Government/Industry Aeronautical Charting Meeting (ACM)
Meeting 26-02
Charting Group
September 21-22, 2026

CHARTING GROUP MINUTES

I. Opening Remarks

FAA, Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) hosted the Charting Group Portion of the ACM on September 21-22, 2026. Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A213, opened the meeting on Monday, 21 September. 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.

Rune then provided a brief update on the ongoing FAA Organizational Realignment supporting the FAA Administrator's "Flight Plan 2026." He stated that the agency-wide strategy aligns with organizational modernization, safety management, and operational efficiency initiatives.

II. Review Minutes of Last Meeting, ACM 26-01

The minutes from the ACM 26-01 meeting were distributed electronically via the AIS ACM website and were accepted as submitted with no changes or corrections.

III. Agenda Approval

The agenda for the 26-02 meeting was accepted as presented.

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

FAA's Aeronautical Charting Program

Nate Rahn, FAA/AJV-A2, provided a presentation on the Aeronautical Charting Program's modernization initiatives, reviewing progress to date and outlining priorities for the coming year. He discussed the ongoing transition of core charting products from paper-based products to data-centric services (Slide 3) and noted continued progress on current development initiatives (Slides 4-7). He then outlined the program's key priorities for 2027 which include finalizing a data-driven VFR Sectional prototype, developing a data-centric Terminal Chart prototype, and delivering a digital version of the Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD) portion of the Chart Supplement.

Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, asked about efforts to transition VFR charts to digital formats, specifically whether the FAA plans to recreate the charts as they currently exist or introduce design changes. Nate clarified that the goal is to replicate the existing chart depictions as closely as possible using new datasets. He noted that minor adjustments may be necessary during data integration, but no major changes are planned.

Nate invited anyone interested in participating in discussions 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

Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, provided a briefing on behalf of the Aeronautical Data Team (ADT). He reported that the technical refresh for the National Airspace System Resource (NASR) system has been completed. Following NASR Release 10.1, five enhancements were published, and ADT hopes to maintain a schedule of regular quarterly releases moving forward. Tom reminded stakeholders that test CSV files and Data Product Notices will continue to be issued between March and April as users transition away from legacy text files. The final release of TXT-formatted Subscriber Files is scheduled for December 2026, and TXT files will be officially sunset on February 18, 2027. He noted that ERAM is the only system remaining to complete readiness and encouraged users to review the published Legacy TXT to CSV Mapping Documents online.

Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, confirmed that Garmin is on schedule to convert from TXT to CSV ahead of the final TXT release.

Tom then provided updates on outstanding ACM items 20-02-348 (NASR Improvements for ARTCC/RCAG Frequencies) and 23-02-384 (Improvements to NASR CSVs). Both items remain on the priority list, but a specific build has not yet been scheduled. Regarding item 23-02-384, Tom's team is working on a short-term solution for providing fix use data. They are investigating providing a CSV of the Fix Use and ESV data that are in IFP/FIX. Since IFP/FIX does not contain any active fixes that are only utilized on special procedures, by the Military, or as ATC Coordination Fixes, the list will be limited. He asked the audience if this list would be useful. Steven Madigan, Garmin, expressed interest in obtaining the CSVs for fix use data.

Regarding item 25-01-400 (Publish ATCAA Boundaries), ATCAA boundary data has been extracted from ERAM and published as CSV Files on the Aeronautical Data website (Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace Boundaries (ATCAA)).

Additionally, in response to a military request, Slow Routes will be published starting in the October cycle on the ADDS and UDDF sites to assist the unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) community.

Chart Supplement Data Product XML

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A223, provided a presentation updating the status of the Chart Supplement Data Product XML initiative. He reviewed the historical background and challenges associated with extracting data from the Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD) section (Slides 2–3) and outlined current limitations and opportunities for future enhancements (Slides 4–5). Odie presented the architecture, data structures, and digital transition model (Slides 6–8), noting that the core objective is to deliver machine-readable data to developers while keeping user feedback central to the process (Slides 9–11).

Odie highlighted major milestones, including the successful formation of the working group, where 34 out of 37 recommendations were implemented (Slide 12). He detailed the new relational data model and structural changes (Slides 13–14), explaining that over 6,000 airports will be contained in a single XML delivery. To maintain relational links, elements such as Land and Hold Short Operations (LAHSO) and A/FD remarks have been organized using distinct reference keys and nodes (Slides 14–18). Odie concluded by announcing that a full functional prototype covering over 6,000 airports will be released for external comment (Slide 19).

Ray Lewandowski, FAA/TCAU1-ZAU, asked how closely the custom XML schema aligns with AIXM. Odie explained that AIXM's size poses performance challenges for this specific application, which would require custom extensions, but noted that future iterations aim to be fully AIXM-compliant.

Rich Boll, NBAA, inquired whether previous ACM requests, such as recommendation 21-01-353 regarding the consolidation of airport and runway lighting in the A/FD section, could be incorporated into the new XML structure. Odie clarified that this initiative only extracts existing A/FD data as currently formatted without altering its underlying location or structure.

Michael Stromberg, UPS, asked about the overall XML file size and how graphic elements and Airport Diagrams within the Chart Supplement will be handled. Odie stated that each airport entry averages 800 to 1,000 lines of code across 6,000 airports. He emphasized that the project strictly focuses on the A/FD textual data and does not include information found in the back of the Chart Supplement, sketches, or airport diagrams.

Steven Madigan, Garmin, asked whether the XML product could be released on a 28-day update interval rather than the standard 56-day cycle, and suggested adding change flags at the individual airport level rather than solely at the document level. Odie responded that a 28-day interval is technically feasible, but operational synchronization with AIRAC effective dates requires further study. He welcomed feedback on adding change flags per airport.

