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said his concern with charting a symbol is that pilots might assume there is no UAS activity in areas where no symbol is shown. Pilots need to understand that UAS operations can occur anywhere. He also expressed concern about the temporary nature of the proposed charting solution. He suggested adding a boxed note in areas with high-density operations or finding another way to communicate that UAS activity may occur below 400 feet. Another option he suggested was publishing a graphic notice in the Chart Supplement highlighting the locations where drones routinely depart and arrive. Alvin said he would support that approach if it improves awareness. Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, said his team recently removed all UAS data from the Chart Supplement as part of modernization efforts. Rich responded that reintroducing the information could be justified if it addresses a safety concern.

Nate Rahn, FAA/AJV-A2, said adding new UAS symbols to charts as a temporary solution is not practical. He suggested publishing digital data for these locations and relying on third-party chart providers to include it in electronic flight bags (EFBs). He added that if this is a safety concern, additional stakeholders will need to be involved. He also noted that Part 108 is forthcoming and may help address these issues.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, agreed that the symbols should not be added to the chart because these hazards exist everywhere in the NAS.

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, said chart clutter is a concern. However, if FAA Flight Standards determines that identifying these sites is important, the information could be maintained as data and published through subscriber files. He noted that a process to keep the data current and clear criteria for inclusion would need to be established first.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, said the recommendation will be presented to the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) for further internal discussion. The results will be reported to the proponent and at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will present this item to the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine possible actions and report the outcome at ACM 26-02.

VI. Outstanding Charting Topics

18-02-327 IAP Chart Modernization

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, reported that an Instrument Procedures Group (IPG) Recommendation Document (RD), [IPG 25-02-390](#), *Improved Clarity on Inoperative Component Adjustments with Like-Named Approach Minima*, was introduced at ACM 25-02 that overlaps with the IAP Chart Modernization initiative. The IPG RD proposes publishing a new table to help pilots determine the appropriate visibility minimums when the approach lighting system is inoperative. The plan is to pursue publication of this table in the Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP).

Rune said a discussion was held with Rich Boll, NBAA, the original proponent of the IAP Chart Modernization RD. Rich expressed support for pursuing the new table but said he remains interested in advancing the other chart format changes, even if the inoperative minimums are not added to the chart. The [IAP Chart Modernization prototypes](#) were presented, and Rich noted that the expanded minimums section, expanded profile view, and simplified airport sketch would still provide a benefit.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, added that the IAP Chart Modernization Workgroup did not originally recommend partially adopting the recommendations. However, based on Rich's feedback, the item was brought back to the ACM to gather input on the remaining chart format changes. She said Terminal Charting could consider moving forward with those changes if there is strong support and a clear understanding that the inoperative minimums may never be added to the charts.

Rich noted that the original recommendation had already been modified because AJV-A determined the inoperative minimums table would only be added when non-standard adjustments are required. Standard adjustments would continue to be published in the Inoperative Components or Visual Aids Table. Steve Madigan, Garmin, agreed and said he had concerns with adding the inoperative minimums table only in nonstandard cases.

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, emphasized that implementing the IAP Chart Modernization format changes would be a significant effort for the Terminal Charting Team and would take a long time to complete. She asked whether having two chart formats during the transition could create confusion.

Sy Pinkert, ALPA, said he supports the new format but acknowledged that having two formats during the transition could cause confusion. Rich responded that when Terminal Charts transitioned to the VOLPE format, the change took many years and did not result in significant pilot confusion.

Kevin "Timbo" Carter, NGA, said that for NGA there may be locations outside the United States where the new table would not work and the inoperative minimums may still need to be provided on the chart. However, he noted that NGA uses a single charting standard worldwide, so differences in standardization would need to be addressed in the Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Specifications. He also agreed with Krystle that implementing the remaining IAP chart changes would require significant effort but said the simplified airport sketch could reduce chart maintenance in the long term.

Rich asked whether a comparable Inoperative Components Table is published in Department of Defense (DoD) Flight Information Publications (FLIPs) for locations outside the United States. Timbo said no. Rich noted that the original Chart Modernization proposal, which includes inoperative minimums on the chart, might be more appropriate for DoD. Steve Madigan, Garmin, asked whether a similar inoperative minimums table could be published for NGA. Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, said that decision would be up to DoD.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, suggested looking toward the future and considering publishing only one line of minimums on the chart, with any adjustments handled in the electronic flight bag (EFB). Kevin responded that the intent is for the FAA to stop publishing inoperative visibility notes on the chart and allow EFBs to perform those calculations. Rich emphasized that this approach requires all providers to have access to the necessary data.

