December 2, 2013

Dear Forum Participant

Attached are the minutes of the Aeronautical Charting Forum, Instrument Procedures Group (ACF-IPG) meeting held on October 29, 2013. The meeting was hosted by the Air Line Pilots Association, 535 Herndon Parkway, Herndon, VA 20192. An office of primary responsibility (OPR) action listing (Atch 1) and an attendance listing (Atch 2) are appended to the minutes.

Please note there are briefing slides inserted in the minutes as PDF files shown as stickpins. All are asked to review the minutes and attachments for accuracy and forward any comments to the following:

Mr. Tom Schneider
FAA/AFS-420
P.O. Box 25082
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

Phone: 405-954-5852
FAX: 405-954-5270
E-mail: thomas.e.schneider@faa.gov

Copy to:

Mr. Steve VanCamp
FAA/AFS-420 (DIGITALiBiz)
P.O. Box 25082
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

Phone: 405-954-5237
FAX: 405-954-5270
E-mail: steve.ctr.vancamp@faa.gov

The AFS-420 web site contains information relating to ongoing activities including the ACF-IPG. The home page is located at:
http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/avs/offices/afs/afs400/afs420/acfipg/
This site contains copies of minutes of the past several meeting as well as a chronological history of open and closed issues to include the original submission, a brief synopsis of the discussion at each meeting, the current status of open issues, required follow-up action(s), and the OPR for those actions. There is also a link to the ACF Charting Group web site. We encourage participants to use these sites for reference in preparation for future meetings.

ACF Meeting **14-01** is scheduled for **April 29-May 1, 2014** with the **MITRE Corporation, 7515 Colshire Ave, McLean, VA 22012**, as host. ACF meeting **14-02** is scheduled for **October 28-30, 2014** with ISI/Pragmatics, Inc. as host

Please note that **meetings begin promptly at 8:30 AM**. Dress is business casual. Forward new agenda items for the 14-01 ACF-IPG meeting to the above addressees not later than April 10, 2014. A reminder notice will be sent.

We look forward to your continued participation.

Thomas E. Schneider, FAA/AFS-420
Co-Chairman, Aeronautical Charting Forum,
Chairman, Instrument Procedures Group

Attachment: ACF-IPG minutes

GOVERNMENT / INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
Meeting 13-02
Air Line Pilots Association
October 29, 2013

1. Opening Remarks:

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, Flight Standards co-chair of the Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF) and chair of the Instrument Procedures Group (IPG) opened the meeting at 8:30 AM on October 29. The Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA) hosted the meeting at their Herndon, VA facility. Mr. Steve Serur made welcoming and administrative comments on behalf of ALPA. A listing of attendees is included as attachment 2.

2. Briefings: There were no formal briefings scheduled for this meeting; however, Bruce DeCleene, the Division Manager of AFS-400, was present and made comments regarding the significance and success of the ACF to the FAA. He made note of the importance of industry participation in making the Forum the success it is. Bruce made brief comments regarding the recent government shutdown noting that FAA is still in the recovery process. He also expressed appreciation for industry patience with work stoppage during the recent furlough and appreciates the huge impact on contract support, especially those laid off without pay. Bruce stated that the financial future for all government programs is unknown, but he expects continued reductions in contract funding; and full-time federal employee replacements due to attrition. Current federal employee replacement numbers are 1 for 2 in safety positions and 1 for 3 for all other positions. One of his goals is to determine industry priorities through meetings like the ACF in order to assist AFS-400 in resource allocation.

3. Review of Minutes of Last Meeting:

Bill Hammett, AFS-420, (ISI/Pragmatics Contract Support), briefed that the minutes of ACF-IPG 13-01, which was held on April 23, 2013 were electronically distributed to all attendees as well as the ACF Master Mailing List on May 14. One comment was received from TJ Nichols, AFS-420, regarding the first IOU for recommendation 13-01-311. The IOU should read “AFS-420 will pursue a review of FAA Order 8260.58 through the US-IFPP and forward the results to AFS-470 for updating of the AIM, IPH and IFH." This change will be made to the Issue history file. Otherwise, the minutes are accepted as distributed.

4. Old Business (Open Issues):

a. 92-02-110: Cold Station Altimeter Settings (*Includes Issue 04-01-251*).

Kel Christianson, AFS-470, provided a brief history update. A Safety and Risk Management Panel (SRMP), including Flight Standards operations and Air Traffic (AT), was originally scheduled to meet in October but that meeting was delayed by the government shutdown. It has been rescheduled for December. The SRMP will discuss the plan to publish, as a Graphic Notice in the Notices to Airmen Publication (NTAP), a list of affected airports and procedure segments, and required ATC training. Exact time frames for both the meeting and timelines for ATC training development are not available. Kel added that MITRE has revised their runway length data base for affected airports, reducing the original 4000’ down to 2500’. MITRE will run this list through

their model and provide an updated list of affected airports. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI/Pragmatics Contract Support) asked whether implementation is targeted for this winter. Kel responded we will try. Val Watson, AJV-3B, asked if adding the cold temperature icon (snowflake) to affected charts had been approved and Kel responded yes, noting that there will be an exception made for Midway so as not to impact O'Hare. Michael Stromberg, Air Wisconsin, asked whether FAA has any idea how long it will take to get all charts updated with the snowflake. Val responded that this would have to be coordinated within the Terminal Charting Team. Val also inquired how many procedures are there to change. Kel responded about 135 airports, but that number will increase. Val stated AeroNav products will look at publication scheduling, but the hope is that when the cold temperature remark is published, all procedures at that airport will be worked in a single chart cycle. She added that because this is a non-regulatory action, it can be done fairly quickly. Val also added that Flight Standards needs to supply AeroNav Products with explanatory text to be published in the front matter of the Terminal Procedures Publications (TPP) for the snowflake icon so that users will understand what it means and will go to the NTAP (or AIM) for further guidance.

Status: AFS-470 will continue developing an implementation plan. Item Open (AFS-470).

b. 02-01-241: Non Radar Level and Climb-in-hold (CIH) Patterns.

Eric Fredricks, AJE-31, briefed that the Document Change Proposal (DCP) to FAA Order JO 7210.3 to mandate CIH holding pattern information be included in position binders is out for final coordination and is now targeted for publication in August 2014. Jim Arrighi, AJV-14, noted that the cutoff for the ATO August publication cycle has been slipped from February to April. He added that he heard there may not be a Feb pub cycle, or it may be slipped, due to deadlines being missed as result of the recent government shutdown.

Status: AJE-31 to continue to track the change, and will advise on progress of DCP. Open Pending Publication (AJE-31).

c. 07-01-270: Course Change Limitation Notes on SIAPs.

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that John Bordy, the AFS-420 conventional TERPS criteria specialist, provided an update stating TERPs Change 26 has been delayed due to AeroNav Products request to incorporate additional policy memorandums which will drive re-coordination. Expected publication is now August 2014. Brad Rush, AJV-3B, asked when Change 26 would be circulated for comment. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, responded "soon" and then provided a target tracking synopsis of all Flight Standards publications that are currently under revision. Bob Lamond, NBAA, asked whether a copy of the synopsis could be posted and maintained on-line. Bruce DeCleene, AFS-400, responded yes, and added that Flight Standards is in the process of updating all of its schedules internally, and one initiative is to increase public visibility of AFS orders.

Status: AFS-420 to track TERPS Change 26. Open Pending Publication (AFS-420).

d. 07-02-278: Advanced RNAV (FMS/GPS) Performance of Holding Patterns Defined by Leg Length

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following report as received from Steve Jackson, the AFS-420 staff specialist for holding issues: "AFS-400 has made a decision to combine the planned Order 8260.HLD into a future version of Order 8260.3 (TERPS), probably as a separate

volume. This does not really change any ongoing activity except that it ties any revisions to an 8260.3 publication date, most likely Jan 2015. A draft document was circulated within AFS-400 before the decision was made to change the publication. The ongoing effort at this time is to determine whether some of the non-obstacle clearance information published in Order 7130.3A (originally an Air Traffic document) such as end reduction areas, should be deleted, moved to some other document, or retained in some other form. Once that is determined and the document revised accordingly, further internal coordination will take place."