Mark Mentovai, Manhattan Flight Club, expressed appreciation for the progress made based on stakeholder input and supported the idea of incorporating airport-level change flags.

Updated Hold Line Symbols

Joshua Ivy, FAA/AAS-310, briefed on an Interagency Air Committee (IAC) Recommendation Document (RD) in progress to update and standardize airport hold line symbols. He explained that current chart symbols do not align with physical markings on the field and noted that seven Aviation Safety Reporting System (ASRS) reports identified symbol confusion contributing to unauthorized taxiway access. He presented examples aimed at improving consistency across Airport Diagrams.
Mark Mentovai, Manhattan Flight Club, cautioned regarding spacing requirements in sample figures, noting that taxiway labels placed too close to symbols could be mistaken for hold lines, and recommended ensuring taxiway text is clearly separated from symbology.

Craig Boxrucker, ALPA, expressed concern over adding excessive hold line symbology to Airport Diagrams and asked whether additional operational data was being evaluated alongside the graphics. Joshua clarified that the effort focuses strictly on updating symbol graphics.

Steven Madigan, Garmin, raised concerns regarding non-LAHSO hold short lines on runways, citing locations such as Atlantic City (KACY) and Worthington (KOTG) where ATC holds traffic at lines with two solid and one dashed mark, causing confusion with standard LAHSO markings. He noted this impacts Garmin Safe Taxi products and estimated at least 50 such locations exist across the NAS. Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, requested that Steven compile a list of affected facilities and forward it to Joshua Ivy, and the Aeronautical Data Team.

Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed strong concern regarding hold short lines placed on runways. He said this violates FAA policy and creates a significant safety hazard by encouraging the use of runways as taxiways. He urged the FAA Office of Airports to coordinate with regional offices to ensure improper markings are removed. Joshua agreed that taxiway hold lines should not be installed on runways unless there is an established operational need or LAHSO requirement.

Stan Davis, FedEx, concurred with Rich, stating that non-standard or excessive runway markings contribute to cockpit confusion.

Paul Hannah, PDCAero, suggested some markings may originate from temporary events like air shows, to which Rich responded that temporary markings should be completely removed once events conclude.

Removal of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Data

Mark Wilson, FAA/AJV-A210, provided a presentation on the planned removal of Customs and Border Protection (CBP) data from FAA products. He explained that because CBP data originates outside the FAA, the agency is establishing a policy to exclude this data from the authoritative source database and charting products by Spring 2027, with formal Data Product Notices scheduled prior to implementation. Mark detailed the specific removals (Slides 4–7), which include deleting Airport of Entry (AOE), Landing Rights Airport (LRA), and User Fee Airport designations from Visual charts and the Chart Supplement. Pilots and planners will be directed to obtain official, up-to-date customs information directly from the CBP website.

Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, asked how the fields will be handled in CSV Subscriber Files. Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, clarified that in the short term, the fields will remain but be populated with null values, with complete field removal planned for a later phase. John Johnson, FAA/AJV-A313, added that setting fields to blank/null is preferred for system compatibility.

Alex Rushton, FAA/AJV-A313, explained that CBP data is not updated according to the 56-day AIRAC cycle, and no formal data-sharing agreement exists between the agencies to support synchronized releases. Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, added that this policy aligns with recent changes to the U.S. Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP), which removed CBP lists and replaced them with direct web links. Alex noted that facility remarks submitted directly by airport managers will remain published.

Joshua Ivy, FAA/AAS-310, noted that the Office of Airports utilizes this data for Safety Management System (SMS) requirements and requested advance notification before data fields are modified, which Alex confirmed would be provided via Data Product Notices.

Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that while the data was convenient for initial flight planning, pilots frequently verify customs details directly with CBP. He noted NBAA has no objections to the change, though he suggested CBP's public files could be improved by adding direct telephone contact numbers. Jim McClay, Vertical Aviation

International (VAI), concurred, stating that as long as EFB providers can ingest CBP's CSV data, the impact on pilots will be minimal.

Bill de Groh, Allied Pilots Association (APA), asked how this change might impact in-flight international diversions. Alex noted that crews rely on EFBs and official CBP resources during planning, with Rich adding that pilot training courses emphasize verifying international entry procedures through primary CBP sources.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, concluded the topic by stating that a follow-up briefing will be provided at the April ACM meeting.

V. New Charting Topics

26-02-414 Out of Service VORs

Eric Leuty, FAAST, submitted a recommendation requesting that charting remove the frequency from NAVAIDs that are out of service and not expected to return to service prior to formal decommissioning. He was not in attendance at the ACM, so Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, explained his concerns regarding current depictions of out-of-service NAVAIDs on VFR and Enroute charts and how that can be misleading to pilots.

Jennifer outlined the current operational process, explaining that when FAA Technical Operations plans to decommission a NAVAID, they notify the Aeronautical Data Team (ADT). ADT updates the facility status in NASR to "shutdown," and as a result, the Enroute and Visual Charting teams add hash marks across the NAVAID frequency to denote the shutdown status. Jennifer noted that while this process addresses the proponent's intent, when she spoke with him prior to the ACM, he expressed continued concerns regarding delays in Tech Ops notifying ADT and getting status changes reflected on charts in a timely manner.

John Johnson, FAA/AJV-A313, explained that decommissioning a NAVAID is a complex multi-year regulatory and administrative process. In the interim, a facility's status can be changed to "shutdown" which results in hash marks charted on the NAVAID frequency during the decommissioning process. He noted potential process gaps and lag times between Permanent (PERM) NOTAM issuance, Service Center actions, and ADT notification, emphasizing the need to close the loop with Technical Operations and Regional Service Centers.

