

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING MEETING (ACM)
MEETING 22-02 October 24-25, 2022
Virtual – Zoom platform

Instrument Procedures Group (IPG) Meeting Minutes

1. **Opening Remarks:** Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, welcomed the participants and provided an in-depth guide to how the virtual meeting would be managed. An attendance roster for the virtual meeting is [attached](#).

2. **Review of Minutes from Last Meeting, ACM 21-02:** Steve VanCamp, Digital iBiz, advised there were no comments, and the minutes were accepted.

3. **Briefings:** None

4. **Old Business (Open Issues):**

a. **15-02-323: Depiction of Low, Close-in Obstacles on SIDs and ODPs:** Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and status of order changes. Dan Wacker, FPAG, briefed the next draft revision of Order 8260.3, U.S. Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS), will enter the coordination process within the next month for review and will include new initial climb area (ICA) criteria. Sue Walker, FPAG, briefed the next revision of Order 8260.46, Departure Procedures (DP) Program, is being prepared for coordination, and it contains the revised documentation for low, close-in obstacles. This is a [link to directives drafts](#).

Actions: FPAG will continue to coordinate the order revisions and will brief status at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

b. **16-02-328: Increasing Complexity of Speed Restriction Notes on SIDs and STARs:** Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary. The original recommendation document (RD) had several recommendations for a variety of speed restrictions. The remaining action was for FPAG to reengage with the PARC PCPSI on any potential criteria changes. Dan Wacker, FPAG, briefed that the Departure Working Group (DWG) met with the PARC PCPSI and agreed to make changes to some standard chart notes on SIDs and STARs. The FPAG will incorporate those changes into the orders in an upcoming revision. A couple of items (radius-to-fix (RF) turns and speed restrictions) will go back to the PARC for some clarification prior to inclusion in the draft orders. Jeff suggested we close the issue, and there were no objections.

Status: Item closed

c. **18-02-337: Improve Remote Altimeter Airport Notes:** Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue from the [slide](#). For years, the city name was used to reference the source and the suggestion was to use the airport identifier. Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, said this change was incorporated in Order 8260.19J, Flight Procedures

and Airspace, which will be published soon. Jeff added there were no negative comments received related to this revision during coordination. Associated AIM changes will be coordinated and will be published relatively concurrent with the order publication. There will be some time after the order is signed before the criteria changes are fully implemented and further time before amended procedures will be promulgated, so the time between order publication and AIM revision should not be an issue. Jeff confirmed this will be a day-forward effort and feels the issue can be closed. Vince Massimini, NavTec, does not object to closing the issue but did wonder if we should keep it open pending AIM revisions. Andrew Fenwick, Garmin, said this was his original RD, and asked if the ICAO airport identifiers would be used. Diane said when there is an ICAO identifier it will be used. Andrew does not have any objection to the issue closing. Jeff said there is no example of AIM language yet, but it will be worked as the order language changes. Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group (FOG), said they are currently working several AIM changes, and this change is part of that effort. Jeff showed the [slide](#) with example language from Order 8260.19J. Vince pointed out that some U.S. airports do not have ICAO identifiers, and that is what the language is trying to reflect. Andrew suggested changing the wording to use ICAO identifiers when available, such as in Alaska. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), agreed with Andrew adding that procedures would typically use FAA identifiers in the Continental U.S. and thinks the Order 8260.19 language should be modified. Bruce McGray, FPAG, suggests only using ICAO when appropriate. Krystal Kime, FAA Aeronautical Information Services Terminal Charting, suggests using FAA identifiers for CONUS airports. Doug Willey, Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA), suggested using ICAO when available and FAA identifiers otherwise to avoid confusion for foreign pilots. Diane said she will consider the draft order language for possible changes to ensure clarity. Andrew said he prefers using just the ICAO identifier.

Actions: FPAG will consider modifying the Order 8260.19J language prior to publication and will report status at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

d. 19-01-342: Charting “NA When Local Weather Not Available” for Alternate Minimums: Diane Adams-Maturo, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and status from [slides](#). There was a small internal working group formed to discuss results from the last ACM meeting. Diane presented three suggested recommendations from that working group. The group suggested incorporating portions of all three recommendations, with the first step to better define “local weather.” The WX Community of Interest (COI) proposed recommendation was shown with supporting background information. Updated TPP front matter has already been completed. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, discussed using local weather for alternate planning, pointing out pilots do not use the weather but are using the forecast information. He said pilots need a clear definition of the term “local weather,” and Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, said the proposed definition seems to provide extra clarity. Dale Courtney, FAA/AJW-263, said it is not so much about having a Terminal Area Forecast (TAF), but that altimeter reporting or weather information from an observer or a qualified automated system (AWOS or ASOS) could meet the requirements for an alternate airport consideration. Bill set up a scenario with planning a three-hour instrument flight rules (IFR) flight that requires an alternate. He would see the note “NA when local weather not available,” but at the time of filing he would not care about the current weather observations at