Rich Boll, NBAA, asked whether all the proposed holding order changes will be included in TERPS. Tom responded yes. Rich followed up asking which TERPS change will include this. Tom replied the plan is for inclusion in 8260.3C, since it will not make Change 26. Gary Fiske AJV-8, asked if this was discussed in a sub group of US-IFPP. Tom replied that he was not sure if Steve Jackson had a sub-group on this. Bruce DeCleene, AFS-400, added explanatory comments that Flight Standards is making a concerted effort to consolidate guidance. For example, Flight Standards has combined over 200 pieces of guidance for Aviation Safety Inspectors in Order 8900.1. A similar goal is to do the same in combining as much TERPS criteria as possible within a single document. Rather than produce a new holding document it makes sense to incorporate it into TERPS. Tom added that some items in the present holding order exist to support AT, and Steve Jackson is moving to resolve that.

> ***Editor's Note:*** *Following the meeting, there was a discussion within AFS-400 to reconsider and publish a separate holding order prior to consolidating holding criteria into Order 8260.3C. A final decision will be made in Jan 2014 and the ACF will be advised.*

Status: AFS-420 to continue development of revised holding criteria. Item Open (AFS-420).

e. 09-01-282: Glide Slope Intercept Altitudes on ILS Parallel Approaches

Brad Rush, AJV-3B, briefed that of an approximate original 1,300 charts, there are only 17 left that require the notes to be removed. These revisions will be made as those procedures are amended by full/abbreviated form or via P-NOTAM. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI/Pragmatics contract support) asked whether the changes would be made only when routine IAP amendments to the procedures are required. Brad responded, no, the procedures would not be placed in work specifically to remove the note; however, he added that anytime a chart is put into work, that opportunity would be used to formally amend the procedure and remove the note. Tom asked whether the group supported closure; although not completed, everything is on the production schedule. Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that the majority of procedures have been revised and since work is in progress to handle the remaining IAPs, he is comfortable with closing the issue. The group agreed. **Status:** Issue CLOSED

f. 09-01-284: Question of TERPs Containment with Late Intercepts

There were two distinct IOUs relating to this issue. The first relates to Order JO 7110.65, paragraph 4-8-1. Mike Poisson, AJV-8, briefed that the revised procedures specified in this paragraph were implemented via Notice (N JO 7110.620), which became effective July 31, 2013 and will also be included in the next update of the Order. Rich Boll, NBAA, inquired whether the Notice has been implemented and whether all AT training has been completed. Gary Fiske, AJV-8, responded that all training has been complete and the procedures are in place. John Collins, GA Pilot, stated that the diagram associated with Change 3 regarding straight-in clearances doesn't make sense. Gary agreed to work this comment off line with John and Rich.

Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI/Pragmatics contract support) asked about second part of the IOU that relates to AIM guidance. Bruce McGray, AFS-410, advised that the AIM has been updated. Bill said if this has been accomplished, then we should not need InFO or SAFO guidance. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, asked Rich Boll NBAA, the originator of the issue, if he supported closure. Rich said he will work off line with Bruce on training, and he is good with closing issue.

Status: Issue CLOSED

g. 09-02-286: Initial "Climb & Maintain" Altitude on Standard Instrument Departure Procedures

Bruce McGray AFS-410 briefed that the wording for the AIM change has been completed; however, AFS-410 is holding off on AIM changes until all Document Change Proposal (DCP) work has been completed by AT and to ensure everything controller-related is in place before change. A copy of the draft AIM language thus far is provided below. It is proposed that this language will be included as new paragraph 4-4-3c (following paragraphs will be re-numbered and retained) and also included within paragraph 5-2-8 following the sentence "ATC clearance must be received prior to flying a SID" follows:

> "In your initial SID clearance, ATC will normally assign a SID and an altitude to climb and maintain. In some cases, your initial altitude will be published on the SID. In others, the altitude issued with your IFR clearance may be higher than restriction(s) on the SID. ***In all cases, you must comply with the SID restrictions. Pilots must notify ATC immediately if they cannot meet the published climb gradient or, if one is not published, a minimum of 200 ft/nm on each segment of the SID up to the MEA.*** If you are radar vectored or cleared off an assigned SID, you may consider the SID cancelled unless the controller adds — "Expect to resume SID". If ATC reinstates the SID and wishes any restrictions associated with the SID to still apply, the controller will state: — "Comply with restrictions".
>
> Amended Clearances. ATC may amend your clearance at any time. It is important to remember that the most recent ATC clearance takes precedence over all others. When the route or altitude in a previously issued clearance is amended, the controller will restate applicable altitude restrictions. In the United States if the altitude to maintain is changed or restated, whether prior to departure or while airborne, and previously issued altitude restrictions are not re-stated, those altitude restrictions are canceled, including SID/DP/STAR altitude restrictions. ***Pilots must ensure minimum climb gradients for obstacle clearance are still met.***"

Bruce advised that anyone is welcome to forward suggestions to the draft wording directly to him. He went on to provide a brief explanation of the AIM wording: If a SID is issued while on taxi out, and an altitude change is made after, the SID is cancelled *unless* you are explicitly advised the SID still applies along with all restrictions associated with it. Similarly, if AT takes you off the SID with a vector heading, the SID is cancelled unless AT explicitly restates that the pilot return to the SID routing. John Frazier, Advanced Aircrew Academy, stated that, although not related to departures, his office has noted many Aviation Safety Action Program (ASAP) reports relating to pilots descending on STARs, having to query the assigned altitude to which cleared after ATC intervention. Rich Boll, NBAA, advised the Pilot Controller Procedures System Integration group (PCPSI), a sub group of PARC, has been working on "climb via/descend via", and speed adjustments. Jim Arrighi, AJV-14, and Rich are members of the group. Rich advised that the changes the PCPSI recommended appear to align with the proposed AIM changes, but it would be a good idea to sit down off line and make sure there are not two AIM issues being worked coincidentally. Jim advised that the PCPSI has a meeting on Nov 20-21, 2013 to work on the pilot briefing material (which he stated NBAA has done a

tremendous job in developing), the pilot video, and status of AT procedures regarding climb via and descend via. All the DCPs have been finalized and are in queue to be signed, with implementation targeted for April 2014. Original target was Feb 2014. All changes are planned and being worked in earnest. The concern is that a change in a procedure is considered to cancel the procedure *unless* AT restates it. AT should advise the pilot to either resume procedure or give other guidance. The pilot should not delete the procedure from the data base since they may be put back on it. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, surmised the changes had not been submitted formally for AIM publication, and questioned if Bruce should cease activity until after the PCPSI Nov meeting. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI/Pragmatics Contract Support) inquired if the key members of the PCPSI were present for tasking purposes. Jim stated AJV-14, En Route, Terminal, and AFS-470 are all a part of the group and are present. Bill asked if AFS-410 was a part of the group. Jim responded there had not been any 410 participation. Bill suggested the PCPSI working group, with AFS-410 participation, accept the tasking to develop AIM language and pilot educational material for this issue. That would stop the dual effort, and the ACF would have just one focal point. The group agreed. Bill requested a POC to track the issue and Jim Arrighi graciously agreed to be focal point. John Frazier restated his desire for the discussions to include arrivals. Group discussion ensued; with agreement arrivals will be included. John Collins, GA pilot, added that it is important that AIM guidance and AT implementation occur simultaneously.