Rich Boll, NBAA, suggested removing frequencies from out-of-service facilities, noting that frequency hashmarks do not always stand out clearly to pilots. Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, agreed that removing the frequency would improve clarity and asked whether secondary elements like Morse code or the NAVAID channel could also be removed. Luca Dalton, CSEL, questioned why facilities subject to long-term permanent NOTAMs and pending decommissioning are retained on charts with full symbology during intermediate steps, noting it creates unnecessary chart clutter.

Art Griffenkranz, FAA/AJV-E240, explained that NAVAIDs cannot legally be removed or have their published frequencies removed from charts without formal Part 71/P2 airspace rulemaking because existing airways and instrument procedures remain legally tied to them. He emphasized that from initial shutdown to final decommissioning typically takes three years or longer due to procedural, legal, and environmental requirements.

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, noted that even during extended shutdowns, NAVAIDs continue to serve as GPS waypoints, maintain underlying FAA Form 8260-2 dependencies, or retain associated TACAN/DME components. Vince Massimini, TetraTech, and Trent Page, FAA/AIR-626B, discussed TACAN and DME retention, highlighting complex facility configurations like Newark where associated DME/TACAN channels remain operational even if the VOR element is out of service.

Matt Fisher, NATCA, noted that repairing or formally decommissioning equipment takes significant time during which facilities must remain published to support the airspace system until all dependencies are removed.

Lynette Jamison, FAA/ASG-140, and John Warner, FAA/AJV-P130, discussed NOTAM duration limits, noting that temporary NOTAMs are restricted to 90 days under ICAO standards, which leads to long-standing PERM NOTAMs.

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 27-01.

26-02-415 Inconsistent TAA Geometries

Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, presented a recommendation regarding the depiction of Terminal Arrival Areas (TAAs) on Instrument Approach Procedure (IAP) charts. He explained that current TAA charting depictions can be geometrically misleading to pilots. Using KBTV ILS or LOC 15 as an example, when flying outbound on the localizer towards STAEV, the visual representation of the TAA arcs can make aircraft appear to be within a 5 NM sector when they are actually outside that distance. He said the overall depiction inconsistencies create challenges for dynamic-driven chart renderings and pilot situational awareness. Bill referenced relevant AIM guidance and a tangential NTSB case where TAA geometry was involved (though not cited as a proximate cause, see NTSB ANC13FA030), emphasizing the safety need for clear, geometrically consistent guidance. He estimated perhaps 10 procedures across the NAS exhibit this specific issue and was asked by FAA Kevin Keszler FAA/AFS-420 to provide a full list.

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, presented a prototype showing an adjusted TAA depiction.

Rich Boll, NBAA, noted that TAA arc depictions are historically centered around the IAF/IF fixes, describing the example provided as a charting quirk highlighted by dynamic digital charting. He acknowledged the potential for pilot confusion but noted that addressing altitude and clearing issues involves air traffic control policy and procedure design criteria.

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, explained that historical procedure design criteria in FAA Order 8260.19 were not always explicit regarding TAA arc construction when initial approach fixes offset the standard TAA geometry. He noted that revising criteria to mandate dual 180° TAAs would require significant redesign effort.

Matt Fisher, NATCA, said the prototype resolves the issue from a TERPS perspective, but operational challenges remain from an ATC standpoint. He explained that controllers cannot clear aircraft into certain segments of that airspace due to Air Traffic policy limitations when 90-degree turns and intermediate IAFs complicate the sector. He emphasized that TAAs should run 180° to be fully usable for air traffic vectoring.

Luca Bencini-Tibo, ATP/CFI, commented that TAAs serve a purpose similar to Minimum Sector Altitudes (MSAs) for terrain clearance.

Mark Mentovai, Manhattan Flight Club, noted that procedure revisions made in January 2026 did not invalidate existing 10–11 NM buffers and asked how widespread the issue was. Bill said Garmin can provide a list of charts with problematic TAA geometries.

Jeff Rawdon, FAA/AFS-420, noted that current FAA charting criteria for TAAs remain consistent with ICAO PANS-OPS standards. Weslee Combs, FAA/AFS-420, added that procedure modeling in TARGETS generates TAA boundary graphics that closely match current FAA chart depictions.

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 27-01.

26-02-416 STAR Runway Language

Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, presented a recommendation to amend the textual route descriptions on Standard Terminal Arrival (STAR) charts. He proposed changing the standard phrasing from "Landing Runway XX" to "Approach(es) for Runway XX". Bill explained that this change would clarify to pilots that the text describes the orientation of the approach transition rather than restricting aircraft solely to that specific runway for landing. Updating this language would require revisions to criteria in FAA Order 8260.19.

Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed skepticism, stating that he does not see significant value in altering the established phrasing. He noted that changing the standard wording could create pilot confusion and highlighted that not all STARs terminate directly into an instrument approach.

Craig Boxrucker, ALPA, agreed with Rich, stating that the proposed revision is not worth the implementation effort and could introduce unnecessary confusion in the cockpit.

Jeff Rawdon, FAA/AFS-420, explained that adopting the recommendation would require a lengthy process of updating criteria and revising published procedures. He noted that while such efforts are justified for safety concerns, this issue does not present a safety case.

Luca Dalton, CSEL, supported the proposal, noting that the revised phrasing could provide helpful clarity by making it clearer to flight crews that other runways might be assigned.

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, raised the topic of sidestep procedures and said these clearances are issued by air traffic control. He asked whether removing the "L" or "R" designators might address the problem. Stan Davis, FedEx, noted that many STARs across the NAS already reference more than one runway. He voted against making any changes to current charting standards.