Nate Rahn, FAA/AJV-A2, reminded the group of the plan to establish a workgroup to discuss the future of Terminal Charts. He said the group should think broadly and ask key questions, such as whether the FAA needs to continue producing Terminal Charts, what industry needs, and how the FAA can improve its products.

JJ Biel-Goebel, Wisk Aero, asked whether the future approach could include an XML format similar to what is being developed for the Airport/Facility Directory portion of the Chart Supplement. Krystle said that it is possible and should be discussed by the Workgroup.

Rich requested a vote to gauge the audience's support for moving forward with the remaining Chart Modernization recommendations. Of those who voted, 22 supported proceeding and three opposed.

Jennifer thanked participants for their input. She said the immediate plan is to continue working on the table proposed at [IPG 25-02](#) to help pilots determine the appropriate visibility when the approach lighting system is inoperative. If the table does not provide the expected solution, the full IAP Chart Modernization proposal will remain under consideration. If the table successfully addresses concerns related to inoperative minimums, the remaining IAP Chart Modernization recommendations may move forward. Any future action will also need to consider recommendations from the planned workgroup on the future of Terminal Charts.

STATUS: OPEN - ACTION PENDING

ACTION: Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, to report on the Flight Standards investigation into the feasibility of a table in the TPP for inoperative components.

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will report on the status of the IAP Chart Modernization recommendations.

[20-02-348 NASR Improvements for ARTCC/RCAG Frequencies](#)

Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, reminded the audience that Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, addressed this topic during his [Aeronautical Data Update](#) briefing earlier in the meeting. Brian said this item is a priority and is on the list of future changes to NASR following the technical refresh.

STATUS: OPEN - ACTION PENDING

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

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that Joshua Ivy, FAA/AAS-310, met with Rich Boll, NBAA, to discuss his concerns about the CFR references in the new standardized runway notes. After further discussion and clarification, it was agreed that the current remarks provide the best language to convey the runway restrictions to industry. All actions are complete, and this item is closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

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

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, reported that Flight Standards has been actively working through the criteria and form changes needed to implement this change.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reminded the audience that at the last ACM, NGA asked whether circling restrictions could be shown in the simplified sketch if the IAP Chart Modernization initiative moves forward. Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, agreed that Terminal Charting would consider that, depending on the status of that initiative.

STATUS: OPEN

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, reported that he plans to publish a Notice to [FAA Order 8260.19](#) in Fall 2026. The Notice will state that all prohibited areas will be charted and will no longer need to be specifically requested on the procedure source document. If other airspace is requested for charting, a waiver to Flight Standards policy will be required. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, added that the Charting Group will work on an Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Specification change to require charting of prohibited areas.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, will report on the 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, reported that he plans to publish a Notice to [FAA Order 8260.19](#) in Fall 2026. The Notice will state that special conservation areas and marine sanctuary areas will not be specifically requested for charting on the procedure source document unless a waiver to the Flight Standards policy is granted.

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, reported that internal FAA discussions have taken place since the last ACM. She acknowledged industry concerns regarding published procedure amendment effective dates and explained that the FAA continues to research potential solutions. There was internal agreement to implement recommendation #2 from the original [RD 23-02-382](#) to update pilot guidance to reflect the current definition and use of the procedure amendment effective date. Joel Dickinson, FAA/AFS-410, is working on the [Aeronautical Information Manual \(AIM\)](#) changes and plans to collaborate with Rich Boll, NBAA, on the update.

Joel stated that the intent of the AIM update is to remove language related to the use of an expired database and clarify that pilots are expected to operate with a current navigation database.

Rich expressed his dissatisfaction with the decision and requested that a note be added to the original [RD 07-02-198](#), indicating that it was not implemented as intended.

Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen, explained that Jeppesen analyzes changes to every amended procedure and only updates the procedure amendment effective date when a change affects coding. They plan to continue this practice. As a result, the procedure amendment date may differ between FAA charts and Jeppesen charts.

John Collins, Jeppesen ForeFlight, said he does not see the risk and objects to removing the database verification language from the AIM. He said stating that “pilots are expected to fly with a current database” is too rigid. He added that the flight manual supplement states that pilots may use an expired database as long as they can verify that the data being used is current. Joel asked John to share that reference with him.

Rich emphasized that industry does not want to lose the ability to use an expired database when the procedure amendment date has not changed.

Jennifer said an update on the proposed AIM language will be provided at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Joel Dickinson, FAA/AFS-410, will report on updates to the AIM language regarding procedure amendment effective dates.