Status: AJV-14 (Jim Arrighi) will monitor the PCPSI group actions to develop pilot guidance and controller training material and keep the ACF-IPG apprised of progress. Item Open AJV-14).

h. 09-02-288: VNAV Minimums vs. Circle to Land

Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI/Pragmatics Contract Support), briefed that the following draft language has been developed for the IPH; and, if accepted, may also be considered for the AIM:

> On some RNAV (GPS) procedures, LNAV (only) and circle-to-land procedures might have lower minima than vertically guided straight-in procedures (LNAV/VNAV or LPV). A different sloping obstacle clearance surface (OCS) is applied to vertically guided procedures that may result in higher published LNAV/VNAV minima than that published for LNAV. Under TERPS criteria, the circling MDA may be no lower than the highest non-precision approach (NPA) line of minima published on the same chart.
>
> Additionally, the missed approach point (MAP)-to-threshold distance is also factored into computing the minimum visibility value for each straight-in line of minima on the approach. The MAP for a non-vertically guided procedure is normally the threshold, but may be any specified point between the FAF and the landing threshold. The MAP for a vertically guided procedure is the point where the published glide path intercepts the DA. In those cases where there is a high NPA MDA, this point may be computed farther from the threshold, requiring a higher visibility. Thus, the LNAV and Circling MDAs and visibility minimums may be lower than the published LNAV/VNAV minimums.

Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that the text should include a copy of an IAP chart with the problem and a graphic to explain the variances in ROC application. John Collins, GA Pilot, agreed. Coby Johnson, AFS-410, asked how prevalent the problem is. Both Rich and John responded it is a common situation. Coby agreed that if it is, then AIM clarification should be provided. Rich added that pilots need to know what to do when flying LNAV/VNAV. When reaching the DA,

does the pilot initiate a missed approach or can he/she revert to LNAV and continue to the LNAV MDA. Mike Webb, AFS-420, stated that the MOPS for SBAS state that the pilot should select a line of minima and fly it. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, requested that the ACF participants review the draft language and forward comments directly to Maj. Brian Strack, AFS-420, at brian.strack@faa.gov, Gil Baker at gilbert.ctr.baker@faa.gov and Bruce McGray, AFS-410, at bruce.mcgray@faa.gov.

Status: 1) AFS-410, in concert with AFS-470, to develop AIM language; and, 2) AFS-420 track IPH publication. Item Open (AFS-410, AFS-470, and AFS-420).

i. 09-02-291: Straight-in Minimums NA at Night

Rich Boll, NBAA, presented an addendum to the original recommendation Document ( ). NBAA is concerned over a recent proliferation of NOTAMS affecting straight-in and/or circling minima on instrument approach procedures. The NOTAMs specify that straight-in and circling minimums are NA at night. Without straight-in or circling minima, the affected approaches are not authorized at night since there is no way to complete the approach. Pilots should not request nor should ATC issue a clearance for an approach where both straight-in and circling minima are "NA". When this situation occurs, NBAA believes Order 8260.19 should clearly state that the procedure itself must NA at night.

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, stated that AFS-420 agrees with this proposal and has included the following change to current paragraph 8-54m(2)(a) in Order 8260.19F "If unable to authorize night minimums (e.g., when both straight-in and circling minimums are not authorized at night), use: "**Chart note: Procedure NA at night**." Tom also noted that additional changes have been made to the draft Order as briefed at the last ACF meeting.

Brad Rush, AJV-3B, commented on draft Order 8260.19F, paragraph 8-54m(2)(h) note that states "remain on or above the VGSI glide path until threshold" portion not being necessary and in fact redundant. The group initially concurred. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI/Pragmatics Contract Support), said the Order is still out for formal coordination so comments can still be made. Tom asked if NBAA agreed with removing the comment portion in subparagraph (h). Rich Boll, NBAA, had questions on this and subparagraph (g), and then presented a PowerPoint discussion on operations, surfaces, and minima from the NBAA perspective. A copy of Rich's presentation is provided here: . He concluded prohibitions on operations at night must be consistent for the affected runway across all charts. NBAA believes surfaces should be aligned, and should protect aircraft on the visual portion of an approach, and until this is accomplished FAA needs to stop applying TERPS paragraph 3-3-2. Lev Prichard, APA, stated that circling approaches should be almost obsolete since current rules allow a straight-in RNAV approach to be developed nearly everywhere. Therefore, current policy is forcing pilots to fly a more risky circling maneuver. Kel Christianson, AFS-470 said the note in subparagraph (h) is there as mitigation for 20:1 visual surface obstacle penetrations. Tom asked Rich again, specifically about the note in subparagraph (h) regarding remaining on or above the VGSI. Rich stated the note should remain in support of Kel's comment. A group discussion followed. Bob Lamond, NBAA, emphasized that NBAA wants action on this issue ASAP as it is impacting operations. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, asked what harm does the note do. Val Watson, AJV-3B, responded that is takes up "white space" on the chart and that providing pilot guidance is not the purpose of an approach chart. John Moore, Jeppesen, supported Val's position adding that pilot guidance should be contained in the AIM, IPH, etc. John Frazier, Advanced Aircrew Academy, stated that if we start publishing notes to advise pilots to stay on or above the VGSI, will there be pilots that think if there is no note, they don't have to follow the VGSI. Kel stated that the VGSI is used to

support a waiver and was concerned to hear comments that pilots may not be following the VGSI. John Collins, GA Pilot, stated that he supports the note as it is rulemaking under Part 97. If the VGSI is used to mitigate 20:1 surface penetrations, then it should be so noted. After the discussion, Tom said we will retain note as is, and reminded the group this was the direction decided upon at the last ACF. Bruce DeCleene, AFS-400, opened a discussion regarding charting unlit obstacles. Tom said we have forced obstacles to be lit, but this does not work in every case. Brad stated charting all unlit obstacles would result in a black blob on chart. Rich again questioned suspending 3-3-2 (c) until issue brought up by NBAA addressed. Tom said this would need to be brought up in AFS-400, since there are possibly bigger ramifications.

Tom also briefed the following update as received from John Bordy, the AFS-420 conventional TERPS criteria specialist: “In June 2013, the US-IFPP designated AFS-420 to lead a working group to develop a recommended position related to all aspects of visual segments, to include using VGSI to mitigate 20:1 visual surface penetrations. To date, no working group has been convened due to other commitments; however there has been other significant activity by AFS-400 relating to 20:1 penetrations. These include, but are not limited to:

1) The issuance of a waiver in September to allow the temporary use of VGSI in lieu of obstruction lighting prior to receiving explicit approval from AFS.
2) A waiver was issued in September to temporarily mitigate 20:1 penetrations that exceed the lateral boundaries of localizer/LP signals (ILS, LOC, LPV, LP IAPs only).
3) Additionally, in September, representatives from AFS-400 participated in a "tiger team" along with representatives of Mission Support Services, AeroNav Products (AJV-3) and the Airports Division (AAS-100) to develop risk-based requirements (assessment, response times, NOTAM actions, etc.) related to the discovery of 20:1 penetrations. The tiger team's recommendations are currently under management review.
4) AFS-400 is also considering issuing a waiver that will allow application of a beginning straight-in/offset visual surface width of +/- 200 ft for CAT A/B aircraft on all IAPs that have CAT A/B minimums published even when higher CAT minimums are established to the same runway.
5) Lastly, John stated that during the October 23 AFS-400 Division Manager's meeting, Bruce DeCleene, Manager, AFS-400, stated this ACF issue is being added to the Division's One Plan. He directed that AFS-450 work hand-in-hand with the Airport Obstructions Standards Committee (AOSC) to acquire data so an objective analysis can be made regarding what area needs to be considered when assessing visual surfaces. The AOSC, through MITRE, has already collected much data that could be used for analysis of straight-in procedures; but, it's likely AFS-450 will need to obtain additional data related to aircraft alignment with the landing runway following a circling maneuver. An AOSC working group telcon is scheduled prior to the ACF meeting where John Bordy, AFS-420, will bring this issue up to the members to ensure all are on board as well. John has also agreed to keep the ACF informed of future actions of the working group.”