Matt Fisher, NATCA, stated that the specific example cited on the ZOMBZ arrival appears to be a localized procedure design issue rather than a system-wide charting issue. He agreed with the prior comments and recommended no change to current standards.

Post-ACM: Dr. Bill Tuccio agreed to closure of this item due to lack of ACM support for the recommended changes.

STATUS: CLOSED

26-02-417 IAP Missed Approach Icons

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, presented a recommendation regarding the depiction of missed approach icons on Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs) in the Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP). She explained that while the original intent under the VOLPE format transition was to show up to four icons to represent the initial "up and out" phase, current FAA charting practice shows all missed approach waypoints where space permits. In contrast, NGA limits missed approach icons to four. Krystle provided prototype examples. She questioned whether additional icons would add unnecessary chart clutter, noting that missed approach information already appears in three locations: text in the briefing strip, graphics in the planview, and icons in the profile view.

Kevin "Timbo" Carter, NGA, confirmed that NGA charts limit missed approach icons to four, explaining that icons were never intended to depict the full missed approach procedure. He noted that for RNAV procedures, all waypoints are fully detailed in the Planview and/or inset, and on conventional procedures the missed approach tracks are typically shorter.

Steve Madigan, Garmin, raised concern that limiting icons without pilot outreach or training could lead flight crews to incorrectly assume a missed approach ends after the fourth icon. Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, and Craig Boxrucker, ALPA, noted that pilots need a way to double check the missed approach information that is contained in the planview. Mark Mentovai, Manhattan Flight Club, agreed, noting that missed approach icons are actively read by pilots to verify the missed approach, particularly when the text in the briefing strip does not contain all the steps.

Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, supported reducing the icons to four, provided all underlying waypoints remain fully clear and verifiable in the Planview.

Rich Boll, NBAA, supported simplifying charts to reduce clutter, but emphasized that extra icons can provide significant value on complex conventional approach procedures. He suggested maintaining flexibility for conventional procedures while streamlining RNAV depictions. He also suggested adding more details to the missed approach inset box when that is used in the planview to ensure the connection to and from the inset is clear to pilots.

Jeff Rawdon, FAA/AFS-420, noted that ICAO Annex 4 contains no requirement for missed approach icons and emphasized that any policy change must be accompanied by AIM updates and charting notices.

Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen, stated that the textual missed approach instructions remain the primary regulatory authority. Aaron noted that Jeppesen handles complex procedures by adding cross-references such as "Refer to RNAV route" within icon boxes.

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 27-01.

VI. Outstanding Charting Topics

18-02-327 IAP Chart Layout

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, reported that the proposed expanded inoperative components table will be discussed in detail during the Instrument Procedures Group (IPG) meeting. He displayed IAP chart prototypes of the proposed format changes without the incorporation of non-standard inoperative minimums.

Rich Boll, NBAA, reviewed the history and current goals of the proposal. He emphasized that even though the non-standard inoperative minimums will no longer be added to the chart, adopting the simplified airport sketch and expanding the profile view and minima table creates critical real estate on the planview and profile, particularly for complex procedures. He suggested that with additional space, the decision to remove the parenthetical statute mile visibility from the military minimums could be reconsidered.

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, reported that a Safety Risk Management (SRM) Safety Management System (SMS) process was completed for these layout changes and resulted in no identified safety hazards, therefore she does not recommend revisiting those changes. She and Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223 emphasized that implementing the layout changes across all IAP charts remains a massive undertaking that will take years to complete.

Mark Mentovai, Manhattan Flight Club, asked whether the changes provide sufficient benefit to justify the time and workload needed and expressed concern over maintaining dual charting specifications during a prolonged transition.

Kevin "Timbo" Carter, NGA, expressed continued support for the layout changes and said the simplified airport sketch reduces long-term maintenance burdens for charting teams. He said he also sees no reason to revert to showing the repeated statute mile visibility in the military minimums.

Jennifer suggested renaming this initiative to "IAP Layout Changes" rather than "Chart Modernization" to prevent confusion with the upcoming Terminal Charting modernization workgroup. There were no objections to the name change. Jennifer stated that future steps will need to align with any decisions that may come out of the planned Terminal Charting modernization working group.

STATUS: OPEN

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

Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, addressed this topic during the Aeronautical Data Update briefing earlier in the meeting. The recommended changes remain on the priority list for a future NASR change but have not yet been scheduled.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, will report on the status of the request to improve the databasing of ARTCC frequencies in NASR.

21-02-362 Graphic Circling Restrictions on IAPs

Vic Naso, FAA/AFS-420, briefed on the evolving approach to address complex circling restriction notes on Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs). Before going down the road of providing graphic circling restrictions, Flight Standards and Aeronautical Information Services have developed a three-phase plan to address the complex circling restriction notes.

- **Phase 1 (Target Completion: February 18, 2027):** Review and correct current notes on existing procedures so they accurately reflect criteria and maintain consistency across airports.
- **Phase 2:** Recalculate remaining "complex" notes (approximately 40 to 50 procedures across the NAS) and coordinate with the proponent of this issue to determine if the original issue has been resolved.
- **Phase 3:** Update the Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) with clear examples and explanatory guidance to clarify the interpretation of complex restriction notes.

Vic displayed the prototype circling restriction graphics but emphasized that the immediate strategy is to clean up textual notes and AIM guidance before considering a graphic portrayal. If successful, this revised plan would avoid the extensive criteria and form changes required to implement graphic circling restrictions.

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, added that AIS is adopting a "whole airport concept" to ensure circling notes match across all procedures serving a facility. He noted that cleaning up the notes will avoid requiring new flight inspections.

Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, asked if adding a dedicated, to-scale chart page was considered, noting that non-scale graphics might create ambiguity. He provided an example of a graphic circling restriction page that Garmin provides.

Paul Hannah, PDCAero, asked how a NOTAM could be written to a graphic circling restriction. Pat said it would use text to describe the change like how a NOTAM is written for an MSA.

Rich Boll, NBAA, supported standardizing the text but reiterated that a graphic depiction remains the preferred long-term solution. Circling restriction graphics align with ICAO standards and prevent accidents caused by misinterpreting complex notes. Vic affirmed that graphic depictions remain an option if textual updates prove insufficient.

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, noted that correcting the 40 to 50 problem procedures and updating the AIM provides the fastest solution for pilots. John Collins, Jeppesen ForeFlight, emphasized that standardized note phrasing is critical for digital platforms that parse text to generate dynamic chart displays.

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, agreed and emphasized that the primary focus remains successfully executing Phase 1 to clean up published notes.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Victor Naso, FAA/AFS-420, will report on progress updating currently charted circling restriction notes.

22-01-368 Special Use Airspace on IAPs

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, reported that the waiver memo to Special Use Airspace (SUA) and other airspace area depiction requests on instrument flight procedure 8260-Series Forms is now effective. The upcoming update officially removes the requirements to chart these areas from FAA Orders 8260.19 and 8260.46 criteria. Under the new policy, all prohibited areas will automatically be charted on terminal procedures, while other

SUAs, such as MOAs and Restricted Areas will no longer be specifically requested on procedure source forms. These areas will be removed from terminal charts over time through the procedure amendment process.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, confirmed that an IAC Specification change is in process for the requirement to chart all Prohibited Areas.

Steve Madigan, Garmin, asked whether procedure designers will stop requesting these areas immediately, and Kevin confirmed they will be removed as procedures undergo standard amendments. Steve noted no immediate objections, adding that these airspaces remain fully depicted on VFR products.

Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen, sought clarification on whether source forms would document the request to chart prohibited areas. Jennifer said it will not be on the form but required for charting in the IAC specifications.

Stan Davis, FedEx, expressed concern over removing MOAs and Restricted Areas from approach charts, stating that maintaining situational awareness of surrounding military airspace is beneficial during weather reroutes or airspace congestion. Kevin said ATC will never clear a pilot through those areas when they are active.

Joel Dickinson, FAA/AFS-410, clarified that when operating on an IFR clearance, Prohibited Areas are the only airspace type that pilots are strictly required to avoid independently, as ATC provides separation from active MOAs and Restricted Areas. Matt Fisher, NATCA, agreed with Joel, pointing out that SUAs are currently charted inconsistently across terminal charts, and removing them streamlines the presentation to focus on more critical information.

STATUS: OPEN

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

Kevin Keszler, FAA/AFS-420, reported that the policy waiver memo discussed in item 22-01-368 also covers wildlife, seashore, and similar conservation areas. Under the updated policy, these special conservation areas will no longer be specifically requested for charting on procedure source documents unless a formal waiver is granted. Existing instances currently depicted on instrument approach procedures will be removed as procedures are amended.

All actions related to this RD are complete. This item is now closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

23-02-382 Procedure Amendment Effective Date

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, provided a comprehensive recap regarding the status of procedure amendment effective dates on FAA Terminal Charts. She acknowledged industry dissatisfaction with the outcome of this issue while clarifying the agency's operational position. She explained that, on current charts, the procedure amendment number reflects the most recent amendment to a procedure. The associated procedure effective date reflects the AIRAC cycle date on which the amendment is incorporated into the chart. Changes to the amendment number and effective date indicate revisions to the charted procedure, whether procedural, criteria-based, or both.

Jennifer acknowledged that the original intent of Recommendation Document (RD) 07-02-198 was to allow pilots to use this date to verify navigation database currency. However, because some chart updates can change

the effective date without affecting navigation database coding, that intent has not been met. Although the FAA recognizes that RD 07-02-198 was not implemented as intended, the agency is unable to change its current practice because of several factors previously discussed at the ACM and documented in prior meeting minutes. The agency instead plans to address database currency verification through future data-driven enhancements. Jennifer also noted that an explanatory annotation was added to closed RD 07-02-198 referencing RD 23-02-382.

Joel Dickinson, FAA/AFS-410, reported on planned Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) updates, specifically sections 1-1-17 and 1-2-3, targeted for late 2027. The updates will clarify pilot operational expectations and emphasize that flight crews are expected to maintain a current navigation database.

Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, requested that the AIM update also clarify the purpose of vertical margin dates published on FAA charts.

Rich Boll, NBAA, thanked the FAA for annotating the ACM history and acknowledging the implementation gap. He asked whether Jeppesen plans to revise its practice for documenting procedure amendment effective dates in light of the FAA's decision. Aaron Jacobson, Jeppesen, said the company does not plan to make any changes and will continue updating the procedure date only when database coding changes. He added that Jeppesen may publish a briefing bulletin explaining its chart dates and why they may not align with the dates shown on FAA charts.

Stan Davis, FedEx, and Steven Madigan, Garmin, discussed expectations for future digital databases. Stan suggested adding digital database effective dates. Steven noted Garmin matches FAA chart dates and cycle expirations but said he would like to see the FAA move to on-demand daily digital data updates instead of fixed 56-day AIRAC release cycles.

Jennifer confirmed the item will remain open for an update on proposed changes to the AIM language.

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

Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, provided an update during the Aeronautical Data Update briefing earlier in the meeting.

STATUS: OPEN

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

ACTION: Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, will report back on the Aeronautical Data Team's investigation into providing a subset of the Fix Use and ESV data that are in IFP/FIX.