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

Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, reminded the audience that Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, addressed this topic during his [Aeronautical Data Update](#) briefing earlier in the meeting. Brian said this item is a priority and is on the list of future changes to NASR following the technical refresh.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, will report back on the Aeronautical Data Team’s investigation into adding the additional data elements to the NASR CSV files.

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

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, informed the audience that although the initiative did not meet the March 2026 target date, the FAA will begin providing FAA Form 8260-9 on the Navigation Database Resource (NDBR) tab of

the [Instrument Flight Procedures Information Gateway](#) starting in May 2026. He explained that FAA Form 8260-2 will not be included because it is already available on another FAA website.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked whether .kmz files will be included on the NDBR. Pat said they will not be included in May but that the FAA is working on that request. He added that .kmz files for specific locations can be requested if needed.

Steve Madigan, Garmin, asked whether waivers and other materials included in the coordination package would also be provided. Pat replied that the FAA does not plan to include waivers and initially intends to provide only the 8260-9 forms to determine whether that addresses most concerns. He suggested keeping the item open for discussion at the next ACM to assess how this approach works.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, asked Steve whether the request applies only to Instrument Approach Procedures. Steve replied that it applies to all terminal procedures posted on the IFP Coordination site. Dan then asked whether waivers are included in the package posted on the IFP Coordination site. Steve said they are included there but are not available permanently. Dan asked to be included, along with Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, in any future discussions.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, will report on progress toward providing 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 charting weather camera locations on VFR Sectional and Helicopter Route Charts was implemented for the 19 March 2026 publication date. Jennifer presented [examples](#) of the weather camera symbols. An IAC specification change to remove the redundant weather camera location information from the Alaska Chart Supplement was also implemented for the 19 March 2026 publication date.

All actions are complete, and this item is now closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that the FAA held internal discussions to determine the best path forward. The group decided the most workable solution is to expand the Minimum Operational Network (MON) Airport List in the back of the Chart Supplement. A new column would be added to identify the procedure(s) that make each airport MON qualified.

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, added that this data is stored in SIAP rather than in NASR. Because this would be a new data source for his team, time will be needed to modify the automation. His tentative timeline is to complete development, testing, and implementation by July, with full deployment planned for October.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said a notice to airmen (NOTAM) solution is still needed for short-term navigational aid (NAVAID) outages. John Collins, Jeppesen ForeFlight, agreed and said the Chart Supplement solution is helpful for long-term outages, but pilots also need to know in real time whether an airport is available for MON use.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, asked which office is responsible for maintaining the VOR MON Airport list. Jennifer replied that the VOR MON Program Office currently maintains the list, but the program will be sunset this summer. Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, informed the group that responsibility is moving to FAA Technical Operations. Alex Rushton, FAA/AJV-A313, recommended a VOR MON sunset briefing at the next ACM.

Rich noted that if Technical Operations becomes the responsible office, it should establish a NOTAM mechanism to relate the VOR facility outages to the affected MON airports. He suggested the issue be brought to Technical Operations.

Jennifer clarified that the proposed Chart Supplement list would be static and would not change based on NOTAMs. She suggested holding a meeting with the VOR MON office, Technical Operations, John Warner, Rich Boll, John Collins, and Matt Fisher to discuss the possibility of a NOTAM-based solution.

Matt Tucker, ESA FPT Support, noted that any change would also require training for air traffic control (ATC) facilities. Matt Fisher, NATCA, added that ATC checks NOTAMs three times a day and relies on Technical Operations to notify them when a VOR goes out of service. He supports the Chart Supplement solution but said it may be more useful to add the information to the Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD) entry rather than as a list in the back.

Gary Fiske, AJV-P310, reminded the group of the [2024 ACM discussion](#) and suggested the issue may be getting over-analyzed. He said this is primarily a pilot issue, not a controller issue, and that ATC will do what is necessary to get aircraft safely on the ground.

John Collins, Jeppesen ForeFlight, noted that the information located in the back of the Chart Supplement is not easily accessible in electronic flight bags (EFBs). He supported the earlier suggestion to add the MON procedures to the A/FD entry next to the MON designation, since that information is more accessible to pilots. Odie said he will take that suggestion back for consideration.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, will report on progress toward expanding the MON Airport List in the back of the Chart Supplement and will investigate adding this information to A/FD entries.

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, will report on discussions regarding the use of NOTAMs to alert pilots when an airport is no longer MON-qualified.