Bruce DeCleene, AFS-420, provided a brief recap on 20:1 visual surface penetrations. The VGSI angles are usually reasonably coincidental with the approach VDA. More and more 20:1 penetrations are being noted and there is increased pushback from users regarding minima/procedure loss on procedures that have been in place for many years. We need to look at risk. If the risk is low, then give the airport time to fix the problem. If the risk is high, then amend or cancel the procedure. If the risk is medium, then apply a combination of the above. This would be a near term solution. For long term, we need to determine why there is an

increase in penetrations and we need to study the effectiveness of using VGSI as mitigation. We also need to assess what data we currently have on the surfaces in question, and collect new data using the best technology available. John Collins, GA Pilot, stated that "Procedure NA at night" NOTAMs affect more GA airports and he believes FAA is attempting to apply an airline solution for all airports when GA can easily accept a 4 degree descent angle. Bruce responded that the goal is to provide a descent angle to get all aircraft into a position to land. The preference is to not always use 3 degrees, rather to use an angle that coincides with the VGSI. He stated that he is a strong proponent for vertically guided approaches and if there is vertical guidance available to a runway, then it should be used. John agreed; however, adding that vertical guidance is not as substantial for GA operations.

Status: AFS-420 will continue to work the issue through the US-IFPP.
Item Open AFS-420 (US-IFPP)].

j. 10-01-292: Removal of the Visual Climb Over Airport Option on Mountain Airport Obstacle Departure Procedures

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that 4 IOUs remain open for this issue. Each is addressed separately below:

1) Track IPH Guidance. Tom briefed the following update from Gil Baker, contract support to the AFS-420 OPR for the IPH: "Final IPH revisions should be completed by the end of October 2013 with a revised IPH targeted publication date of February 2014". This IOU remains open pending publication.

2) Develop AIM Educational Material. Eric Fredricks, AJE-31, briefed that the Document Change Proposals (DCPs) are finished and out for comment. This IOU remains open pending publication.

3) Re-establish VCOAs at Selected Mountainous Airports. Rich Boll, NBAA, stated they are monitoring this process through the RAPT. Eagle, CO is the airport that prompted this issue, and NBAA and ATC are currently working on designing a new SID that includes the visual climb provision as well as the requirement for pilots to notify ATC. Rich took responsibility to continue to monitor this issue on a case-by-case basis through the applicable RAPT. Since this will be a lengthy on-going process, Rich stated this IOU could be closed. This IOU is CLOSED.

4) Develop a list of those locations where Air Traffic has requested a VCOA be denied: Brad Rush, AJV-3B, briefed that he sent NBAA ( ) a list of approximately 53 airports that do not have a VCOA per AT request. Rich stated he will edit obvious large airports like JFK, LAX, etc., out, and take IOU to follow the process through the RAPT. This IOU is CLOSED

Two IOUs remain open with taskings as indicated below.

Status: 1) AFS-420 to track the IPH revisions until published; 2) AJE-31 to track AIM, AIP, PCG, and FAA Orders JO 7110.65/7110.10 changes until published.
Item Open (AFS-420 and AJE-31).

k. 10-01-294: RNP SAAAR Intermediate Segment Length and ATC Intervention.

Kel Christianson, AFS-470, briefed this item has been taken up by the PARC, and they are actively working the issue; however, there is no update to quote. Gary Fiske, AJV-8, advised the ad hoc work group was supposed to meet on Oct 7, but that meeting was cancelled and has not yet been rescheduled. Gary added that there will be Document Change Proposals (DCPs) developed to support PARC recommendations.

Gary also briefed that the DCP for FAA Order JO 7110.65, paragraph 4-8-1 has been completed and the change implemented via NOTICE on June 13, 2013.

Status: AFS-470 to monitor PARC actions and report back. Item Open (AFS-470).

l. 11-01-296: Magnetic Variation Differences and FMSs

Kel Christianson, AFS-470, briefed that the AIM changes presented at the last meeting were finalized and have been forwarded for the next AIM publication cycle (February 6, 2014).

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, provided the following update as received from Steve Jackson, AFS-420: "RTCA SC-227 changed the order of use for MV data to place procedure MV first, followed by airport MV. Use of procedure MV will resolve many of the issues relating to MV since the equipment would always be using the same value as that used in the procedure design. Airport MV is the basis for RNAV and ILS procedures as well as runway bearing. However, this is a long term solution since existing avionics equipment will still use the source specified when the equipment was designed, which is usually either the NAVAID or airport on-board tables, which usually don't. The NavLean initiative will help resolve the issues by identifying the correct source for this data; e.g., several airport MVs exist, but only one of which matches the instrument procedures. Due to the Minimum Operational Network (MON) plan to remove VORs, and the existing workload for developing and maintaining procedures, many VORs are already out of tolerance, and policy on splitting the VOR MV from the rest of the procedures at an airport is being discussed. This would allow updates to the ILS and RNAV based procedures without updating airways and other conventional procedures. Once the list of VORs to be removed is finalized, a policy for bringing the remaining VORs back into tolerance will be devised.

The PARC MV Working Group completed its work and is no longer meeting. The report was delivered to the FAA in July, and most short term issues have been resolved. Long term issues such as use of True either at specific airports or as a region of True only operation in Alaska, similar to the Canadian Northern Domestic Airspace is under discussion. Another long term proposal to tie airport MV updates to aircraft MV database updates does not appear to be practical at this time, since there is no fixed schedule for manufacturers to make the data available, or for users to install the new tables, which in most cases requires sending the equipment back to the manufacturer. New guidance from Certification will cause manufacturers to notify users with older MV tables for airports where there may be issues with coupled approaches and auto-land operations.

There will be no further AFS-420 updates from the PARC MV WG and no further action on this issue is planned at RTCA; therefore, recommend closing this IOU. AFS-420 actively participates in many working groups and advisory committees. Should an issue of ACF concern arise, it will be presented as a briefing item; however, and continual updates under recommendation 11-01-

296 will no longer be provided." Tom recommends closing this second IOU and the group agreed.

Rich Boll asked will there be any requirement to change aircraft certification and whether AIR is addressing the issue. Kevin Bridges, AIR-130, said the next SC-227 meeting will address this issue; however, keep in mind that "guidance is guidance".

Status: AFS-470 to track requested AIM changes. Open Pending Publication (AFS-470).

m. 11-02-297: Airway "NoPT" Notes on Instrument Approach Procedures

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that, as noted at the last meeting, the change to resolve this issue has been included Order 8260.19F, which is just completing the formal coordination process and is still on target for publication in early 2014.

Status: AFS-420 to revise FAA Order 8260.19. Item Open Pending Publication (AFS-420).

n. 11-02-298: Converging ILS Coding and Chart Naming Convention.

Brad Rush, AJV-3B, briefed he is working with Air Traffic (Ron Singletary's office, AJV-8) on this issue. They have developed a draft Document Change Proposal (DCP) to eliminate Order 7110.98 and incorporate policy into Order JO 7210.3. The target date to eliminate the current converging naming convention and move towards a suffix is 2014-2015. Possible interim steps of using "converging" in phraseology and a suffix in the procedure title are under consideration. This is a work in progress and hopefully advancement will be seen within a year.

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that draft Order 8260.19F, includes added guidance in new paragraph 8-6-5 m (8) as follows:

> "Simultaneous Converging Approach Operations. When informed by ATC that Simultaneous Converging Approach Operations will be conducted, use Order 8260.3 instrument procedure naming standards with a "suffix" to distinguish between the standard instrument procedure and the procedure used for converging operations. Additionally, the applicable "Converging" approach charts must be annotated to indicate they support this concept. "Converging," in parenthesis, will be placed following the procedure name; i.e., "ILS Y RWY 31R (CONVERGING)."

Val Watson, AJV-3B, asked when this will occur. Tom responded, when Order 8260.19F is published. Brad Rush, AJV-3B, disagreed stating that naming conventions are specified in Order 8260.3 and the .19 cannot contradict those criteria. John Blair, AFS-410, asked about avionics coding limitations. Brad said there should be no problem as 6 characters are OK. Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that lots of FMSs can accept a suffix for RNAV, but not for conventional procedures. Brad reemphasized in other words, that since Order 7110.98 wouldn't go away until 2015, 8260.19 can't be change before that time. Tom agreed to work the issue off line to determine whether the draft guidance should be re-worded.

