May 26, 2010

Dear Forum Participant

Attached are the minutes of the Aeronautical Charting Forum, Instrument Procedures Group (ACF-IPG) held on April 27, 2010. 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 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. Bill Hammett
FAA/AFS-420 (ISI)
6 Pope Circle
Nashua. NH 03063

Phone: 603-521-7706
FAX: 603-521-7706 (Call first)
E-mail: bill.ctr.hammett@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 two 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 **10-02** is scheduled for **October 26-28, 2010** with the **MITRE Corporation**, 7515 Colshire Dr., McLean, VA 22012, as host. Meeting **11-01** is scheduled for **April 26-28, 2011** with FAA's **AeroNav Services** 1305 East-West Hwy. SSMC 4, Silver Spring, MD 20910 as host.

Please note that **meetings begin promptly at 8:30 AM** and dress is business casual.
Please forward new issue items for the 10-02 IPG meeting to the above addressees not later than October 8th. 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 10-01 Herndon, VA.
April 27, 2010

1. Opening Remarks:

Mr. 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 April 27, 2010. The Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA) hosted the meeting at their Herndon, VA facility. Steve Serur made welcoming and administrative comments on behalf of ALPA. A listing of attendees is included as attachment 2.

2. Review of Minutes of Last Meeting:

Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI) briefed that the minutes of ACF-IPG 09-02, which was held on October 27, 2009, were electronically distributed to all attendees as well as the ACF-IPG Master Mailing List on November 18, 2009. No comments were received; therefore, the minutes are accepted as distributed.

3. Briefings:

- Brad Rush, AJW-372, presented a briefing on new chart covers for several AeroNav Services products that will be effective July through September, 2010. He emphasized that no data would be eliminated, only re-located. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, stated that the briefed changes would also require related changes to the AIM and AIP and asked whether the proposal could wait and be made coincidentally with the associated AIM & AIP changes. Brad responded that the chart changes are contractually bound and must occur as briefed. A copy of Brad's briefing slides is attached.

- Al Herndon, MITRE, presented a briefing on location, access, and security requirements for attendees at the next meeting, which will be hosted by MITRE. A copy of the information is posted on the next meeting page of the ACF-IPG web site and is attached.

- Brett Brunk, AJR-32, was scheduled to present a briefing on efforts to update and modernize the US NOTAM system. Due to a scheduling conflict, Brett was unable to attend; however, the briefing was presented by Kathlyn Hoekstra, AJR-32, during the Charting Group meeting on April 29. The briefing covered the concept and progress thus far for the proposed Federal NOTAM System (FNS) as well as a new sort tool that is being tested by several ATC facilities that will not only facilitate sorting NOTAMs, but also provide a forced delivery and acknowledgement feature. The briefing also covered proposed enhancements to the En Route Information Display System (ERIDS), which is used by ARTCCs. A copy of Kathlyn 's briefing slides is attached.

4. Old Business (Open Issues):

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

Catherine Majauskas, AFS-470, briefed that there has been recent renewed interest from Air Traffic and FAA employees working within the Aviation Safety Information Analysis and Sharing System (ASIAS) regarding the impact of cold station altimeter settings. AFS-470 recognizes the need for special attention to be placed on avionics systems in regards to cold temperature corrections. Catherine added that data from the MITRE study is being used to make some decisions to develop an operations concept for temperature correction. Her office will continue to work with MITRE to formulate an AVS position.

Status: AFS-470 will continue to work the issue with MITRE and report progress. Item Open (AFS-470).

b. 96-01-166: Determining Descent Point on Flyby Waypoints (Originally: Definition of "On Course").

Bruce McGray, AFS-410, presented a status update paper on the issue requesting that the attendees review it and provide feedback prior to July 16. After all comments are reviewed, AFS-410 will provide a final decision back to the ACF-IPG for consensus and closure. An excerpt of Bruce's paper follows:

"On course for situations involving various levels of FMS/ LNAV/ VNAV equipped aircraft, and with varying levels of automation are broken down to three answers for aircraft on course to a *fly by waypoint and are going to change course to a different track outbound from the waypoint*.

Disclaimer: There is no standardization mandated among today's technologically advanced avionics systems that are LNAV/VNAV capable, or GPS/RNAV equipped. Pilots must be fully aware of AFM limitations for their systems, and all specific operating information for the particular hardware and software versions they are using. Those specifics supersede any general statement below, that may or may not apply, given what is in an AFM limitation or system operating description. In all cases, for any of these GPS/RNAV equipped aircraft, the aircraft is considered to be on course any time the course indication is within ½ scale deflection of being centered.

Background conditions for all GPS/RNAV equipped aircraft:

a. Confirm aircraft is operating in the proper mode – en route, terminal within 30 miles of destination, or approach mode within 2 miles of FAF.
b. Verify proper indication of course line for required accuracy.
   Many units go from white to magenta on the course if all conditions are correct.

1. Fully automated FMS/FMC with LNAV/VNAV [example; NextGen 737-700, 800, 900 with Smiths FMS]: The aircraft is on course inbound, during the turn, and in the descent at the bisector, as the aircraft transitions from the inbound segment to the next published track.

Other conditions:
1. The aircraft is past the flyby point bisector.
2. RNP/ANP values are confirmed within parameters for the appropriate segment.
3. Actual cross track is confirmed to be as commanded by the FMS/NAV system.