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, opened the item by informing the audience that this item was taken back to the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) for discussion. The group acknowledged broader concern about the added complexity of redesigned Class C airspace. That aspect of the issue was determined to be outside the scope of the ACM and will need to be addressed through another venue. However, many in the group supported the request to chart the nonstandard radial distances. The Visual Charting Team was asked to create prototypes to evaluate the feasibility of this recommendation and its impact on chart congestion.

Nathan Carafelli, FAA/AJV-A214, presented several [prototypes](#). Option 1 adds radial distances for Class B and C airspace on the Sectional Charts ([Slides 2-4](#)). He noted that while the text can fit in these instances, it clearly shows the resulting chart congestion. Option 2 adds a Class C radial distance graphic in the chart margin ([Slide 6](#)). Nathan said the effectiveness of this solution depends on how many directional Class Cs are added in the future. Option 3 adds a boxed note that directs users to [FAA Order 7400.11](#), *Airspace Designations and*

Reporting Points, which contains the airspace descriptions ([Slide 7](#)). Nathan explained that the best solution will depend on how widely directional Class C airspace is implemented.

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, said [FAA Order 7400.2](#), *Procedures for Handling Airspace Matters*, was recently rewritten to allow more flexibility in airspace design. While no specific number is known, the framework now allows for more directional Class C airspace.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked whether the radial distance graphic would also be implemented for Class B airspace. Nathan said no because radial distances for Class B are already shown on the Terminal Area Charts (TACs).

Matt Fisher, NATCA, said he prefers Option 2 for printed charts. In response to concerns about chart congestion, he asked whether third-party chart providers could add this information as a data layer. Steve Madigan, Garmin, said this could be added as a data layer for the electronic flight bag (EFB). He also agreed that Option 2 is the best solution.

John Barry, FAA/AIR-626B, said Option 2 appears to be the most practical for pilots. He suggested that when Class C airspace is shown on the TAC, consideration should be given for depicting the radial distances there as well. He also suggested that the reference point for the radial distance be shown on the graphic. Nathan said the reference point is typically based on the airport, and the Team can investigate adding that to the graphic.

Jim McClay, AOPA, also expressed support for Option 2. He noted that this may serve as an interim solution until charts become fully digital and the information can be provided as a data layer.

Bill de Groh, Allied Pilots Association, said Option 2 is the best of the presented options, but questioned whether the change is necessary because distances can already be measured on the chart.

Rune Duke, FAA/AFS-420, noted that some of the Class Cs have irregular shapes that do not correspond to a single radial distance. Nathan replied that the distances provided in the airspace description will be charted.

There was general agreement that Option 2 is the preferred approach. Nathan thanked the group for their feedback.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Nathan Carafelli, FAA/AJV-A214, will report on progress in documenting the Class C airspace radial distances on VFR charts.

[25-01-398 Charting of Non-Standard CPDLC Logon Information](#)

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, informed the audience that the Aeronautical Data Team (ADT) met with Rich Boll, the FAA's Data Communications Office, and Enroute Charting. He said there is not much to report yet, but the options presented at the last meeting are being discussed with the various facilities. He expects to provide a more comprehensive update at the Fall ACM.

Rich Boll, NBAA, thanked Brian for his work and noted that, in addition to the nonstandard areas presented at the last ACM, another area in the MIA oceanic area has been identified. He said this work is ongoing.

STATUS: OPEN

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

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, opened the item by informing the audience that this item was taken back to the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) for discussion. The group determined that the criteria needs to be clarified so the requirements for requesting communications are clear for the facilities that are responsible for procedure design.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, added that the goal is to give air traffic control (ATC) facilities the flexibility they need while strengthening the criteria language, so expectations are clear. He said that when the new criteria are published and Flight Standards briefs the changes in the field, they will place special emphasis on this topic to ensure that facilities evaluate which communications are necessary rather than simply carrying forward communications that were requested in the past. Flight Standards approval will be required to chart any additional communications.

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked Dan if this solution would resolve the issue. Dan is confident that it will. Jennifer suggested that the item be closed, and Rich agreed.

STATUS: CLOSED

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that this item received support at the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) and referred the audience to the [Aeronautical Data Update](#) briefing presented earlier by Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310. During that briefing, Brian stated that a path forward has been identified and the data is planned for release in the CSV subscriber files, with a target effective date of September 3, 2026. He said he expects to report that all actions have been completed at the next ACM.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, will report on the publication of ATCAA Boundary information in the NASR subscriber files.

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that this item did not receive support from the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG). The group determined that there is not a sufficient safety case for expanding the notes into plain language. The plan is to continue using the contractions order, [FAA Order 7340.2](#), *Contractions*.