the alternate airport. Vince Massimini, NavTec, said when filing a flight plan, there is no requirement for the destination or alternate to have a TAF. Trey Turner, Southwest Airlines, said though he flies for a Part 121 carrier, he also regularly flies GA IFR. He questioned the intent of the 600-2 and 800-2 standard alternate weather minima and if it was considered to account for deteriorating conditions on a local forecast. Jeff Rawdon, FPAG, said he did not know the history of the standard alternate minimums values. Diane said this work is an ongoing effort and Jeff said the item would remain open at this time. John Collins, ForeFlight/Boeing, said this is a procedure qualification issue and should have nothing to do with the weather, but rather to determine if the procedure is usable as an alternate. Mike Crim asked if this is a question of alternate planning or a question of what drives the procedure to be not authorized with “NA” on a chart. Diane said some charts have the note “NA when local weather unavailable,” and that was the original question. The effort is to define clarification of what the note means and showed the WX COI proposal (slide 5). Jeff added this would be worked as a criteria issue for the flight procedure designers. Joshua described Spirit of St. Louis RNAV (GPS) RWY 8L as an example, which is allowed for as an alternate procedure but has the note “NA when local weather not available.” The question is the confusion of local vs. remote weather and/or altimeter and when a procedure can be used as an alternate. Bill said the note does not indicate whether the altimeter is available and feels that is a key part of the issue. John agreed with Bill but added the chart note should use the terminology “...when local altimeter not available...” as opposed to “local weather” for consistency. Dale said there are two separate issues in this and feels the local vs. remote altimeter discussion should be separate from the alternate minima discussion. Diane continued the briefing, showing possible AIM draft language. John Blair, FAA Flight Operations Group, said he had investigated origins of the 600-2 and 800-2 standard alternate minimums several years ago, and found it was a comparison of how Parts 121 & 135 utilize the minimums for alternate planning versus how they are utilized for Part 91. The intent was to make it simple so Part 91 pilots could use it. Bill discussed the last sentence in the proposed AIM language, suggesting a revision such as: “For the purpose of Part 91 operators considering an alternate, the note “NA when local weather not available” refers to the availability of the alternate airport local altimeter reporting. For example, an approved AWOS, ASOS, or ATIS. This does not refer to the availability of a forecast for the purpose of determining if an airport meets the requirements of 14 CFR 91.169; it is the pilot’s responsibility to determine appropriate weather reports or weather forecasts.” Jeff sent this to Diane for consideration. Diane showed a final slide regarding Pilot Controller Glossary draft language and will consider the suggestions. The effort is ongoing, and she welcomes any suggestions. Bill suggested a human factors review as proposals are developed.

Actions: FPAG will continue working this issue and will report status at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

e. **19-01-343: Clarify Text of Notes that Affect Minima:** Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), discussed the issue regarding the ambiguity of notes to avoid misinterpretation. Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, has been working through the proposed order and AIM changes. These changes are captured in the FPAG internal issue tracking system and will be addressed in a future order revision. Associated AIM changes will be addressed as the order revisions are undertaken.

Actions: FPAG will continue to work the issue and will report status at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

f. 19-02-344: Intermediate Segment Stepdown Altitudes: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slide](#)) summary. Dan Wacker, FPAG, advised the Order 8260.3E (Change 2) draft incorporated the necessary criteria in an appendix and has held discussions with Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) and MITRE to determine the possibility of implementing in automation. Dan suggested the issue could be closed. Jeff Rawdon, FPAG, pointed out there were no concerns raised with this criteria change during coordination of the order draft. Since the original proponent (Rich Boll, NBAA) was not present, attendees felt the issue should remain open until he could provide concurrence with closing the issue. Michael Stromberg, Independent Pilots Association (IPA)/UPS, said he believes Rich wanted stronger guidance on the issue to require fix location compensation, and he has the same concern. Jeff recalled Rich's concern but said the Agency decision was that this would be an appendix to the order, and therefore not mandated. Doug Willey, Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA), voiced concerns also, agreeing with Rich and Michael that this should be a standard requirement. Dan pointed out that the addition of this criteria (though not mandated) would support airports where Air Traffic and pilots had perceived altitude compliance issues, and the change would replace the 2011 memo initially providing this information. John Blair, FAA Flight Operations Group, said this was an issue at some locations, and this effort would provide designers the ability to address those locations.