23-02-385 Perpetual Access to Procedure Packets

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, reported that FAA Form 8260-9 forms have been posted to the Navigation Database Resource (NDBR) website since June 2026. He noted that this effort was specifically scoped to 8260-9 forms, and he proposed closing the item.

Steven Madigan, Garmin, expressed appreciation for making the 8260-9 forms available but asked whether full waiver documents and TARGETS build files could also be included. Pat said the underlying waiver documents are not currently included, though the waiver remark is captured on the 8260-9. He agreed to investigate whether providing the actual waiver files is feasible. He does not think the TARGETS build files can be made available but said he can also investigate that.

Rich Boll, NBAA, inquired about the status of providing .kmz files. Pat stated he would investigate providing .kmz files, noting that delivering this data may be more straightforward than incorporating the full waiver documentation.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, confirmed that the item will remain open while AIS investigates adding the additional documents requested.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, will report on his investigation into providing additional documentation to the NDBR website.

24-01-391 MON Airport Symbol on IAP Charts

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that the FAA plans to expand the MON Airport List in the back of the Chart Supplement to include the specific MON procedure(s) and required VOR NAVAID(s) for each MON-qualified airport. Additionally, the Aeronautical Data Team plans to publish the MON procedures/NAVAID data on the AIS Information Gateway website this fall to be updated every 28 days if aeronautical data changes occur.

Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, added that the data could also be provided as a static CSV subscriber file. Nate Rahn, FAA/AJV-A2, noted that delivering machine-readable CSV files will allow third-party electronic flight bag (EFB) providers to ingest the data easily.

Luca Bencini-Tibo, ATP/CFI, commented on operational aspects, noting that if radar surveillance is available, a MON approach is unnecessary. He questioned whether listing specific procedures in the Chart Supplement is practical for cockpit use. Vince Massimini, TetraTech, disagreed, emphasizing that VOR MON procedures are essential during GPS outages or ATC facility disruptions and that providing a centralized data source helps pilots plan alternates effectively. Matt Fisher, NATCA, agreed that establishing a defined pool of non-GPS procedures is helpful, assuming radar vectoring is available.

Art Griffenkranz, FAA/AJV-A610, explained the VOR MON procedure maintenance and coordination process. He noted that procedure specialists check the MON status in the SIAP system during updates to prevent inadvertent removal of MON-qualifying procedures. He clarified that removing a MON designation requires formal coordination with Flight Procedure Teams (FPTs) and is not a rapid process. Rake McGraw, FAA/AJV-A422, confirmed that the automated SIAP system flag ensures designers are alerted when modifying procedures at MON airports.

Rich Boll, NBAA, raised questions regarding feeder routes and marker beacon dependencies, emphasizing that clear procedure criteria are increasingly critical as GPS interference events grow.

John Collins, Jeppesen ForeFlight, said having a published list of MON procedures and NAVAIDs is a significant improvement for digital flight planning tools.

Jennifer summarized three key deliverables: (1) adding the expanded table to the Chart Supplement, (2) posting the VOR MON data to the AIS website, and (3) providing the data in an ingestible CSV subscriber file. She said this item will remain open to report progress.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A223, will report on implementation of expanding the MON Airport List in the Chart Supplement.

ACTION: Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350, to report on the publication of the MON Airport data to the AIS website.

25-01-396 Charting Radial Distances for Class C Airspace

Nathan Carafelli, FAA/AJV-A214, showed chart examples of Class C radial distance graphics, including the points of origin, that will be added to the chart margins on Sectional Charts. Class C radial distances will be depicted on the body of the chart for Terminal Area Charts (TACs), Flyway Planning Charts, and Helicopter Route Charts. Nathan confirmed that this work is complete and scheduled for publication in the October 29 AIRAC cycle. He emphasized that this was the best solution because AIS does not have the bandwidth to create dedicated TAC charts for individual Class C airspaces.

Joel Dickinson, FAA/AFS-410, and Luca Bencini-Tibo, ATP/CFI, discussed specific locations featuring directional Class C redesigns, such as Nashville (BNA), Palm Beach (PBI), and Fort Myers (RSW). Kristen Leake, FAA/AJV-E220, noted that several additional directional Class C proposals are in development pending final rule publication.

Rich Boll, NBAA, emphasized that AIM Section 3-2-4 needs to be updated to provide clear pilot guidance regarding directional Class C airspace structures. Keith Adams, FAA/AJV-W220, explained that new policy requirements for Class C airspace redesigns are awaiting a final rule and criteria updates to FAA Order 7400.2. He offered to connect Rich directly with the Policy Office, as the Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) for the AIM updates.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, noted that all actions are complete, and this item can be closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

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

Mark Wilson, FAA/AJV-A210, presented the chart changes and reported that through coordination with the Data Communications Office and Rich Boll, NBAA, changes to Miami ARTCC and New York Oceanic Controller Pilot Data Link Communications (CPDLC) logon information were successfully published for the 09/03/2026 effective date. Mark confirmed that charting teams implemented the non-standard logon text as received from the source data.

Becky McDowell, FAA/AJV-A311, detailed the specific database updates in NASR. Segment remarks were added to NASR for Y-routes requiring the CPDLC KUSA logon code, along with updated remarks for Miami Oceanic and the New York RADAR area. She noted that while remarks were updated in NASR, no changes were made to FIR or ARTCC boundary enroute chart depictions.

Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, confirmed that a repeatable process is now established between the Data Comm Office, Aeronautical Data Team, and charting groups. Moving forward, any non-standard CPDLC logon updates

submitted to NASR will be distributed via the National Flight Data Digest (NFDD) and subscriber files for all external chart producers. Rich expressed appreciation for establishing this mechanism.