Jennifer added that the FAA Office of Airports plans to release an AI tool this summer to assist submitters of airport data in applying the correct contractions based on the order. Third-party providers should be able to use the order to translate airport remarks into plain language if that is what their users prefer.

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, added that his team conducted tests using the AI Tool, and the results were encouraging. He said the tool performed well, translating contracted text into plain language.

Jennifer informed the audience that this item is now closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, discussed this topic during his [Chart Supplement Data Product XML](#) briefing presented earlier. The proposed solution is to publish an additional XML file that captures the data points in the Airport/Facility Directory section of the Chart Supplement, allowing users to compare them to the previous edition to identify changes.

Jennifer said this item will remain open for further tracking.

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](#)

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that this item received support at the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG). The group agreed that the instances identified by Garmin should be investigated and resolved. There was also an acknowledgement of a broader issue involving a gap in the communication regarding the status of these facilities.

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, reported that the Aeronautical Data Team (ADT) has been working with FAA Technical Operations to review the list of unused marker beacons identified by Garmin. John Johnson, FAA/AJV-A313, said they discovered that most of the instances were errors in NASR, and those are being corrected. A few were military facilities that remain in use. There are also four facilities that are still operational but are no longer used on any procedures. Brian stated that the ADT is continuing to work through the list and expects to provide a more comprehensive report at the next ACM.

Dan Wacker, FAA/AFS-420, said he would like to review the list to better understand where and how these marker beacons are used.

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.

[25-02-406 VOR Checkpoints in Chart Supplement](#)

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, explained that at the last ACM, he reported that the Chart Supplement Team conducted an assessment of the request to add VOR receiver checkpoint information to the Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD) entries. He noted that VOR test facilities (VOT), which are listed in the same associated data section in the back of the Chart Supplement, are already included in the A/FD entries. Those entries contain only the VOT frequency. It was also discussed at the last ACM that this information is easily retrieved from the NASR subscriber files. Odie said his team could consider implementing the addition of the VOR receiver checkpoints, but he first wanted to reach out to the proponent to determine whether a digital solution would satisfy this request.

Odie reported that he reached out to Mr. Sandvig, the proponent of the recommendation, but did not receive a response. He then asked the ACM audience whether there is broader support for including this information in the A/FD.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, added that there was limited feedback at ACM 25-02, so the item was brought back to determine whether others support the recommendation. Jennifer presented an [example](#) showing where VOT information currently appears in the A/FD entry, along with an example of the VOR Receiver Checkpoints and VOR Test Facilities table from the back of the Chart Supplement.

Rich Boll, NBAA, said it makes sense to keep all related information in the same place and that the recommendation is an appropriate solution. He added that if additional sponsorship is needed, NBAA is willing to sponsor the recommendation.

Mike Stromberg, UPS, agreed that keeping the information together would be beneficial.

Jennifer thanked Mike and Rich for their feedback and said the Chart Supplement Team will continue to investigate the request and plans to present a prototype at the next meeting.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A241, will continue to investigate the request to add VOR receiver checkpoints to the A/FD entries and plans to present a prototype at the next ACM.

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

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, opened the item by informing the audience that the consensus of the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) was similar to the feedback provided when the recommendation was introduced at ACM 25-02. There is not a large population of these procedures, and no indication that their use will significantly increase. Therefore, the group determined that consideration should be given to the level of effort required to create a new category of procedures and develop criteria for something that already has a publication option in the Chart Supplement. Jennifer emphasized that these are VFR procedures that are initiated and generated at the local facility level, and there is currently no criteria or design specification governing them. While the ARRG agreed that these procedures could benefit from standardization, related work is already occurring outside of the ACM. Additionally, if air traffic control (ATC) determines that standards are needed, the initiative would need to come from ATC because that work falls outside the ACM's scope. As a result, the ARRG determined that this recommendation will not be accepted for work at the ACM.

Brian Eliot, SQL, said he disagrees and believes the number of these procedures continue to grow. He stated that he plans to pursue the recommendations through another avenue.

Bruce Williams, CFI, added that in the Seattle area, they are already working with ATC on these issues. He also expressed disagreement with closing this item at the ACM.

Rich Boll, NBAA, agreed with Brian that more of these procedures are being observed. He said the issue is being discussed in other groups, including a similar proposal being discussed in the PARC NAV Workgroup. Rich expressed support for the ARRG decision but noted that, depending on the outcome of discussions in other groups, the topic may return to the ACM in the future.

Jennifer noted that all input will be documented in the ACM minutes and stated that the item is 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 26-02 is scheduled for September 21-23, 2026.

IX. [Attendance Roster](#)