Actions: FPAG will report status of the Order 8260.3E (Change 2) changes at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

g. 19-02-346: Deceleration Segment on STARs Supporting Compliance with 14 CFR 91.117(c): Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary ([slide](#)), and the need for the criteria change. Dan Wacker, FPAG, briefed draft Order 8260.3E (Change 2) revisions and that the draft would be in coordination soon. Dan added the revised language has already been coordinated with Rich Boll, NBAA, as the RD proponent. Dan said the language is crafted specifically to provide adequate distance for deceleration when going beneath a Class B shelf. The latest draft strengthens the language. Michael Stromberg, Independent Pilots Association (IPA)/UPS, says he thinks this should solve the identified issue. Jeff displayed the draft language for the group, and Dan added that the revision would make it mandatory. The issue will remain open until Rich has an opportunity to concur with closure.

Actions: FPAG will brief status of Order 8260.3E (Change 2) at ACM 23-01 and suggest closure at that time.

Status: Item open

h. 20-02-353: Revised Guidance and Charting for Order 8260.3 Circling Area Dimensions: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed background on the issue from the [slides](#). All circling areas evaluations and necessary Notices to Air Mission (NOTAMs) [are expected to be complete with the December 29, 2022 chart cycle]. The current estimate for Flight Inspection validation completion is now the first half of 2023.

Once all the areas have been validated, Charting will begin the process of removing all the icons with a completion estimate of six chart cycles. When this last process begins, Flight Standards will begin the process of updating AIM and IPH information and the Charting Office will update the TPP legends. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), said when they begin removing the icons, there will be a chart notice and updates to the Chart Users Guide.

Actions: FPAG will continue to provide briefings at subsequent ACM meetings until the initiative is complete.

Status: Item open

i. 20-02-354: Use of Suitable Area Navigation (RNAV) Systems on Conventional Procedures and Routes: Jeff Rawdon, Flight Procedures Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slides](#)). There are conventional routes charted as unusable, and the Flight Standard's position is that these routes are entirely unusable, even by aircraft with RNAV systems. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), said there is a Charting Group issue on unusable airways later in the meeting and wanted to avoid confusion. Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group (FOG), said AC 90-119 is still in draft mode, has been through the PARC NAV Work Group, and has been out for public comment with many comments received. That comment review process is ongoing, and once adjudication is complete, they intend to put the AC through coordination again. AC 90-119 consolidates the information from ACs 90-100, 90-105, 90-107, and 90-108 into a single Performance Based Navigation operation advisory circular. It will include and consolidate the technique of using RNAV systems on conventional routes and procedures.

Actions: FOG will provide a status update of AC 90-119 at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

j. 20-02-355: Minimum En Route Altitudes (MEAs) Published on Standard Instrument Departures (SIDs) and Standard Terminal Arrivals (STARs): Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slide](#)). An MEA/MOCA working group was formed, and that work is now complete. The working group did not feel any broad redefinitions of MEA or MOCA were necessary. There will be some minor editorial changes in the applicable orders for clarification, but there are no changes in the definition or expectation of usage. The work is completed, and although the recommendation could be closed, the proponent (Rich Boll, NBAA) was not present so it will remain open until Rich has a chance to comment. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, asked if unnecessarily high MEAs will be removed, and Jeff said those MEAs should be revised as procedures with those MEAs are amended.

Actions: FPAG will discuss the planned changes with Rich Boll prior to ACM 23-01 to reach concurrence for closure and will provide an update on that discussion at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

k. 21-02-358: Canned FAA Chart Notes Leading to Pilot Error: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slide](#)). This has generated an

internal issue in Flight Standards where it will be tracked and worked. The issue will remain open and FPAG will continue to brief progress. Pat Mulqueen, FAA Instrument Flight Procedures Group (AJV-400), added the notes restricting autopilot coupled approach usually are added after the initial procedure design since the need is typically identified during flight inspection.

Actions: FPAG will draft appropriate changes for an upcoming revision of Order 8260.19 and will brief status at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

l. 21-02-359: CNF Used in Airways: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slide](#)) is being worked in the ATS Routes Working Group. Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, briefed they are working on clarification of some legal issues regarding identification and application of CNFs. Jeff said the item is still being worked, and the issue will remain open.