2. Partially automated FMS/FMC with LNAV/VNAV but not VTS equipped: The aircraft is on course inbound, also during the turn, and in the descent at the bisector, if the pilot operates the system to properly follow command bars [or command lines], and manages descent to begin after crossing the bisector. If following commands properly, Those FMS commands will roll the aircraft out of the turn on course, with aircraft positioned on the course center line.

3. PART 23 Aircraft RNAV/GPS presentations without the above types of automation: The aircraft is on course inbound while the CDI is within ½ scale full deflection. The pilot should use normal lead points (anticipatory turns) for making a fly-by turn, and is on course for the next segment when the aircraft is within ½ scale deflection of course being centered. For this type of system, descent to a new authorized altitude should be begun when on course on the new segment."

Several comments followed the presentation. Mike Frank, AJT-28, asked whether Part 23 operators that are not auto-pilot equipped were considered. Bruce responded that he needed feedback from part 23 operators as lower end systems function differently. He believes high-end avionics systems are OK with pilot confirmation. Steve Serur, ALPA, asked whether all operators use the same scale. Rich Boll, NBAA, confirmed that AIR needed to weigh in and criteria must be established for scaling. Al Herndon, MITRE, noted that the paper he presented at the last meeting contradicted some of Bruce's assumptions. A full functioning Flight Management Computer (FMC) will begin descent to meet a required altitude at the bisector, not wait until the bisector to initiate descent. If a subsequent waypoint specifies a lower crossing altitude, the FMC will not begin descent at the previous waypoint, rather it will compute a start descent point to accommodate the next lower altitude. All participants are encouraged to provide feedback directly to Bruce at bruce.mcgray@faa.gov. AFS-410 and 470 will jointly evaluate feedback and develop appropriate AIM/AIP guidance for ACF-IPG consideration.

Status: AFS-410 and 470 to evaluate feedback and develop AIM and other educational material. Item Open (AFS-410 and AFS-470).

c. 98-01-197: Air Carrier Compliance with FAA-specified Climb Gradients.

Catherine Majauskas, AFS-470, briefed that the PARC is developing a new list of special interest items and her office will make every effort to ensure this issue doesn't fall by the wayside. She stated that AFS needs ALPA and industry input to help develop a cost-effective strategy, including engineering and dispatch needs, to ensure operators comply with FAA specified climb gradients for Air Traffic and obstacle clearance restraints. Catherine added that her office is working a revision to AC 90-100B for next year. Rich Boll, NBAA, emphasized again, as he has done at previous meetings, that incorporating similar language as is in AC 90-105 in the 90-100B re-write will prod OEMs to provide the data. Rich added that OEMs do not know in what format to provide the data that will enable the pilot to determine an acceptable climb profile. Bruce McGray, AFS-410, stated that his office would form an ad-hoc group to research and understand the issue. This group will work with performance engineers to develop a plan to resolve the issue, hopefully within the next 8-10 months.

Status: AFS-470 to monitor PARC progress and report. AFS-410 to chair an ad-hoc group to further assess the issue. Item Open (AFS-470 and AFS-410).

d. 02-01-238: Part 97 “Basic” Minima; ATC DP Minima, and DP NOTAMs.

Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI) briefed that progress is finally being made to resolve the DP NOTAM portion of this issue. The System Operations Service Unit, AJR-32, has developed several Air Traffic Document Change Proposals(DCPs) to revise Order 7930.2, *Notices to Airmen (NOTAMs)* to move SID and STAR NOTAMs to the FDC process vice NOTAM Ds. The DCPs are currently in internal coordination with a targeted publication date of Feb 2011. Approval of these DCPs and the associated Order revision will achieve the ACF-IPG expressed goal of having all instrument flight procedure (IFP) NOTAMs under the FDC format. This change will also serve as a segue to the new Federal NOTAM System where all IFP NOTAMs will be under a single ICAO Series - currently projected as Series V for instrument flight procedure NOTAMs, Series Z for ATS Route NOTAMs, and Series W for chart corrections.

Status: AJR-32 to continue to track efforts to revise Order 7930.2 to include all instrument flight procedure NOTAMs under the FDC process and continue to provide periodic updates on the NOTAM system upgrade. Item Open (AJR-32).

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

Ron Singletary, AJT-28, briefed that Dan Diggins has been re-assigned and there has been no action to write the recommended Air Traffic Bulletin (ATB) article. Gary Fiske, AJT-28, stated that the issue should be closed as it is not applicable in today's air traffic control world. He added that facilities no longer require non-radar training. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI), responded that although radar coverage has greatly improved, there are still places where holding and climb-in-hold procedures may be used. Bill stated that an impromptu CIH clearance in a holding pattern that was not assessed for the maneuver could have catastrophic coincidences and he did not believe the ACF's request to ensure controller awareness was unreasonable. He added the ATO has routinely used the ATB for refresher training. (***Editor's Note:*** *It should be noted that the IOU for an ATB article was accepted by the Air Traffic representative at the Oct 2002 meeting and passed to each of 5 successive representatives to date; however, no action has been taken).* Tom Schneider, AFS-420, stated that if the ATO is sure that controllers, including those providing service to non-radar airports, are trained to know what holding patterns are authorized for climb-in-hold, he would agree to close the issue. Gary Church, Aviation Management Associates (AMA), added that if the information is a national ATC training initiative, then it could be closed. Paul Eure, AJE-31, stated that, from an en route standpoint, he did not believe controllers are aware of the significance of the increase in holding pattern size to allow climb-in-hold. Gary stated that he also did not believe controllers are aware of the issue. The issue remains open with AJT-28 as OPR.