> ***Editor's Note:*** *After post meeting discussion between Brad and Tom, it was decided not to make the above change to draft 8260.19F due to the fact that a final decision regarding procedure identification has not been made and it is still undetermined when the necessary controller guidance will be published in ATO directives.*

Status: 1) AJV-3B will continue to monitor US-IFPP activities as well as on-going AJV internal actions, and keep the ACF apprised of the issue status. 2) AFS-420 will track publication of Order 8260.19F. Item Open [AJV-3B (US-IFPP) and AFS-420] .

o. 12-01-299: Loss of CAT D Line of Minima in Support of Circle-to-Land Operations.

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update as provided by John Bordy, the AFS-420 conventional TERPS criteria specialist: "Within Order 8260.3, Volume 1, Chapter 3, Paragraph 3.1.1.a, the last sentence of the note that reads, "ARC codes/supporting infrastructure should not be considered when determining authorized approach categories when the RAPT determines it is appropriate for safe operations." has been removed from the draft Change 26 to the order. It's expected the final revisions to Change 26 will be completed and entered into final coordination by the end of November. Although this change is expected to provide minor relief to this issue, it may not address it completely. AFS-420 intends to convene an additional meeting of the working group prior to the next meeting of the US-IFPP to determine whether/what additional actions are warranted."

Rich Boll, NBAA, says it appears we took out a sentence providing guidance from 2000, and questioned what is going to take its place. Tom advised that this will go to working group, of which Rich is a participant. Bob Lamond, NBAA, discussed that taking this out is fine, but this appears to be a half-step approach to a solution, and should we instead go to a more direct solution. Group discussion ensued. Rich asked about linking to a policy memorandum. Tom said we try to avoid those as much as possible, and we will bring the ACF-IPG input back to John Bordy and the working group. Rich requested the target date for publication of Order 8260.3C, since any change will now have to wait until then. Tom responded “August 2015”. Rich said NBAA would prefer to see something sooner and recommended the policy be included in TERPS Change 26.

Status: AFS-420 will continue leading the workgroup to develop a recommended position for the US-IFPP. Item Open (AFS-420).

p. 12-01-301: Publishing a Vertical Descent Angle (VDA) with 34:1 Surface Penetrations in the Visual Segment (*Includes Issue 13-01-309 LP Procedure Cancelled Because of VDA Not Being Charted)*

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update as provided by John Bordy, the AFS-420 conventional TERPS criteria specialist: "This issue was discussed at length during the US-IFPP meeting in June. The US-IFPP determined that AFS-420 will lead a working group (tentative members were identified during the US-IFPP meeting) to develop a recommended position for the US-IFPP to consider. It was also agreed that non-US-IFPP member participation would be included in the working group as requested at AFC-IPG meeting 13-01. AFS-420 intends to convene a meeting of the working group prior to the next meeting of the US-IFPP." Rich Boll, NBAA, requested he be included as a meeting participant.

Lev Prichard, APA, briefed that he had decided to research examples where the problems exist and emphasized that it is not strictly a commercial operational problem. He briefed from a PowerPoint presentation, which included a CFIT history slide that showed where aircraft accidents occurred relative to runways. Lev used the San Diego (KSAN) LOC RWY 27 IAP to demonstrate the benefits of vertical guidance. Lev compared the FAA and Jeppesen approach plates, with emphasis on the advisory altitudes on the Jeppesen chart. Lev said the point is that APA supports all vertical guidance to MDA, with advisory use below MDA; however, NOTAMs

not allowing straight-in procedures at night effectively cancel all vertical guidance. A synopsis of Lev's presentation and briefing slides are included here .

From the GA perspective, Lev discussed the Fayetteville (FYV) RNAV RWY 34 which illustrated several issues. This approach has LPV minimums, has a VDP so the 20:1 visual surface is clear, but no 'stipple' indicating the 34:1 is not clear, and has a VDA. However, if you fly into the airport with a Garmin equipped aircraft, you will note the box is stripped of vertical descent programming because of Garmin programming methodology. Therefore, even though the chart shows LPV and LNAV minimums, you have no vertical guidance. But, if you look at the plate, you would think you also have vertical guidance since it has both a VDA and VDP. This is the unintended consequence of when this box was certified; some systems may have the guidance while others do not. Lev recommended charting everything and letting pilots/operators sort it out to their specifics. John Collins, GA Pilot, stated that a pilot can't always tell from a charted NPA whether vertical guidance is available. Discussion ensued about steep glide paths, and that advisory vertical guidance is advisory everywhere.

Rich Boll, NBAA, referred back to the KSAN LOC RWY 27 approach. The Jeppesen version profile has the ball note: "only authorized operators may use VNAV/DA/H in lieu of MDA/H". Rich asked how the VGSI could be inop and the FAA still allow an operator to treat a MDA as a DA/H under OpSpec C073. Rich stated he is raising this issue due to the note, and he is seeing it on a lot of approaches, where straight-in/circling is N/A at night but the ball note is still on the chart. Tom asked John Moore if he could determine the Jeppesen source for these notes. John said he did not know, but there had been internal discussions on the matter and he would check with Ted Thompson. Group discussion indicated that this was due to criteria at Part 139 airports only, and also is unique to Jeppesen charts, not FAA charts. Tom stated that since this subject is off topic from the agenda item, it would be put in the minutes as a discussion item, but will not be tracked by ACF. Rich concurred since NBAA concern deals with Part 135 operators.

Much later in the Forum John Collins raised concern that no updates or discussion was provided relating to Recommendation 13-01-309, which was combined with this item at the last meeting. Tom assured the group that this item will not be closed till both 12-01-301 and 13-01-309 are resolved. John asked that issue 13-01-309 be specifically updated in the next update to this issue.

> ***Editor's Note:*** *The following response was provided by Ted Thompson, in response to John Moore's inquiry regarding the use of the ball note in the profile of Jeppesen approach charts: "In essence, the origins of the Jeppesen-added notes are based on HBAT 99-08 and related requests from several ATA (now A4A)-member airlines when VNAV was introduced. The criteria originally cited in HBAT 99-08 were eventually replaced with amended criteria contained in OpSpec C073. The criteria were mainly unchanged with the exception that they now only apply at 14 CFR, Part 139 Airports. Jeppesen charting specs address the removal of the notes for charts at non-Part 139 Airports."*

Status: AFS-420 will continue to work these two issues through the US-IFPP.
Item Open [AFS-420 (US-IFPP)].

q. 12-02-303: Charting Computer Navigation Fixes (CNFs)

This item was discussed in conjunction with Issue 11-01-296. Kel Christianson, AFS-470, briefed that the AIM changes presented at the last meeting were finalized and have been forwarded for the next AIM publication cycle (February 6, 2014).

Status: AFS-470 to track publication of AIM guidance. Open Pending Publication (AFS-470).

r. 12-02-305: Conflict Between STAR VNAV Path and MEA

Jim Arrighi, AJV-14, briefed that Order JO 7100.9E was signed on September 27, 2013.

Status: Issue CLOSED.

s. 13-01-307: TDZE is Required by 91.175, THRE is Not

Bryant Welch, AFS-410, provided a recap on the issue. 14 CFR, Part 91.175 requires TDZE be known by pilot to use approach lights to descend below minimums; however, the TDZE was removed with TERPS Change 20 in 2007 and replaced with THRE. Since then, there has been a lot of push back by industry stating that the lack of TDZE information could cause them to violate a Rule. After staffing the issue, Flight Standards decided to return to the old way of computing and basing minimums on the TDZE. This will require changing 4000+ charts back to TDZE, (with about 150 more per cycle currently being added to this number). Until accomplished, it is proposed to publish a listing of affected runway TDZEs on an AJV web site and possibly in the NTAP. Since minimums are not affected, this will provide the necessary information for pilots to compute the 100 foot above TDZE point. John Collins, GA Pilot, recommends when both values are the same; i.e., THRE is the TDZE, just publish the TDZE. Bryant agreed and stated they are proposing to publish a list in the NTAP.