Actions: The ATS Routes WG will continue working the issue and FPAG will continue to brief status at upcoming ACM meetings.

Status: Item open

m. 21-02-360: Insufficient Guidance on How to Process Minima-Related Notes on IAPs: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slide](#)). Jeff discussed an element of the proposal from the chart modernization proposal ([CG RD 18-02-327](#)) relates to this issue. Once that improvement is in place there will be a separate area on the approach chart showing the adjusted visibility values for inoperative components. FPAG will also be reviewing the possibility of AIM changes to address some of the concerns raised by this RD. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), reinforced that the related point of the chart modernization effort is to take inoperative component adjustment notes and translate them into tabular form. Since it will take many years for these changes to be reflected on a significant number of approach charts Valerie recommends creating enhanced AIM guidance for pilots to better understand minima-related notes.

Actions: FPAG will work with the Flight Operations Group to consider possible AIM revisions.

Status: Item open

n. 21-02-361: Differing TACAN Missed Approach Instructions: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slide](#)). There are currently 28 existing combined VOR or TACAN procedures with separate missed approach instructions in the inventory. This is no longer allowed by criteria and will be corrected as those procedures are amended. However, there is no specific guidance prohibiting separate missed approach instructions for other types of procedures. There are 31 ILS, or ILS or LOC procedures that have some sort of separate TACAN missed approach instructions currently published. Flight Standards has had internal discussions since the last ACM and has determined that separate missed approach instructions should not be permissible on any approach procedure and will initiate revisions to Orders 8260.3 and 8260.19 to codify this. An issue has been added to the

order revision tracking system to capture this as a future change. Steve Madigan, Garmin, voiced his approval of the RD resolution. Mike Stromberg, Independent Pilots Association (IPA)/UPS, asked if language or wording was needed until these procedures are fixed to avoid confusion, and Jeff said there would be no way to accomplish that without an amendment. Questions regarding specific procedures can be submitted via the Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Gateway, though the only possible confusion would likely be for the TACAN portion.

Actions: FPAG will initiate order revisions to eliminate the option of separate missed approach instructions for all approach procedures and will provide a status update at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

o. 21-02-362: Un-Codable Departure Procedures: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slide](#)). The Departure Working Group (DWG) is looking into the third recommendation on the RD which is the only recommendation still under consideration. Dan Wacker, FPAG, briefed the current allowance for conventional procedures to have multiple initial departure fixes (IDFs) is still needed by Air Traffic. The DWG has no intention to convert conventional departures that have these into RNAV-only procedures. The DWG is considering changing RNAV departure criteria to allow multiple IDFs and this will involve ARINC coding. Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, discussed the third recommendation of his RD involved a way of charting the transitions differently; a vector leg would be communicated differently than the rest of the procedure. Dan did not think the vector leg initial runway departure transitions join the procedure. Joshua wanted the vector portion considered differently if charted. Dan said there is a TERPS evaluation for the initial departure heading and the intent for future criteria is to move toward a range of headings as assigned on departure. The solid line from the airport is a transition segment and would be part of the procedure. Joshua said the vector transition is not codable and not in the FMS, and that is confusing. Dan said the example RNAV procedure being discussed is an open SID where an RNAV path terminates in a VM leg, then goes to an IDF and continues from there. Joshua added if Air Traffic wants multiple paths that would be fine, but since multiple transitions cannot be coded, you must be able to distinguish when the heading to vector portion ends and the RNAV portion starts. Gary Fiske, FAA ATC Procedures (Terminal) Team (AJV-P310), said these vector path lines are for only for illustration purposes and Air Traffic does not want them coded. Joshua agreed and discussed the possibility of a different line type representation on the chart. Dan said the recommendation is to leave these as is, since coding is provided on the RNAV portion, and the lines on the chart are general pilot information. Dan believes AOPA and NBAA wanted the information on the charts for pilot situational awareness. Dan does not want charting based on RNAV alone since there can be various non-coded information for the pilots on the procedure. Jeff asked if the DWG considered changing line weights on the charts, and Dan advised they did not since that might create confusion for the pilots to know if they were actually on the procedure. Gary said he does not want different line weights and Dan added he has not heard of any complaints from pilots. Joshua said they are receiving complaints and questions about loadable portions in their databases and Dan asked if that could instead be a training or awareness issue. Joshua restated that a different line weight might help. Dan said the departure starts at the runway, but the codable portion may not. Dan said STARs currently have similar depictions. Dan added he would bring the issue back to the DWG for further discussion on possibilities for addressing the

recommendation. Joshua is concerned about adding more headings to the procedure and would like to consider not charting certain portions until beyond the vector portion of the procedure.