Status: AJT-28 will ensure controller training on impromptu climb-in-hold assignment. Item Open (AJT-28).

f. 03-01-247: Holding Pattern Criteria Selection and Holding Pattern Climb-in-Hold Issues.

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following from Dr Sherri Avery, AFS-450: "AFS-450 is currently running simulation and analyzing results from ASAT Holding software tool." There was no discussion on the issue.

Status: AFS-450 to continue ASAT/simulator analysis and report. Item Open (AFS-450).

g. 04-01-250: RNAV and Climb Gradient Missed Approach Procedures.

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that since the last meeting, he again followed up his previous coordination with AFS-600 and 800. He reported that AFS-800 replied that nothing has been done to provide pilot guidance. AFS-600 responded that they can no longer take requests to revise the PTS from outside agencies. All requests must come from AFS-200 or AFS-800. John Bollin, AFS-220, took an IOU to get the information to AFS-600. Brad Rush, AJW-372, advised that when a missed approach climb gradient is required, they also develop an approach with higher minimums to accommodate a standard, 200 Ft/NM, climb gradient. Rich Boll, NBAA, recommended AFS-800 get the FAA Safety Team (FAAST) involved to educate Part 91 operators.

Status: AFS-220/800 to provide PTS information to AFS-600. Additionally, AFS-800 consider the NBAA suggestion to get FAAST involvement. Item Open (AFS-220 and AFS-800).

h. 04-02-258: Vertical Navigation (VNAV) Approach Procedures Using DA(H); OpSpec C073.

Catherine Majauskas, AFS-470, briefed that that the AC regarding Controlled Descent Final Approach (AC-CDFA) has been completed and is still in FAA internal coordination. OpSpec C073 will be updated as needed and the CDFA penalty language has been removed from the new OpSpec C052 pending further guidance.

Status: AFS-470 to continue to develop guidance and keep the ACF-IPG updated. Item Open (AFS-470).

i. 05-01-259: Visual Climb Over Airport (VCOA).

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update as received from Jack Corman, AFS-420: "A draft Order titled *Visual Climb to IFR Departure (VCID)* is 90% complete. The name/acronym change is a result of conversation on this issue at ACF-IPG meeting 09-02. The new Order will replace the current VCOA criteria in TERPS Volume 4, Chapter 4,. The conventional navigation portion is complete and work is underway to develop RNAV criteria for VCID. The estimated completion date for a draft that can be forwarded to the US-IFPP departure working group members is 26 Apr 2010." Bill Hammett briefed that research after the last meeting indicated that Air Traffic had published controller awareness material in Air Traffic Bulletin (ATB) 06-01. An excerpt from the ATB was included in the minutes of meeting 09-02. Roy Maxwell, Delta, stated that the use of a VCOA option as an ODP, when weather allowed, was important for air carriers as it often resulted in shorter distances to be flown, which in turn, saved fuel. Roy added that pilots should be required to advise ATC when using the VCOA option if that would lessen the ATC impact. Tom responded that this option will be considered under new issue 10-01-292. Brad Rush stated that some military ODPs currently contain a note for pilots to advise ATC when using the VCOA; e.g., "Aircrews must notify ATC prior to executing this VCOA procedure.".

Status: AFS-420 will continue to track the VCOA issue through the US-IFPP and report. Item Open [AFS-420 (US-IFPP)].

j. 06-02-267: Pilot Option to Use Standard Timing for RNAV IAP Holding Patterns

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following from Dr Sherri Avery, AFS-450: "Further discussion is needed (e.g. with pilots, ACF reps). AFS-450 would like to continue with the study given the restriction that Standard Timing leg lengths be less than or equal to the current RNAV leg lengths." Brad Rush, AJW-372, asked whether this particular issue could be studied closer and faster. While there is no problem with conventional DME holding leg lengths, RNAV ATD leg lengths are not being applied properly in all cases as noted in issue 07-02-278; therefore, timed holding would be standardized and safer. Brad added that magnetic variation also presents a problem when RNAV holding is over a facility. FMS systems will apply the assigned magnetic variation of the facility vice the variation to be used for RNAV. Tom asked whether Order 8260.19 was being applied properly. Brad responded yes. The airport magnetic variation of record is used for the RNAV approach design; however, if the missed approach goes to a facility, the FMS switches to the assigned variation of the facility. Tom agreed to pass the priority request to AFS-450.

Status: AFS-450 to include timing in lieu of ATD for RNAV holding in the study. The ACF-IPG Chair will forward the request for increased priority. Item Open (AFS-450 and ACF-IPG Chair).

k. 07-01-269: Diverse Vector Areas (DVAs).

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update as provided by Jack Corman, AFS-420: " The draft DVA Order is complete and has been provided informally to AeroNav Services and AJT-28 for pre-review. A draft has also been sent to the US-IFPP Departure Working Group (DWG) whose next meeting has been scheduled for May 11-12, 2010." Paul Eure, AJE-31, briefed that current criteria requires use of ASR. Some facilities will be using fusion radar systems and he would like new radar systems considered in the proposed criteria. Tom agreed to ensure the US-IFPP is aware of the request. Mike Frank, AJT-28, briefed that the proposed ATO Order to provide policy for air traffic facility managers to request a DVA has been scrubbed in favor of expanded guidance in Order 7210.3. An ATO Document Change Proposal (DCP) is currently in coordination to effect this change. Gary Fiske, AJT-28, added that the informal coordination AFS-420 recommendations were not incorporated in the DCP and they would have to be re-submitted. Valerie Watson, AJW-372, asked whether charting of DVAs is still a consideration. Tom responded that it is still a consideration and AFS-420 is looking at a simple solution; perhaps a simple note denoting what runway(s) a DVA is authorized; e.g. "DVA authorized RWYs 9, 27, and 18". Tom assured Val that AeroNav Services and Air Traffic would be included in any decision.