Val Watson, AJV-3B, asked if there is some way to halt the development of procedures using THRE, since we are publishing procedure charts to the wrong data every day. Bruce DeCleene, AFS-400, stated that AFS had sent a memo to accommodate this and asked where AJV was in implementing the new standard. Brad Rush, AJV-3B, responded they will not change procedure development until the supporting criteria is in place. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, said all these changes are in the 8260.19F, which is scheduled for January, 2014. The second piece to the solution is TERPS Change 26, which has been delayed. Val asked if we can have interim guidance or a policy memo on this. Tom responded there is a problem with this, since we do not usually make changes to directives signed by AFS-1 without either a NOTICE or a change to the Order directly. We originally believed changes to Orders.8260.19 and 8260.3 were going to come out sooner. Also automation needs to be changed for both FAA and DoD. Bruce recommended this portion of the discussion be taken off line.

Michael Stromberg, Air Wisconsin, stated that it seemed the simplest solution would be to change the rule. Bruce responded that there was a rich dialog within Flight Standards on this issue centering on what is operationally pertinent to the pilot and the response is TDZE. THRE is irrelevant; no one lands on a threshold. AFS tried to change the rule once before and there was significant industry pushback, especially from Boeing and Airbus, who both expressed concern over the impact on autoland operations. In short, industry is on public record as opposed to the change and FAA has gone on record as accepting the industry comments. Moving on, the next issue is the impact on procedure design and criteria needs to be reversed to pre-Change 20 and return to use of TDZE for minimums calculations. AFS agrees that in the

interim a manual workaround is acceptable for procedure designers. We must also make the current TDZE known for those procedures designed to THRE when the TDZE is a higher value.

Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that this is not just an airline issue as some Part 91 operators also use the 100' provision. Rich believes the NTAP is not a good medium for promulgating the TDZE information and asked whether it could be done through the regular NOTAM process. Bill Hammett, AFS-420, (ISI/Pragmatics Contract Support), stated that this could probably be distributed as a NOTAM D as updating runway information. Brad Rush, AJV-3, objected, stating that NOTAMs should be for safety of flight conditions only. Val Watson, AJV-3, also voiced that a runway NOTAM is not appropriate, as the runway information is not changed or updated, it is simply not depicted on the approach plate. Rich responded that NOTAMs are also used to broadcast operational information and referred to Order 7930.2M, Paragraph 1-3-5.

George Bland, AFFSA, asked if the FAA would/could do this manually, and stated the DoD will have to change automation first. Brad commented that FAA is aware of the automation problem, and it will take time and money to resolve it. Tom said a memo went out to advise of upcoming policy changes some time ago, so this shouldn't be a surprise.

Tom moved to end discussion of issue. He stated that minimums can be raised by P-NOTAM if necessary. Bill Hammett responded to a question about placing both TDZE and THRE on IAP charts by reminding the group this subject was discussed at a previous ACF, and was violently objected to by nearly all pilot industry groups. Bruce suggested the discussion of how to expedite day forward TDZE usage for new/revised charts be taken off line and worked between AFS-400 and AJV-3. Brad re-stated that criteria changes are needed before automation changes can be done and discussed the possible introduction of errors due to manually changing numbers.

Status: 1) AFS-400 and AJV-3 will jointly work a plan for immediate implementation, and 2) AFS-410 and AJV-3B to work the issue of publishing TDZE on current procedures developed under TERPS Change 20. Item Open (AFS-400, AJV-3, AFS-410 and AJV-3B).

t. 13-01-308: RNAV (GPS) Approach Procedures That Do Not Have an LNAV Minimum Line Should Indicate "Alternate NA"

Kel Christianson, AFS-470, stated that the information has been published in the AIM and recommended closing issue. John Collins, GA Pilot, disagreed, commenting that LPV-only approaches are vertically guided and since they do not have an associated non-vertically guided line of minima published, must be marked as ALT N/A. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, discussed John's concerns and advised of specific guidance that has already been incorporated into Order 8260.19 to alleviate them. John concurred the 8260.19 changes address his concerns; however, the AIM guidance is lacking. Kel stated he will take this issue back to Catherine Majauskas, the AFS-470 specialist working this issue, for action.

Status: AFS-470 to consider John Collin's comments for possible AIM update.
Item Open (AFS-470).

u. 1**3-01-310:** Option “Pilot Must Have at Least the Textual Description of a SID/STAR in Possession” to Fly a SID or STAR

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update from Gil Baker, contract support to the AFS-420 OPR for the IPH: "Draft IPH wording has been changed to reflect current AIM guidance. Targeted publication date is February 2014”.

Status: AFS-420 to track changes to the IPH. Open Pending Publication (AFS-470).

v. 1**3-01-311:**Terminal Arrival Areas

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update from the US-IFPP as received from TJ Nichols, the AFS-420 TERPS RNAV criteria specialist: "This subject was extensively discussed at the June US-IFPP meeting and led to a collaborative effort between AFS-420 and AFS-470 to review TAA use and a review of Order 8260.58. Both offices agreed to make changes in the next revision of the Order to remove all references to "free flight" from Volume 4, paragraphs 1.1.1, 1.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3, and table 1-1. It was also noted that there is a discontinuity between the minimum leg length or the ideal leg length and the assumed intercept angle. There was some language implying pilots were supposed to or were obligated to maneuver themselves to make the angle, in order to make the leg length good and there are issues with that. There is no obligation nor any pilot training that requires this, and AFS is going to re-consider the leg length criteria instead of trying to put this on the pilot.

It was also discussed that there is contradiction between TERPS design, ATC procedures, and AIM material for pilots that must be resolved. For example, the AIM says that once a pilot crosses the TAA boundary he/she may proceed direct to the applicable fix, whereas TERPS implies the pilot must maneuver to be at a 45º intercept or fail to make the intercept with the appropriate leg length.

AFS-420 and AFS-470 agreed to jointly lead a US-IFPP working group to develop recommended revisions to FAA Order 8260.58, AIM, IPH, and IFH."

A lengthy group discussion followed on TAA concepts and actions, including pilot actions and controller responsibilities. Kel Christianson, AFS-470, advised action is underway to revise the entire TAA portion of the AIM. John Collins, GA Pilot, stated the original TAA concept was to apply to RNAV approaches, but it is becoming more and more common to see them on conventional IAPs. He supports increased use of TAAs and asked that if a TAA is published in lieu of a MSA, should the IAP be annotated “GPS Required”. The consensus was yes. Brad Rush, AJV-3B, stated that they are seeing increasing TAA application on conventional IAPs. John stated he supports this concept. Tom advised the TAA concept was to replace MSA and a short discussion ensued regarding the future value of MSAs. Any changes will be discussed in US-IFPP, including all references to free flight. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI/Pragmatics Contract Support), asked Gary Fiske, AJV-8, if TAA controller training had been developed. Gary said that AT had not been good at training controllers on the benefits of TAAs. He also added that use of TAAs is most beneficial in remote areas where the ARTCC serves as the approach control.

Status: 1) AFS-420 will continue a review of FAA Order 8260.58 through the US-IFPP and forward the results to AFS-470 for updating of the AIM, IPH and IFH; and, 2) AJE-31 and AJV-8 will continue developing controller training material.
Item Open (AFS-420, AJE-31, and AJV-8).

5. <u>New Business</u>:

a. 13-02-312: Equipment Requirement Notes on Instrument Approach Procedures

New issue presented by Rich Boll, NBAA, as a joint submission on behalf of NBAA and Bruce Williams, CFI and FAASTeam Member, Seattle, WA.