With all actions complete, there was agreement that this item could be closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

25-01-400 Publish ATCAA Boundaries

Tom Carrigan, FAA/AJV-A350 reported that the FAA Air Traffic Control Assigned Airspace (ATCAA) boundary data webpage is now live and public data was published on September 3, 2026. The initial release covers CONUS ARTCC facilities, with ATCAA boundary data for Anchorage ARTCC (ZAN) and Honolulu Control Facility (ZHN) scheduled for inclusion by December 2026.

John Collins, Jeppesen ForeFlight, said he has reviewed the ATCAA boundary data samples on the website, noted that the data format looks good, and expressed support for closing the item.

With the primary web portal active and digital boundary data made publicly available, all charting actions are complete, and this item is now closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

25-01-403 Julian Dates in the Chart Supplement

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A223, addressed this item during his Chart Supplement Data Product XML briefing. He confirmed that capturing change history is being incorporated directly into the ongoing Chart Supplement XML project.

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, noted that this item will remain open while the XML prototype efforts progress.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A223, 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

John Johnson, FAA/AJV-A313, reported on the Aeronautical Data Team's (ADT) investigation into unused marker beacons. Out of 17 identified marker beacons, ADT successfully removed 10 from NASR that were no longer active. Three of the remaining facilities were found to still be in active use for other operational requirements, leaving four marker beacons (located at Tampa, Rochester, Dulles, and Salt Lake City) still under investigation.

Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, explained that under FAA Order 8260.19 criteria, when a Final Approach Fix (FAF) or Precise Final Approach Fix (PFAF) uses DME, marker beacons are no longer required or documented on procedure source forms. However, because the physical marker beacon hardware remains operational in the field, ADT cannot remove them from NASR without coordination with Technical Operations.

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, confirmed that Terminal Charting will only depict a marker beacon on an approach chart if it is explicitly listed for charting on the procedure source form.

Rich Boll, NBAA, questioned why operational marker beacons that serve no published procedure purpose remain in service, noting that pilots rarely use marker beacons and advocating for decommissioning unused facilities to save taxpayer resources. He asked what formal process exists to ensure unused marker beacons are decommissioned and removed from NASR. Pat agreed there may be a missing connection or notification process between Technical Operations and ADT when facilities are no longer tied to published procedures.

Art Griffenkranz, FAA/AJV-A610, explained that formal decommissioning involves the Service Area Technical Care (SAT-C) team at the regional Service Center level, which initiates a defined 44-step Service Area Decommissioning (SADC) process in coordination with Flight Procedure Teams (FPTs) and Technical Operations.

Steve Madigan requested to keep the item open until the investigation into the final four marker beacons is resolved. Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, agreed to keep the item open while AIS coordinates with Technical Operations on the remaining facilities.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Pat Mulqueen, FAA/AJV-A440, will provide an update on the investigation into the remaining unused marker beacons in NASR.

25-02-406 VOR Checkpoints in Chart Supplement

Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A223, presented an update and prototype regarding the integration of VOR receiver checkpoints into individual Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD) entry listings in the Chart Supplement. He explained that the Chart Supplement team determined this update can be accomplished with low implementation impact by adding a VOR Receiver Checkpoint notation with its associated frequency directly under airport entry details, while maintaining the comprehensive VOR checkpoint reference table in the back of the publication.

Rich Boll, NBAA, expressed support for the prototype, noting that adding the information to the A/FD entry provides a helpful prompt for pilots to check available VOR receiver checkpoints.

Odie confirmed that the Chart Supplement A/FD legend will be updated accordingly to reflect the new entry.

All charting actions are complete and there was agreement that this item could be closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

26-01-409 Spaceport Symbol on VFR Charts

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported on the outcome of discussions following the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) evaluation and subsequent inter-agency coordination. The ARRG accepted the item for work and determined that addressing pilot education took precedence over altering established VFR chart symbology.

An internal FAA meeting was conducted involving the FAA Office of Commercial Space, NATCA, Flight Standards, and FAA Policy. The group reached consensus that existing AIM and Aeronautical Information Publication (AIP) guidance regarding spaceports is sufficient. Representative feedback from the Office of Commercial Space indicated no widespread reports of pilot confusion at other spaceport locations. The group noted that local flight activity concerns appear to be economic (such as general aviation traffic avoiding the facility based on the name/symbol) rather than a safety issue and concluded that local pilot outreach and education are the appropriate mechanisms to address site-specific operational issues.

Jennifer noted that email correspondence outlining these findings was sent to the proponent, William Flowers, Colorado Air and Space Port, on August 31, 2026, with no response received.

Craig Boxrucker, ALPA, confirmed his understanding that no changes will be made to chart symbology or AIM guidance. Jennifer confirmed that is correct and this item is now closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

26-01-410 VOR Gaps

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported on the outcome of discussions following the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) evaluation. The ARRG accepted this item for work, noting that stakeholder interest centered on accessing underlying data rather than adding VOR gap polygons to published charts. On August 4, 2026, FAA Technical Operations conducted a briefing to share the signal coverage calculation method and algorithm details with industry representatives. Technical Operations reported receiving no further questions regarding the algorithm following the meeting.

Jennifer opened the floor for industry feedback to determine if providing the calculation methodology satisfied the proponent's intent.

John Collins, Jeppesen ForeFlight, stated that mathematical coverage algorithms are not directly useful to pilots in the cockpit, as flight crews need clear operational indications of where NAVAID signal coverage is available and which specific VOR provides service. He noted that while raw data is not suitable for static chart publication, it could potentially be leveraged as a dynamic layer within Electronic Flight Bags (EFBs) in the future.