Status: 1) AFS-420 will continue to track DVA criteria development through the US-IFPP, and 2) AJT-28, jointly with AJE-31, will continue to track controller guidance for radar vectoring departures at airports where an ODP is established. Item Open (AFS-420, AJT-28, and AJE-31).

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

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update as received from Jack Corman, AFS-420 and Executive Director of the US-IFPP: "Initial studies indicate that turns should be limited to an absolute maximum of 120 degrees, with a recommended maximum of 90 degrees. That said, it appears that simply adding a turn limitation may not be sufficient to address the entire problem. Inside turn protection may also need to be expanded. If that is the case, a

notice may be necessary as an interim measure before the TERPS document can be updated. This is #2 or #3 in priority in the queue of changes behind current work in progress."

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

m. 07-01-272: Using an ODP in lieu of the Published Missed Approach Procedure.

At the last meeting, it was noted that Dan Diggins (formerly of AJT-28) stated that he had initiated a memorandum from AJT-2 to AFS-1 and AJW-3 to raise the issue to a higher level within the FAA. The memorandum was sent via email on October 22, 2009; however, there is no record of it being received by either office. A copy was obtained shortly before the 10-01 meeting and Bruce McGray, AFS-410, stated that his office is coordinating an AFS response that hopefully will clarify what is/is not regulatory. Mike Frank, AJT-28, asked the status of the sub group that was supposed to be working the issue. Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that he was awaiting further input from Dan on the internal FAA position and did not call a meeting. Due to the confusion surrounding receipt of the memo, it was decided that the sub group would meet after AFS had a prepared response to the AJT-2 memo.

Editor's Note: *Although not discussed at this meeting, it is noted that AJT-28 has an IOU from the last meeting to evaluate the preamble language for Part 91.116 (now 91.175) and re-assess the need for a review to determine exactly what airports are impacted. The IOU is continued.*

Status: 1) AFS-410 will coordinate a response to the AJT-2 memorandum and evaluate the most recent NBAA (03-05-10) draft of AIM paragraph 5-4-21h (see below). 2) AJT-28 to evaluate the preamble language for Part 91.116 (now 91.175) and re-assess the need for the requested airport review. 3) NBAA to facilitate a sub group meeting when the AFS response is completed. Item Open - (AFS-410, AJT-28, and NBAA).

Proposed Language for AIM Paragraph 5-4-21h (March 5, 2010)

(Blue Text Extracted From the Preamble 14 CFR 91.116)
(Red Text Represents Updated Terminology or Clarification)

A clearance for an instrument approach procedure includes a clearance to fly the published missed approach procedure, unless otherwise instructed by ATC. The published missed approach procedure provides obstacle clearance only when the missed approach is conducted on the missed approach segment from or above the missed approach point. If the aircraft initiates a missed approach at a point prior to the missed approach point, from below MDA or DH, or on a circling approach, obstacle clearance is not necessarily provided by following the published missed approach procedure. During a missed approach, the aircraft must be on, or must re-intercept, a published segment of the procedure at or above the altitude specified in the procedure, and must maintain a climb gradient equal to or greater than the standard (40:1 or 2.5%) unless otherwise published, for obstacle clearance to be ensured by the published missed approach procedure alone.

Prior to initiating an instrument approach procedure, the pilot should assess the actions to be taken in the event of a balked (rejected) landing beyond the missed approach point or below the MDA or DA (H) considering the anticipated weather conditions and available aircraft performance.

If a balked (rejected) landing occurs at a position where in the pilot's judgment it is no longer appropriate to fly the published missed approach procedure, obstacle clearance is the pilot's responsibility. 14 CFR 91.175(e) authorizes the pilot to fly an appropriate missed approach

procedure, which in this situation is one that ensures obstruction clearance. The pilot must consider other factors such as the aircraft's geographical location with respect to the prescribed missed approach point, direction of flight and/or minimum turning altitudes in the prescribed missed approach procedure. The pilot must also consider aircraft performance, visual climb restrictions, charted obstacles, published obstacle departure procedure, takeoff visual climb requirements as expressed by nonstandard takeoff minima, other traffic expected to be in the vicinity, or other factors not specifically expressed by the approach procedures.

The pilot **must** advise ATC as soon as practicable of their current actions and intentions **IF** executing any procedure other than the published missed approach procedure or any ATC-assigned alternative missed approach procedure.

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

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following from Dr Sherri Avery, AFS-450: "AFS-450 is continuing analysis of FMS/GPS information. Steve Jackson, AFS-420, has been assisting in obtaining problem statement information, including, to what extent does RNAV Holding exist?"

Status: AFS-450 to continue to work the issue and provide updates. AFS-420 to provide oversight for the total project. Item Open (AFS-450).