Rich presented background info , highlighting the duplication (both plan view and briefing strip) of chart notes on some procedures. Rich and Bruce both recommend that FAA determine the most critical equipment requirement and publish a single note regardless of whether that equipment is required to enter the procedure or to fly it. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that split notes are published as a direct result of ACF Charting Group consensus on CG issue 01-01-137. A long discussion followed after which Tom asked if the group had any objection to charting just one note in the briefing strip. Brad Rush AJV-3B questioned if IPG was initiating policy. Tom responded no; however, it is helpful to get users consensus **prior to** writing policy/criteria. Kevin Bridges, AIR 130, asked the benefits of the equipment notes. Rich responded that pilots must know what equipment is required to fly the approach. If something more than what the title suggests is necessary, then that equipment must be noted for the pilot. The general consensus is that FAA should determine the most critical equipment necessary for the approach and publish one note in the briefing strip. Tom recommended an AFS-410/420/470 working group be formed to address the issue and report back to the ACF.

Status: A joint AFS 410/420/470 working group will be formed to work the issue. Item Open (AFS-410/420/470).

b 13-02-313: Chart Notes for Simultaneous Approaches

New issue presented by John Blair, AFS-410, expressing concern over the increasingly lengthy note requirements for simultaneous approaches. Current requirements are to note all simultaneous approaches on the chart being used by the pilot. In the case of locations like Atlanta, Los Angeles, etc., this can include up to 19 other approach titles, thus requiring a very lengthy note. AFS-410 is recommending the note be shortened to simple state that simultaneous operations are in effect to runways xx/xx/and xx. Vince Massimini, MITRE, stated that with the change from ILS/MLS being the only simultaneous operations authorized, he believed that pilots only need to know the applicable runways. Brad Rush, AJV-3B, stated that the IAP doesn't change whether there is a note on it or not, the ATIS also provides the information. Brad emphasized that when notes change on regulatory procedures, the procedure has to be amended. John Frazier. Advanced Aircrew Academy, asked why notes are required in the first place. Jim Arrighi, AJV-14, stated that before we decide to get rid of any notes that were added as a result of a SMRD, another SMRP would probably be necessary, before removing them. The group discussion and consensus is to only note the runways to which simultaneous approaches are authorized. It should also be considered whether the note can be eliminated and this information promulgated via the ATIS. Gary Fiske, AJV-8, added that Order JO 7110.65, paragraph 5-9-8 doesn't require specific IAPs only runways. AFS-410 will pursue these options through AT and the SRMD process.

Status: AFS-410 to work issue, with room consensus on direction. Item Open (AFS-410).

c. 13-02-314: Bank Angle Requirements on Instrument Approach Procedures

New issue presented by Rich Boll, NBAA, expressing concern over the use of increased bank angles in procedure design. He used the RNAV (GPS) RWY 33 approach at Buena Vista, CO, which specifies 25 degrees was used in the design; however, this information is not provided to the pilot. Rich is requesting that higher bank angles be published on the chart. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed he had consulted with TJ Nichols, the AFS-420 staff specialist for RNAV criteria, who responded ( ) that the use of an increased bank angle should not have happened. A bank angle calculator was inadvertently included in Order 8260.58. This situation is being corrected by an AFS-400 memo; however, Tom was unsure whether it had been signed. Brad Rush, AJV-3B, asked what bank angle developers should use. John Frazier, Advanced Aircrew Academy, concurred that the chart does not specify the bank angle; therefore, in the absence of other guidance, pilots would apply what they normally use. Group discussion on bank angles and aircraft performance and climb gradients ensued. Bruce McGray, AFS-410, stated that if a 25 degree bank angle is required, then it will have to be a demonstrated aircrew qualification. Rich stated that what he understands from the conversation is this was a fluke and should not happen again. Tom added there should never be a 25 degree bank angle requirement specified on an IAP. With this statement, Rich stated the issue may be closed.

Editor's Note: *The policy clarification memo mentioned above was signed by AFS-400 on November 4, 2013.*

Status: Issue CLOSED.

6. Next Meeting: ACF Meeting **14-01** is scheduled for **April 29-May 1, 2014** with **MITRE Corporation, 7515 Colshire Avenue, McLean, Virginia 22012** as host. ACF Meeting **14-02** is scheduled for **October 28-30, 2014** with **ISI/Pragmatics** as host. ALPA has volunteered to host meeting 15-01.

Please note the attached Office of Primary Responsibility (OPR) listing (attachment 1) for action items. It is requested that all OPRs provide the Chair, Tom Schneider, AFS-420, a written status update on open issues not later than October 9 - a reminder notice will be provided.

7. Attachments (2):
1. OPR/Action Listing.
2. Attendance Listing

Editor's Note: *As was announced during the meeting, this will be my last ACF-IPG meeting as Executive Secretary for this group. I have been attending ACF meetings since 1992 and have served as the Executive Secretary for the Instrument Procedures Group through 5 Chairs as both a 'fed and as a contractor since 1995. It has been a genuinely satisfying work experience. I have learned much from the conversations and my knowledge base broadened exponentially. I thank you all for your friendship and camaraderie over the past 21 years and especially thank Tom Schneider of AFS-420, Ted Thompson and John Moore of Jeppesen, Bob Lamond and Rich Boll of NBAA, and Brad Rush of FAA/AJV-3 for their kind words and farewell presentations after the meeting. I trust and encourage you all to provide the same support to my replacement, Steve VanCamp. I truly believe this Aeronautical Charting Forum has proven to be an invaluable asset to both FAA and industry in addressing and resolving instrument procedure criteria and charting issues and wish it continued support and success. Until we meet again somewhere, I will now retire to a life, as described by Tom T. Hall, a distinguished bluegrass songwriter, of "faster horses, younger women, older whiskey, and more money". Thank you all.....Bill Hammett*

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
OPEN AGENDA ITEMS FROM MEETING 13-02

OPR	AGENDA ITEM (ISSUE)	REQUIRED ACTION
AFS-470	**92-02-110:** (Cold Weather Altimetry)	Continue to develop a cold temperature implementation plan and update the AIM.
AJE-31	**02-01-241:** (Non-Radar Level and Climb-in-hold (CIH) Patterns	Track change to FAA Order JO 7210.3.
AFS-420	**07-01-270:** (Course Change Limitation Notes on IAPs)	Track TERPS Change 26.
AFS-420	**07-02-278:** (Advanced RNAV (FMS/GPS) Holding Patterns Defined by Leg Length)	Continue development of revised holding criteria.
AJV-14	**09-02-286:** (Initial "Climb & Maintain" Altitude on SIDS)	Monitor PCPSI group actions and report progress. .
AFS-410, AFS-470 and AFS-420	**09-02-288:** (VNAV Minimums vs. Circle to Land)	AFS-410: In concert with AFS-470, develop AIM language. **Note:** Assistance has been offered from NBAA, APA, John Collins, and Horizon Air. AFS-420: Track IPH publication
AFS-420 (US-IFPP)	**09-02-291:** (Straight-in Minimums NA at Night)	Continue to work issue through the US-IFPP and report.
AFS-420 AJE-31	**10-01-292:** (Removal of VCOA Option at Mountainous Airports)	AFS-420: Track IPH guidance. AJE-31: Track AIM, AIP, PCG, and changes to FAA Orders JO 7110.65/7110.10 until published.
AFS-470	**10-01-294:** (RNP SAAAR Intermediate Segment Length and ATC Intervention)	Monitor PARC actions and report.
AFS-470	**11-01-296:** (Magnetic Variation Differences and Flight Management Systems)	Track AIM changes until published.
AFS-420	**11-02-297:** (Airway "NoPT" Notes on IAPs)	Track change to FAA Order 8260.19.
AJV-3B (US-IFPP) AFS-420	**11-02-298:** (Converging ILS Coding and Chart Naming Convention)	AJV-3B: Track and report US-IFPP and internal AJV-3 actions on the subject. AFS-420: Track change to FAA Order 8260.19.
AFS-420 (US-IFPP)	**12-01-299:** (Loss of CAT D Line of Minima in Support of Circle-to-Land Operations)	Lead a study group and address the issue through the US-IFPP.