Actions: Dan Wacker will facilitate further discussions in the Departure Working Group and will provide updates at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

p. 22-01-364: Straight-in and Circling Minimums NA Notes: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slide](#)). The NOTAM at KUDD identified in the RD has been corrected. Order 8260.19 has updated language for notes to address this issue but it will take time for those revised notes to propagate throughout the procedure inventory. The ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) reviewed the issue and decided to not act on this recommendation. The RD submitter (Bruce Williams) was not at the meeting. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), pointed out that Rich Boll, NBAA, (not present at this meeting) suggested at ACM 22-01 that the AIM 5-4-5 circling guidance should be strengthened. Dan Wacker, FPAG, said he believed Rich's concern was one of the old notes versus the new notes; specifically, that over the time it will take for the new notes to propagate through all amended procedures AIM guidance could be used to better describe the notes. Karl von Valtier, NetJets, said his organization uses the notes for night restrictions when crafting internal policies for runway ends. They have encountered notes at the same facilities that do not appear to consistently align with one other. They feel there should be a criteria requirement when night circling to a runway is amended that other procedures to the same runway end should be evaluated for consistency and amended if necessary. Dan said this is not part of this issue and has not been addressed. Pat Mulqueen, FAA Instrument Flight Procedures Group (AJV-400), said this is a good topic and the IFP Group has received feedback from user groups and discussed internally. Minor amendments without restrictions to the runway may not receive a full review of all the notes and Pat said any concerns should be submitted via the Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Gateway website. Jeff said he does not see any reference to night circling restriction notes in AIM 5-4-5. Val suggested that was probably Rich's point. Several attendees agreed the old notes may be confusing. Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, discussed that day and night restrictions may have been combined which could create questions, but when considered separately the restrictions would seem clearer. Karl said there may be locations where the dimensions of the visual segment for straight-in and circling may be different leading to the possibility of restrictions for straight-in at night but not for circling. The procedure notes may correctly reflect that situation but could lead to pilot confusion. Jeff pointed out the lateral dimensions of the visual areas were harmonized around 2014, but differences in length between straight-in and circling visual areas to the same runway will still exist. The issue will remain open at this time to address the need for AIM language. Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group (FOG), will discuss the need for AIM and IPH changes to address this topic and advise at the next ACM.

Actions: Joel Dickinson will review the need for AIM and IPH revisions within the Flight Operations Group to address this topic and will brief the results of that discussion at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

q. 22-01-365: As Charted, Teardrop Course Reversals Lack Pilot Guidance on How to Fly the Reversal: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the item from the RD ([slide](#)). The ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) determined this would not be work the Agency would undertake. There are only eight instrument approach procedures (other than various high-altitude approaches) with teardrop course reversals in the inventory and adequate maneuvering guidance already exists. Additionally, there is no intent to provide a navigable course for the turn inbound and the recommendation was that this RD should be closed. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, as the RD proponent concurred with closure.

Status: Item closed

r. 22-01-366: Circling NA Areas Conflict with FAA Legal Counsel Limitations on Class G Right Traffic: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue ([slide](#)), advising that on review the ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) did not feel this should be accepted for work. There will be no rulemaking changes stemming from this RD, and the ACM, ARRG, and associated offices cannot update a legal opinion. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, pointed out there is no way to fly the procedure, so the Office of the Chief Counsel (AGC) should be asked to change their interpretation on the unflyable procedure and suggested a letter be sent to them with some examples. *Editor's note: An attendee brought up a conversation they had with a Flight Standards District Office Aviation Safety Inspector (ASI) on this subject and discussed that conversation. Since the ASI was not present at the meeting and therefore unable to speak to those conversations, and since none of the Flight Standards attendees were familiar with that position and it was unknown if that conversation would be considered a Flight Standards position, details of that discussion are not included in these minutes.* John Collins, ForeFlight/Boeing, discussed he was involved with this AGC query and his letter is included in the RD. John agrees additional clarification would help. Jeff thinks the RD submitter should go directly to AGC requesting further clarification; however, Bill said he believes they would respond to a letter from Flight Standards more quickly than a letter from the public. Jeff did not think the ACM could do anything on this and that this was not the appropriate venue to resolve this issue. Bruce McGray, FPAG, thinks Flight Standards might get a response more effectively from AGC, adding AGC may not have had knowledge of IFR and VFR differences when the response was drafted. Dan Wacker, FPAG, agrees with bringing this back to the ARRG for discussions. Jeff said the issue will remain open and the discussion about Flight Standards approaching AGC will be returned to the ARRG for consideration. Mike Stromberg, Independent Pilots Association (IPA)/UPS, asked what Flight Inspection was doing to check these procedures and said this would be a safety issue. If an aircraft turned right, then back left to join the traffic pattern (complying with both as the legal interpretation suggests) you could end up outside the area evaluated for circling. Karl von Valtier, NetJets, added his review found many discrepancies and ambiguities between the various legal interpretations, advisory circulars, and regulations on this issue. He recognizes resolving all of these is beyond the scope of the ACM, but he would like these differences examined in another forum.