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

Bruce McGray, AFS-410, briefed that his office has discussed the issue and believes the AIM language should be more comprehensive and has edited NBAA's recommendations for the note following 5-4-5b to read (changes shown in red):

NOTE: *When multiple glidepath intercept altitudes are authorized to support ATC simultaneous operations, the glidepath intercept point closest to the threshold is the precise final approach fix (PFAF) and the additional intercept altitudes are specified in a profile view note on US government charts. When assigned one of these annotated altitudes by ATC and subsequently cleared for the instrument approach procedure, pilots are expected to intercept and track the glide slope and disregard minimum, maximum, and mandatory altitudes depicted for subsequent step-down fixes. However, the PFAF and the beginning of the final approach segment remain located at the published glide slope intercept altitude as depicted by the "lightning bolt" symbol on US Government charts.*

Tom Schneider, AFS-460, briefed that Order 8260.19D was revised on October 22, 2009 to change the profile note at ATC assigned intercept altitudes on ILS approaches with multiple GS intercept altitudes to read "When assigned by ATC, intercept and track glidepath." Mike Frank, AJT-28, stated that this was a false premise. The intermediate altitudes on the ILS approaches at Los Angeles Int'l (LAX) are for ATC operational separation; flying the glide slope could violate separation standards unless the underlying step-down altitudes were temperature corrected. He added that there were no problems until the fixes with the associated step-down altitudes were re-located during the last procedure amendments. Brad Rush stated that temperature correcting the intermediate altitudes could create other separation related problems at LAX. He added that the new GS altitude formulae would be used at the next procedure revision. Tom asked when that would occur and Brad responded the ILS RWY 24 and 25 approaches were on the production schedule for the May 5, 2011 chart date. Tom Loney, CAF, asked what

procedures did ATC expect when cleared for an ILS approach at other than the PFAF altitude. Gary Fiske, AJT-28, responded that ATC expected the pilot to comply with intermediate altitude restrictions. This created a lively discussion with several pilot groups all agreeing that this is not what the note or approach clearance implies. They unanimously stated that in that case, the note and ILS approach clearance was of no value unless they could track the GS. The bottom line as expressed by Rich Boll, NBAA, is "a pilot simply wants to know when it is acceptable to track the glide slope after being cleared for an ILS approach". Bruce McGray, AFS-410, agreed that this makes a much more complicated procedure on the part of the aircrew to accommodate ATC. Tom Schneider closed the discussion by stating that the proposed AIM recommendation and 8260.19 guidance is of no value unless all simultaneous ILS approaches with underlying step-down altitudes are temperature corrected.

Status: 1) AJW-372 report status on amending the LAX simultaneous ILS approaches, and, 2) AFS-410 to continue to evaluate the NBAA recommendation to update AIM paragraph 5-4-5-b. Item Open (AJW-37 and AFS-410).

> ***Editor's Note:*** *Following the above discussion, Bruce McGray, AFS-410, presented a sidebar briefing on an initiative currently under consideration by AFS-410. The Branch is proposing to establish a web site where pilots can pre-review known procedural problem areas like the known hard altitude restrictions at Teterboro and Orlando Executive and the ILS approaches at LAX. The concept is that this type "heads up" alert will enable pilots to avoid problems. Mike Frank, AJT-28 recommended that the concept should probably be coordinated through General Counsel. Both Rich Boll, NBAA, and Hal Becker, AOPA, expressed support of the concept. Roy Maxwell, Delta, stated that it is a band-aid approach vice fixing the problems.*

p. 09-01-283: Intermediate Fix Altitudes & ILS Glide Slope

Bruce McGray, AFS-410, stated that this issue is closely related to 09-01-282. The difference is that issue 09-01-282 relates to ILS approaches where multiple GS intercepts may be assigned by ATC for simultaneous operations. This issue relates to a pilot opting to intercept and fly the glideslope from an altitude higher that the specified GS intercept altitude, thus ignoring pre PFAF mandatory or minimum altitude restrictions. Bruce stated that his office has also been looking into this issue and agrees the AIM guidance could be better. He is proposing the NBAA submission to add a new AIM sub-paragraph 5-4-5-b-5 be revised as follows (changes in red):

> The ILS glide slope is intended to be intercepted at the published glide slope intercept altitude. This point marks the precise final approach fix (PFAF) and is depicted by the '"lightning bolt" symbol on US Government charts. Intercepting the glide slope at this altitude marks the beginning of the final approach segment and ensures required obstacle clearance during descent from the glide slope intercept altitude to the lowest published decision altitude for the approach. Interception and tracking of the glide slope prior to the published glide slope interception altitude does not necessarily ensure that minimum, maximum, and/or mandatory altitudes published for any preceding fixes in the intermediate segment will be complied with during the descent. If the pilot chooses to track the glide slope prior to the glide slope interception altitude, they remain responsible for complying with published altitudes for the intermediate fixes encountered during the subsequent descent. ~~**unless specifically assigned a higher published glide slope intercept altitude by ATC.** Higher authorized intercept altitudes are indicated on the procedure chart by an asterisk (or other attention symbol) and annotated in the profile view of US government charts as follows: "When assigned by ATC, intercept and track glidepath." When so cleared, subsequent published altitude restrictions may be ignored.~~

After discussion, the consensus was that the strikethrough portion above should be deleted. Mike Frank, AJT-28, stated that this issue should be worked simultaneously with issue

09-01-282 and both resolved together. Brad Rush, AJW-372, reported that he contacted New York TRACON regarding a procedure re-design to eliminate the mandatory 1500 altitude restriction on the Teterboro ILS RWY 6 approach. The TRACON rejected the proposal saying the currently published 2000 and 1500 altitudes are necessary for procedural separation.

Status: 1) AFS-410 to continue working the proposed new AIM paragraph 5-4-5-b-5 in conjunction with issue 09-01-283. Item Open (AFS-410).

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

Bruce McGray, AFS-410, reported that this issue is still unresolved at ATPAC. Gary Fiske, AJT-28, reported that an ATO Document Change proposal (DCP) to revise Order 7110.65, paragraph 4-8-1, is currently in coordination. The change is intended to address all "direct-to" clearances.