Vince Massimini, TetraTech, agreed that raw gap data does not tell a pilot whether a specific airport or airway segment has usable signal coverage during flight planning.

Jennifer noted that based on feedback from MITRE and industry stakeholders, delivering the calculation method fulfills the requested data deliverable and that displaying graphics on paper or precomposed charts is not supported.

With the calculation methodology delivered to industry and consensus that static chart depictions will not be pursued, this item is now closed.

STATUS: CLOSED

26-01-411 IAP Georeferencing Data

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) accepted this item for work. On August 20, 2026, AIS met with Mark Mentovai and Garmin to evaluate methods for extracting georeferencing data directly from Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) PDFs. Mark presented several extraction techniques using current PDF architecture.

A follow-up meeting was held on September 1, 2026, to address Garmin's compliance concerns regarding data extraction under RTCA DO-200 standards (Standards for Processing Aeronautical Data). Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A223, explained that he developed a custom script that avoids open-source software and extracts georeferencing metadata using the demonstrated methods. He shared these steps with Garmin for internal testing. Odie noted that modifying georeferencing parameters across the entire TPP product inventory is a major effort, but AIS will continue evaluating long-term improvements to FAA georeferenced data.

Steve Madigan, Garmin, highlighted the regulatory and legal implications of using open-source software tools for aeronautical data ingestion and requested that the item remain open to track ongoing technical coordination.

Jennifer confirmed that the item will remain open for Odie to provide a progress report at ACM 27-01.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Odie Silva, FAA/AJV-A223, to report on the investigation into long-term improvements to IAP georeferenced data.

26-01-412 Parachute Jumping Areas in the Chart Supplement

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported that the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) accepted this item for work and that work is underway.

Becky McDowell, FAA/AJV-A311, briefed on the Aeronautical Data Team's audit of approximately 600 Parachute Jumping Areas (PJAs) published in NASR, many of which date back prior to 2006. She reported that nine inactive PJAs were canceled for the October cycle, with an additional 15 targeted for cancellation in December 2026. Becky noted that updates are being made to the Aeronautical Information Portal and FAA Order 7900.2, alongside alignment with FAA Order 7210.3 facility requirements. She noted that while standard 3-year review triggers exist for other airspace elements, PJAs currently lack a periodic validation mechanism. She reported that the PJA updates should be completed prior to ACM 27-01.

Vic Naso, FAA/AFS-420, asked about criteria for removing inactive PJAs from NASR and whether follow-up verification occurs after initial reports. Jennifer noted that activity volume (number of jumps) governs Chart Supplement publication criteria, and Brian Murphy, FAA/AJV-A310, added that Service Centers are coordinating with air traffic facilities to ensure proper portal reporting.

Randy Coller, Aerologic, emphasized the role of airport inspectors in validating Chart Supplement data during master plan updates. TJ Leahy, FAA/AFS-830, suggested establishing a mandatory 18-to-24-month renewal cycle for PJA operators to maintain their published status rather than relying on reactive cleanup, noting high staff turnover at FSDOs.

Jennifer confirmed the item will remain open while the Aeronautical Data Team continues the data verification and process enhancements.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Becky McDowell, FAA/AJV-A311, to report on the continued verification of published PJAs and on improvements to the process for keeping the data current.

26-01-413 Unmanned Aircraft Activity Chart Symbol

Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, reported on inter-agency discussions following the ACM Recommendation Review Group's (ARRG) acceptance of this item. Regarding legacy unmanned aircraft symbols on VFR charts, AIS coordinated with AFS-700, NGA, and the U.S. Air Force to evaluate the small number of unmanned aircraft (UA) symbols published on VFR charts since 2010. The group determined that these legacy symbols are outdated and no longer provide operational utility given the widespread proliferation of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) across the NAS. An Interagency Air Committee (IAC) specification change is in progress to remove the legacy UA chart symbol and its charted locations.

Regarding the recommendation to chart high-density UAS activity locations, Jennifer reported that internal coordination across FAA policy offices, Flight Standards, and Air Traffic yielded significant operational and implementation hurdles. Principal concerns include:

- **NAS-Wide Risk:** UAS operations occur broadly across the NAS rather than at isolated locations; charting selected "high-density" areas could misinform pilots into believing uncharted areas present lower UAS collision risk.
- **Lack of Data Prerequisites:** Establishing aeronautical data for high-density UAS locations requires formal inclusion criteria, an authoritative data source, ongoing data validation workflows, and an assigned Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR), none of which currently exist.
- **Policy Objections:** FAA policy offices did not support modifying charts or publishing UAS data sets.
- **Existing Dynamic Tools:** Short-duration UAS NOTAMs are already graphically displayable through third-party EFB applications and online dynamic mapping services.

Jennifer noted feedback from the proponent of this topic, Carmen Simboli, Amazon Prime Air, who explained that industry is limited in the content permitted in their NOTAMs, despite regulatory requirements in the COAs to provide operational volume details. He requested that this feedback be elevated to the pertinent FAA offices to explore how NOTAM language can be expanded to align with existing COA requirements.

TJ Leahy, FAA/AFS-830, expressed disagreement with closing the topic without further inter-office alignment. He requested a meeting with his office to discuss this topic and the opportunity for AFS-800 to weigh in. Jennifer said she will take action to set up a meeting.

Jennifer agreed to keep the item open to coordinate this topic with AFS-800.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Jennifer Hendi, FAA/AJV-A223, to report on continued discussions regarding the charting/databasing of unmanned aircraft activity.

VII. Closing Remarks

Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A213, 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 27-01: April 20-22, 2027 as a virtual meeting with and in-person option at Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA) in McLean, VA
- ACM 27-02: TBD

IX. Attendance Roster