Actions: This issue will be discussed again by the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine if this issue should be addressed with the Office of the Chief Counsel. Results of that discussion will be briefed at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

s. **22-01-367: Terminal Holds Published with Time and Distance are Confusing:** Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the item from the RD ([slide](#)). From the last meeting, AJV-A committed to revisiting the Garmin inquiry. There were only three procedures affected, and Pat Mulqueen, FAA Instrument Flight Procedures Group (AJV-400), committed that the IFP Group would review these procedures. The ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) decided to not accept the issue for work since the scope was so limited and the IFP Group was committing to amending these procedures. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, asked if any criteria changes were necessary and Jeff confirmed the criteria was reviewed and no changes were determined to be necessary. Pat later confirmed the three procedures were planned for amendments and recommended closing the issue. Garmin concurred with closure of the issue.

Status: Item closed

t. **22-01-368: MSA Center for Non-RNAV Procedures:** Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the item from the RD ([slide](#)). The ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) reviewed the issue and decided this should not be work for the Agency to take on since criteria is already in place to provide the FPT the option of using the airport reference point (ARP) on conventional procedures for the MSA center. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), asked how a non-RNAV equipped aircraft would determine the ARP, and Jeff pointed out the pilot should have a situational awareness of their relation to the airport. Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, referenced Table 1 from the RD – their proposals for non-RNAV MSA center locations – and thinks hierarchal option #2 (an omni-directional facility within 30 NM of the landing surfaces) should be removed. Mike Stromberg, Independent Pilots Association (IPA)/UPS, suggested reordering options #2 & #3 (ARP) in Table 1. Dan Wacker, FPAG, advised the MSA issue had been discussed previously and there was a previous ACM item to remove the MSA to rely on OROCA usage. Michael said if there was only one MSA per airport it should be the ARP. Dan concurred, adding this will be a future effort since he has not seen a safety case on this. Joshua added the OROCA is not on the approach charts and necessitating a pilot reference between charts before beginning the approach procedure could be a safety concern. The ICAO standard is to use the center of the airport. Joshua feels this is a safety issue, and the VOR MON project makes the need greater. Garmin does like the idea of only one MSA per airport. Dan explained with other scheduling priorities for work this may not be considered until 2027. Based on the discussion, Jeff suggested leaving the issue open at this time. Jeff will bring this discussion back to the ARRG for additional consideration.

Action: The ARRG will reconsider the possibility of work on this issue and the outcome of that discussion will be briefed at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

u. **22-01-369: Improve IAP Alternate Minimums:** Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the item from the RD ([slide](#)). The issue is already being addressed so no ACM Recommendation Review Group (ARRG) review was necessary. Flight Standards and AJV-A agree the existing criteria is adequate and that the intent is to publish alternate minimums text in their entirety when promulgated as a P-NOTAM. There may be some

P-NOTAMs to revise, but the FAA feels there are no criteria changes necessary to address the RD. Steve Madigan, Garmin, asked if day-forward that if previous alternate minimums language is not restated in the P-NOTAM it would be because it was no longer necessary. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), confirmed that yes, P-NOTAMS would include the entirety of alternate minimums text.

Status: Item closed

5. New Business (Open Issues)

a. 22-02-370: 8260.3E Figure 2-7-2 Misleading: Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, briefed the issue from the RD ([slide](#)). The main issue is not the accuracy of the textual information but that the figure seems to be an inaccurate representation of the splay geometry. Dan Wacker, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), voiced that the text correctly explains the intent. He pointed out the diagram is to help visualize the area, noting he was not aware of any problems caused by the diagram and does not see a concern. Dan said he will look at either fixing or deleting the figure and does not see a need to track this in the ACM. Dan added there are many figures that may need revision throughout the orders and requested they be sent to him as identified. Jeff said the issue will be reviewed by the ARRG.