Status: 1) AFS-410 will continue to follow and report on ATPAC actions to resolve the issue, and, 2) AJT-28 to report on status of the proposed change to Order 7110.65.
Item Open (AFS-410 and AJT-28).

r. 09-02-286: Initial “Climb & Maintain” Altitude on Standard Instrument Departure Procedures

Mike Frank, AJT-28, briefed that sub group the previous manager of AJT-28 agreed to form did not happen and no action has been taken on the issue due to re-assignment of key personnel. He assured the group the issue would be worked soon. Mike Hilbert, AJR-37 stated that an ATO Document Change proposal (DCP) regarding "climb via" phraseology and procedures may help resolve the issue. Lev Prichard, APA, mentioned that La Guardia is a confusing location for departures and recommend it be used in the study.

Status: AJT-28, with support from AJE-31 and AJR-37, to form a sub group to study the issue and report. Item Open (AJT-28, AJE-31, and AJR-37).

s. 09-02-287 Operator Training Concerning One Engine Inoperative (OEI) Contingency Planning For IFR Departure Procedures

Rich Boll, NBAA, briefed that he has been working with Bruce McGray, AFS-410, and they have decided that the aircraft performance sub group that Bruce has proposed to address issue 98-01-197 will also address this issue. Mike Frank, AJT-28, asked why this issue wasn't being worked by AFS-210 and AFS-800. John Bollin, AFS-220, recommended Eric Friedman in AFS-210 as a POC for issues pertaining to training centers and participation in the sub group.

Status: The AFS-410 and NBAA aircraft performance sub group to work the issue.
Item Open (AFS-410 and NBAA).

t. 09-02-288 VNAV Minimums vs. Circle to Land

Rich Boll, NBAA, reported that he had not had a chance to work the issue to respond to the question whether there was a DA value above the LNAV MDA where LNAV/VNAV minimums should not be considered. Tom Schneider, AFS-420 briefed that on March 4th, AFS-400 held a Technical Review Board (TRB) where consensus was reached that circling from a procedure

that only provided vertical guidance should not be authorized; e.g., ILS without LOC minimums, LNAV/VNAV without LNAV, etc. Larry Wiseman, AOV-330, asked whether this would require published military procedures that did allow circling from vertically guided procedures be annotated "Not for Civil Use". Tom responded not until the change was included in criteria. Rich asked whether it would be feasible to cease publishing LNAV/VNAV minimums on RNAV approaches if the computed LNAV/VNAV DA was 100' above the LNAV MDA. He added that pilots could still fly vertically guided LNAV approaches provided they did not go below the LNAV MDA. Mike Smet, NAVFIG, responded that if a value is to be considered, he recommended 60 feet since that is already the TERPS value required to add stepdown fix minimums. Brad Rush briefed that Order 8260.54A revised the dimensions of the LNAV/VNAV and LNAV final trapezoid to be more linear and more narrow. The Order also provides an option to adjust the LNAV/VNAV DA. These two improvements may help alleviate some of the problems. Brad also supports establishing a maximum difference between DA and MDA where LNAV/VNAV minimums would not be published. He supports the 60 foot value recommended by NAVFIG. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, stated that he would refer the issue to the AFS-420 RNAV criteria subject matter expert.

> ***Editor's Note:*** *Post meeting, Rich Boll notified that NBAA supports the recommendation for a 60 ft maximum difference value where LNAV/VNAV minimums would not be published. Additionally, Tom Schneider advised that AFS-420 has begun coordinating a Notice to revise criteria and policy to prevent circling from a vertically guided procedure without an associated non-precision line of minima.*

Status: AFS-420 to work the issue and report. Item Open (AFS-420).

u. 09-02-289 Use of Leg Combinations and Altitude Constraints on RNAV Departure Procedures

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that Jack Corman, AFS-420, and Executive Director of the US-IFPP, has advised that, "within the US-IFPP, this issue this issue will be worked jointly with 09-02-290. Both issues have been referred to the US-IFPP Coding subgroup for resolution recommendation."

Status: The Executive Director of the US-IFPP will keep the ACF apprised of the issue status. Item Open (AFS-420 (US-IFPP)).

v. 09-02-290 Call for Review and Revision of ARINC Leg Types Used in Construction of RNAV Departure Procedures

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed that Jack Corman, AFS-420, and Executive Director of the US-IFPP, has advised that, within the US-IFPP, this issue this issue will be worked jointly with 09-02-289. Both issues have been referred to the US-IFPP Coding subgroup for resolution recommendation. Al Herndon, MITRE, advised that MITRE research has determined that an RF leg cannot be started at the DER.