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
OPEN AGENDA ITEMS FROM MEETING 13-02

OPR	**AGENDA ITEM (ISSUE)**	**REQUIRED ACTION**
AFS-420 (US-IFPP)	**12-01-301:** (Publishing a Vertical Descent Angle (VDA) with 34:1 Surface Penetrations in the Visual Segment, *also includes issue 13-01-309*)	Facilitate US-IFPP work group to address both issues.
AFS-470	**12-02-303:** (Charting Computer Navigation Fixes(CNFs))	Track AIM guidance regarding CNFs until published.
AFS-400 & AJV-3 AFS-410 & AJV-3B	**13-01-307:** (TDZE is Required by 91.175, THRE is Not)	AFS-400 & AJV-3: Develop a work plan for immediate implementation. AFS-410 & AJV-3B: Publish TDZE value for procedures developed under TERPS Change 20.
AFS-470	**13-01-308:** (RNAV (GPS) IAPs without LNAV Minimums Should Indicate "Alternate NA")	Consider new comments from John Collins regarding IAPs with LPV minima only for inclusion in AIM.
AFS-420	**13-01-310:** (Option to Fly a SID/STAR) with only Textual description)	Track changes to the IPH and ensure the office responsible for the IFH is advised
AFS-420 (US-IFPP) AFS-470 AJE-31 & AJV-8	**13-01-311:** (Terminal Arrival Areas)	AFS-420: Pursue a review of FAA Order 8260.58 through the US-IFPP AFS-470: Based on the above, draft updated language for the AIM, IPH and IFH. AJE-31 and AJV-8: Jointly continue developing controller training material.
AFS-420, AFS-410, and AFS-470	**13-02-312:** (Equipment Requirement Notes on Instrument Approach Procedures)	AFS-420: Lead a joint working group to resolve the issue.
AFS-410	**13-02-313:** (Chart Notes for Simultaneous Approaches)	Work issue using ACF consensus as desired direction.

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
ATTENDANCE - MEETING 13-02

Arrighi	Jim	FAA/AJV-14	202-385-4680	james.arrighi@faa.gov
Becker	Hal	AOPA	540-729-5968	hal.becker@att.net
Blair	John	FAA/AFS-410	202-385-4314	john.blair@faa.gov
Bland	George	AFFSA	405-582-5010	george.bland@us.af.mil
Boll	Richard	NBAA	316-655-8856	richard.boll@sbcglobal.net
Brackin	Jon	FAA/AFS-240	202-267-4129	jon.k.brackin@faa.gov
Bridges	Kevin	FAA/AIR-130	202-385-4627	kevin.bridges@faa.gov
Burns	Andrew	FAA/AFS-410 (Support)	202-385-4974	andrew.ctr.burns@faa.gov
Cato	Mark	ALPA	703-689-4189	mark.cato@alpa.org
Christianson	Kel	FAA/AFS-470	202-385-4702	kel.christianson@faa.gov
Collins	John	GA Pilot	704-576-3561	johncollins@carolina.rr.com
Criswell	Chris	AJV-21	202-267-9302	christopher.criswell@faa.gov
DeCleene	Bruce	FAA-AFS-400	202-385-4586	bruce.decleene@faa.gov
DiPierro	Giovanni	FAA/AJT-2A3	202-385-8691	giovanni.dipierro@faa.gov
Fiske	Gary	FAA/AJT-2A3	860-386-3541	gary.m.fiske@faa.gov
Foster	Mike	USAASA	703-806-4869	james.m.foster1.civ@mail.mil
Frazier	John	dvanced Aircrew Acader	303-726-7423	jfrazier@aircrewacademy.com
Fredricks	Eric	FAA/AJE-31	202-385-8438	eric.fredricks@faa.gov
Gallant	Paul	FAA/AJV-11	202-267-9361	paul.gallant@faa.gov
Gillespie	Kendall	AFFSA	405-502-5023	kendall.gillespie@us.af.mil
Goodson	Robert	NGA	571-558-1714	robert.l.goodson@nga.mil
Graham	Ron	Transport Canada	613-993-5522	ron.graham@tc.gc.ca
Hammett	Bill	FAA/AFS-420 (ISI)	603-521-7706	bill.ctr.hammett@faa.gov
Hendi	Jennifer	FAA/AJV-3B	301-427-4816	jennifer.l.hendi@faa.gov
Herndon	Al	MITRE/CAASD	703-983-6465 FAX: 6608	aherndon@mitre.org
Johnson	Coby	FAA/AFS-410	202-385-4621	coby.johnson@faa.gov
Jones	Chris	FAA/AFS-410 (Support)	202-385-4570	christopher.p-ctr.jones@faa.gov
Jones	beth	DOD NOTAMS	540-422-4752	beth.jones@pentagon.af.mil
Kramer	Tom	AOPA	301-695-2064	tom.kramer@aopa.org
Kuhnhenn	Juergen	Lufthansa (LIDO)	41 44 828-6546	juergen.kuhnhenn@lhsystems.com
Lamond	Robert	NBAA	202-783-9255	rlamond@nbaa.org

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
ATTENDANCE - MEETING 13-02

Laroche	Pierre	Transport Canada	613-991-9927	pierre.laroche@tc.gc.ca
Lombard	Kolie	AFS-400 (ISI)	202-385-4592	kolie.ctr.lombard@faa.gov
Loney	Tom	Royal Canadian Air Force	204-833-2500 x5512	tom.loney@forces.gc.ca
Massimini	Vince	MITRE	703-983-5893 FAX: 1364	svm@mitre.org
McGray	Bruce	FAA/AFS-410	202-385-4937	bruce.mcgray@faa.gov
Mclellan	Christopher	FAA/AFS-240	202-267-4363	christopher.mclellan@faa.gov
Meek	Jordan	Lufthansa (LIDO)	41 44 828 6976	jordan.meek@lhsystems.com
Moore	John	Jeppesen	703-505-0672	john.moore@jeppesen.com
Poisson	Michael	FAA/AJV-8	202-385-6154	michael.poisson@faa.gov
Prichard	Lev	APA	214-212-6357	lhp4@swbell.net
Quezada	Rafael	FAA/AOV-330	202-267-5190	rafael.quezada@faa.gov
Richardson	Walter	FAA/AJV-354	301-427-5139	walter.richardson@faa.gov
Rush	Brad	FAA/AJV-3B	405-954-0188	brad.w.rush@faa.gov
Rushton	Alex	FAA/AJV-3B (LM)	301-427-5186	alex.ctr.rushton@faa.gov
Saenger	Philip	SAIC NextGen Support	202-385-4331	philip.ctr.saenger@FAA.gov
Schneider	Tom	FAA/AFS-420	405-954-5852 FAX: 2528	thomas.e.schneider@faa.gov
Schul	Chris	Delta Air Lines	404-715-8170	christopher.schul@delta.com
Serur	Steve	ALPA	703-689-4333	steve.serur@alpa.org
Stromberg	Michael	Air Wisconsin	920-203-1493	michael.stromberg@airwis.com
Strutin	Ben	ALPA/ATS	973-476-9896	ben.strutin@alpa.org
Swansen	Diane	Jeppesen	303-328-4859	diana.swansen@jeppesen.com
Torzone	Steve	FAA/AFS-410	410-212-8677	stephen.ctr.torzone@faa.gov
Utley	Robert	NATCA	540-660-4291	rutley@natcadc.org
VanCamp	Steve	FAA/AFS-420 (ISI)	405-954-5327	steve.ctr.vancamp@faa.gov
Vogelgesang	Bill	FAA/AJV-8	202-385-6255	bill.vogelgesang@faa.gov
Ward	Ken	FAA/AJW-911	703-927-6243	ken.ctr.ward@faa.gov
Ward	Edward	Southwest Airlines	214-792-1023	edward.ward@wnco.com
Watson	Valerie	FAA/AJV-3B	301-427-5155	valerie.s.watson@faa.gov
Webb	Mike	FAA/AFS-420	202-385-4603	mike.webb@faa.gov
Welch	Bryant	FAA/AFS-410	202-385-4539	bryant.welch@faa.gov
Wood	Leah	Aero Nav Data	703-859-3073	lwood@aeronavdata.com