Actions: This item will be reviewed by the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine any action, and that outcome will be provided at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

b. 22-02-371: Improvement of Periodic Review Process: Steve Madigan, Garmin, briefed the issue from the RD ([slide](#)). This issue was submitted jointly with NBAA and addresses instrument procedures that have not been amended in many years and are therefore unlikely to comply entirely with current criteria. Steve discussed the periodic review frequency requirements, noting that there are procedures in the NAS that have not been amended in many years. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, added there does not appear to be guidance for identifying criteria that must be noted for application at the next periodic review. TJ Nichols, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), said there are ongoing internal discussions on the matter and agreed the perception of timely amendments is important. TJ said since this is already being worked within the Agency, he does not see a need for an outstanding ACM issue. Jeff Rawdon, FPAG, said for now this will remain open pending ARRG discussion. Dan Wacker, FPAG, said the Departure Working Group (DWG) and other groups are aware of the older procedures and are working on criteria updates that would address these older procedures. They are working with Aeronautical Information Services and considering the possibility of requirements for all procedures at an airport to be amended concurrently, rather than amending single procedures. Kevin Keszler, FPAG, pointed out that since TARGETS is programmed with current criteria, the issue is more related to available resources. Pat Mulqueen, FAA Instrument Flight Procedures Group (AJV-400), confirmed Kevin's point, and added that automation does not exist to review procedures for compliance with old criteria. Pat agreed with TJ and confirmed AJV is currently reviewing similar points to those raised by this RD. John Moore, Boeing/Jeppesen, agreed this is an FAA internal issue but believes it should remain open since it was introduced by industry and the user community. John also recommended the RD sponsors

should remain involved as the issue is worked. Steve discussed issues beyond application of new criteria, for example consideration of tree growth as applied on departure procedures since there are some procedures noting trees as controlling obstacles that have not been amended in many years. Dan commented the DWG is looking at tree growth, but it is not currently a high priority item. Pat said during the review process these are reviewed with current survey data and are amended as necessary. Karl von Valtier, NetJets, commented on the extensive list in Order 8260.19 of issues requiring amendments, including changes to minima, and pointed out that tree growth could necessitate this. Pat pointed out that since minimum descent altitudes are published in 20-foot increments an amendment may not be required even with higher trees. If there is a new controlling obstacle there will be an amendment and flight inspection. Vince Massimini, NavTec, discussed that smaller airports are inspected and if trees growth exceeds limitations action will be required by federal, state, or local agencies. Steve commented there does not appear to be any method of coordination between the FAA and the public when a revision is considered or in process and what the results are, and questioned the possibility of a coordination process or system. Pat said there are currently internal processes, and he would consider the suggestion. When a safety of flight issue is identified a NOTAM is issued, and an amendment project is created. Vince added that while it is not secretive, there is no system or process currently in place to identify these reviews and possible amendments for the public. TJ said this information will be taken back to the ARRG for discussion, adding tree height was not in the RD but is a motivator for the issue. TJ added there is interest in transparency for the periodic review process. John Collins, ForeFlight/Boeing, pointed out sometimes charts are updated without criteria changes being incorporated and inquired if a checklist might help. Pat stated for a full amendment the procedure will be updated to fully reflect current criteria, where an abbreviated amendment may not fully reflect all current criteria. An abbreviated amendment is designed to fix a specific issue and does not necessitate a complete procedure redesign. Pat pointed out the Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Gateway website shows procedure coordination for flight procedures undergoing an amendment. Steve inquired about FAA Form 8260-3/4/5 procedure form coordination checkboxes and asked how these are utilized for coordination. Pat said the boxes had been there for a long time and do not really serve the purpose for coordination with the public and reiterated that the IFP Gateway is the best source for procedure coordination information. Additionally, Pat said there are currently considerations to remove the coordination boxes since interested stakeholders can find what they need on the IFP Gateway and that documentation packages are no longer distributed as they were when the checkboxes were relevant. Steve raised a concern regarding older obstacle data on trees growth applied to departure procedures and would like that considered in the discussions. Bennie Hutto, NATCA, feels there is a lack of coordination on procedure amendments and does not feel the IFP Gateway is appropriate for coordinating changes. Pat said he would look at Bennie's comments. Jeff pointed out the coordination issues discussed are beyond the scope of this RD. Steve agreed to consider submitting a new RD to address the coordination issues.