Status: The Executive Director of the US-IFPP will keep the ACF apprised of the issue status. Item Open (AFS-420 (US-IFPP)).

w. 09-02-291 Straight-in Minimums NA at Night

Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update as received from Jack Corman, AFS-420, and Executive Director of the US-IFPP: "If an approach meets straight-in requirements, even though offset, it will receive a straight-in visual segment evaluation using the criteria that accounts for an off-set final segment. If the evaluation results in mitigation actions that cannot be met at night, night operations FROM THIS APPROACH to that runway will be disallowed. In these cases, because the aircraft is approaching the runway from a straight-in alignment, the straight-in approach visual segment serves as the circling evaluation to this runway. Other runways receive a standard evaluation. Aircraft circling to the example runway from approaches to other runways are not prescribed a path to fly in the circling maneuver. The standard area assessment evaluates the area where circling aircraft are expected to gain alignment and descend to the runway for landing. If no mitigation is required for the standard evaluation, night operations to the runway from approaches to other runways will be allowed. ACTION accepted: TERPS will be revised to assure circling to the straight-in approach runway from the straight-in approach (as in the stated example) is not allowed when offending obstacles cannot be mitigated. The existing visual area dimensions are deemed satisfactory and will not be revised." Rich Boll, NBAA, stated that he still has concerns with the proposed policy as it still allows a circling approach and landing from another approach to a different runway to the runway where straight-in minimums are NA at night. He added that the visual assessment area must be larger to account for joining the straight-in assessment area. Rich recommended, and was supported by others, that consideration should be given to not allowing a circling approach to runways where straight-in minimums are NA at night. Tom agreed to take the concerns back to the US-IFPP

Status: The Executive Director of the US-IFPP will keep the ACF apprised of the issue status. Item Open (AFS-420 (US-IFPP)).

5. New Business:

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

New issue introduced by Rich Boll, on behalf of NBAA. Order 8260.46 requires development of a VCOA option when obstacles more than 3 SM from an airport require excessive climb gradients. However, NBAA is concerned over the added option for ATC facilities to opt out of having a VCOA without sufficient justification. This is understandable at high density traffic locations like Chicago, New York, etc.; however, recently the VCOA option was NOTAMed NA for Aspen and Eagle airports in Colorado. Loss of these VCOAs effectively eliminates IFR departures for those aircraft operating under 14 CFR part 135 or certain part 121 that are unable to meet the excessively high climb gradients required of the route ODPs. NBAA appreciates the fact that a pilot executing the VCOA option without first advising ATC may cause traffic flow and safety concerns. However, the wholesale prohibition of the VCOA option at airports with high terrain and associated high climb gradients imposes an unwarranted restriction on IFR operations and an equal safety concern for IFR departures from these airports. NBAA requests that the NOTAMS affecting the ODP's at Aspen and Eagle be amended to restore the VCOA option and also impose a requirement that the pilot advise ATC prior to departure of their intentions to depart the airport IFR using the VCOA. NBAA further recommends that FAAO 7110.65, Air Traffic Control, be amended to include the training material published in Air Traffic Bulletin 06-01; to wit, ensuring controllers are aware that an

airport's ODP may contain a VCOA option and that, if necessary, the controller should query the pilot of their intentions to use the VCOA when departing an airport under IFR. Mike Frank, AJT-28, stated that this issue should best be adjudicated by the ATO Western Service Area and the issue is more appropriate for ATPAC discussion. All agreed that the two airports in question should resolve their respective NOTAM and traffic flow issues through the Western Service Area and Francie Hope, WSC-OSG, agreed to work the issue upon her return. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, stated that the ACF is the appropriate venue for the portion of the issue relating to VCOA development policy and pilot procedures. During discussion of the issue, all attendees expressed concern that they want to keep the VCOA option, especially at airports with high climb gradients. Additionally, Roy Maxwell, Delta, stated air carriers want to keep the VCOA option because it is considered an ODP and satisfies their requirements to fly an ODP unless otherwise assigned a SID or radar vector by ATC under 91.175(f). When weather allows the VCOA, carriers can save much fuel by using the VCOA to climb on course instead of flying a specified ODP ground track that may be going miles away from the intended route. Because an ODP may be flown without ATC clearance, the controller concern of not knowing where a pilot will appear after departure (especially at non-towered & limited radar coverage airports) was acknowledged by all. There is no written rule to require a pilot to request clearance for a VCOA or advise prior to departure that the VCOA option will be used; however, no pilots in attendance resisted that requirement being laid on them. Tom Loney, CAF, stated that (in his opinion) the VCOA is an IFR maneuver and an ATC clearance should be required to fly it. Paul Eure, AJE-31, stated that the VCOA maneuver at places like Aspen and Eagle greatly affect capacity. He added that the ODPs in question were not coordinated through Denver Center. The Forum consensus was: 1) To revise policy in Order 8260.46 to require an ODP chart note stating pilots must notify ATC prior to departure if a VCOA will be used. The USAF note at Vandenberg AFB is offered as a strawman "Aircrews must notify ATC prior to executing this VCOA procedure"; 2) Develop AIM/AIP and Instrument Procedures Handbook (IPH) pilot guidance regarding VCOA; and 3) the ATO Western Service Area work with Aspen and Eagle to resolve the issues at hand.

Status: 1) AFS-420: Include policy in Order 8260.46 to add a chart note requiring pilots to notify ATC prior to departure if a VCOA will be used, and develop applicable IPH guidance; 2) AFS-410: Develop AIM and AIP educational material, and 3) WSC-OSG work with ATC managers at Eagle and Aspen to resolve their VCOA issues.
Item Open (AFS-420 and AFS-410 and WSC-OSG).