Actions: This item will be reviewed by the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine any action, and that outcome will be provided at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

c. **22-02-372: Circling NA Areas and Implicit NA Runways:** Steve Madigan, Garmin, briefed the issue from the RD ([slide](#)). He discussed the circling figures on the RD, and

recommended a criteria change for locations like KIYK Rwy 15. Dan Wacker, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), asked if the procedure is built to current criteria, and Pat Mulqueen, FAA Instrument Flight Procedures Group (AJV-400), said he will have to review the notes to be sure. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, wondered which diagram depicted in the RD would be correct. Garmin showed the diagrams to several folks and all chose different ones. Pat said his office might want to review this procedure again since the high MDA may be causing problems. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), suggested circling NA at night might be specified as “from RWY 2 extended centerline clockwise to RWY 33 extended.” Dan wants to look at criteria again but agrees with Valerie. Kevin Keszler, FPAG, commented the wording for circling restrictions has been around for a long time, and wondered if Garmin compared their request with existing language in publications like the AIM or PCG. Bill said there is nothing in the guidance material on notes similar to this case, so the pilot has to interpret them. Dan said the intent of the airport and Flight Procedures Team Regional Office should be considered and circling restrictions should then be applied accordingly. Dan believes the criteria is clear. Pat does not know what is driving the circling restrictions for this procedure and would like to review it. Jeff Rawdon, FPAG, said while this might not be the best example, the concept of the request is clear, and that this RD will be reviewed by the ARRG. Bill said they have identified 30 to 40 similar approach procedures and will forward the list of those to Jeff. Jeff said this information will help at the ARRG. Pat added when issues like this arise on a public procedure, it is best to enter a specific procedure question through the Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Gateway. Pat’s group has a requirement to respond within 10 days, but their goal is to respond within one or two days.

Actions:

- Bill Tuccio will forward the results of the query regarding applicable instrument approach procedures to Jeff Rawdon.
- This item will be reviewed by the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine any action, and that outcome will be provided at ACM 23-01

Status: Item open

d. 22-02-373: Transponder slant codes on terminal publications: Dr. Bill Tuccio, Garmin, briefed the issue from the RD ([slide](#)). The issue is the existence of transponder codes on some flight procedures which appear to be legacy and no longer compliant with current criteria. Sue Walker, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), already reviewed this issue and determined transponder codes are no longer placed on charts. Jeff Rawdon, FPAG, said there is a project in place to remove these from the noted procedure. Steve Madigan, Garmin, noted when he sent a request on this procedure to the Instrument Flight Procedures (IFP) Gateway, the response was that this was what ATC wanted and that it would stay. Steve said the response was not helpful and he is glad that decision is being reconsidered. Vince Massimini, NavTec, said the ICAO equipment codes are complicated, and should not appear on instrument procedure charts. Karl von Valtier, NetJets, advised the ENCEE TWO arrival at KSTP has these codes also, adding when he reported it, he was also disappointed with the response he received. Jeff did not see a project in the system for this procedure, and Pat Mulqueen, FAA Instrument Flight Procedures Group (AJV-400), said he would investigate that procedure. Jeff asked the group if anyone had a complete list of all procedures on which these codes appear. John Collins,

ForeFlight/Boeing, said Order JO 7110.65, Air Traffic Control, does still reference these codes. Bennie Hutto, NATCA, said codes are entered when the flight plan is filed, and ATC does not enter them. Also, ATC does not change the codes once they are in the flight plan. Bennie added he has concerns with the ENCEE TWO procedure, and Pat advised he will look at it. Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, advised they have more examples of procedures and will forward the list to Jeff and Pat. Jeff added since there is more than just the one procedure currently slated for amendment that are affected, the issue will remain open. He also stated there is no criteria at present or planned to add these codes to procedures. Gary Fiske, FAA ATC Procedures (Terminal) Team (AJV-P310), added these would be old codes and what the aircrew files would be correct. Gary agreed that the codes on these procedures are outdated and that he does not see any need for codes to be published on the charts.

Actions:

- Joshua Fenwick will forward his query results of affected procedures to Jeff Rawdon and Pat Mulqueen.
- This item will be reviewed by the ACM Recommendation Review Group to determine any action, and that outcome will be provided at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

6. Next Meetings

ACM 23-01: Apr 24-27, 2023

ACM 23-02: OCT 23-26, 2023