b. 10-01-293 Departure Procedure Route Instructions

New issue introduced by Rich Boll, on behalf of NBAA expressing concern over the lack of a standardized protocol for departure climb out instructions. The Teterboro Six Departure was offered as a prime example. Some departure instructions stated to climb to an altitude on a heading, some stated to climb on a heading to an altitude. However, the primary point of contention is the instructions for departing runway 24. Runway 24 instructions require "a climb to 1500, then a climbing right turn to 2000"; however, there is a mandatory 1500 crossing restriction specified at TEB 4.5 DME after the climbing right turn instruction. It is easy for a high performance aircraft to reach 1500 in a climb prior to the restriction point. A NOTAM has been issued to revise the text due to frequent violations of the mandatory 1500 restriction. Rich is recommending that at the next scheduled revision of Order 8260.46, a standard protocol be specified for departure instructions so that the instructions are in the order to be flown. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, responded that the current guidance intentionally didn't go into too much detail in order to provide the procedure specialist more flexibility. Brad Rush, AJW-372, agreed

that the Order could use more standardization in the form of additional examples. Bill Hammett, AFS-420 (ISI), recommended the current SID be re-worded to eliminate the NOTAM and clarify the verbiage. Brad responded the SID is on the production schedule for May 5, 2011. Bill stated this would exceed the 224-day specified maximum time for temporary procedural NOTAMs. Gary Fiske took an IOU to advise New York TRACON that if increased priority was desired to coordinate the request through the RAPT. Tom agreed to include improved guidance and additional examples in the next revision to Order 8260.46 as recommended. All agreed the issue could be closed.

Status: CLOSED.

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

New issue introduced by Rich Boll, on behalf of NBAA. ATC is increasing the use of direct-to-the-IF clearances to either expedite the approach or because of ATC required intervention due to traffic sequencing. Current guidance allows up to a 90 degree intercept at the IF for RNAV IAPs. However, NBAA is concerned that applying the 90 degree intercept on RNP SAAAR may compromise obstruction clearance and flyability for RNP approaches with shortened intermediate segments and reduced procedure design widths for obstacle containment. This issue was previously presented to the PARC by NBAA and is supported by the RNP SAAAR charting working group. The PARC steering committee subsequently supported the issue and requested that NBAA bring it before the ACF-IPG as the proper medium for discussion and resolution of the criteria issues. NBAA is recommending that criteria in Orders 8260.52 and 8260.54A be reviewed to ascertain whether intermediate segment length requirements are sufficient for ATC directed 90 degree direct-to clearances. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, briefed the following update as received from Jack Corman, AFS-420's lead RNAV criteria specialist, who performed a preliminary review of the issue : "Unless the entire Intermediate Segment altitude is at or above the MVA, we cannot guarantee obstacle protection for turns in excess of approximately 60 degrees unless the evaluation area is expanded. Work has started on determining the magnitude of expansion required. When draft criteria is written, it will enter the US-IFPP approach working group coordination process. Expect signed revised criteria in 60-90 days if standard coordination is required." Brad Rush, AJW-372, showed several examples where allowance for a 90 degree turn at the IF will require increased intermediate segment lengths. Tom stated the issue would be forwarded to the US-IFPP for consideration

Status: The Executive Director of the US-IFPP will keep the ACF-IPG apprised of the issue status. Item Open (AFS-420 (US-IFPP)).

d. 10-01-295 Official Source for Charting Fix Makeup

New issue introduced by Rich Boll, on behalf of NBAA. Rich briefed that FAA Form 8260-2 is the source for fix make-up, holding patterns, and fix use. Currently, only FAA's AeroNav Services receives the complete the -2 with all the data. Other charting agencies (Jeppesen, LIDO, etc.) only receive what information is promulgated via NFDD. Although the NFDD includes all facilities that were to make up a fix, it does not denote which facilities were used by the procedure specialist for a specific procedure. As an example, the -2 for the fix SILEX indicates that there are five facilities that may be used to form the fix; however, only three were used in design of the Burbank ILS or LOC Z RWY 8 IAP. These three were charted correctly by AeroNav services as they had access to the complete -2. However, Jeppesen charted three different facilities and LIDO charted all five. NBAA recommends that the NFDD provide

complete information so all charting agents will have the same and correct data for chart development. Mike Oudemans, AJR-321, reported that the NFDD is generated from the National Airspace System Resources (NASR) database. However, NASR does not have the fields necessary to automatically generate the information to NFDD output. Changes are planned for NASR to provide this data, but are not in the immediate future. A workaround was considered to add 'comments' to the NFDD, but this idea was rejected as impracticable. Mike offered several interim suggestions with the basic premise that the entire 8260-2 would not be included in the NFDD. 1) He asked whether the fix make-up to be charted could be included on the 8260 form supporting the procedure. Brad Rush, AJW-372, responded no. This would require a full procedure amendment anytime any change was made to the fix. 2) Mike then stated that the NFDC Facility Aeronautical Data Distribution System (FADDs) web site is under consideration as a possible source. The 8260-2s would be stored as procedures are reviewed and then released bi-weekly as a supplement with the Transmittal Letter. It was agreed that this option may work, but would require further coordination between NFDC and all non-FAA charting agents. Tom Schneider, AFS-420, asked whether there has been any discussion to make the NFDC Docushare system available to the public and if it could be used to resolve the issue. Mike said he would have to research this.

Status: AJR-321 to coordinate the feasibility of using FADDS to provide complete 8260-2 data to all charting agents. Item Open (AJR-321).

6. Next Meeting: ACF meeting **10-02** is scheduled for **October 26-28, 2010** with the **MITRE Corporation**, 7515 Colshire Dr., McLean, VA 22012, as host. Meeting **11-01** is scheduled for **April 26-28, 2011** with the **FAAs AeroNav Services**, 1305 East-West Highway, SSMC4, Silver Spring, MD as host .

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 (with an information copy to Bill Hammett), a written status update on open issues not later than October 8 - a reminder notice will be provided.

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

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
OPEN AGENDA ITEMS FROM MEETING 10-01

OPR	AGENDA ITEM (ISSUE)	REQUIRED ACTION
AFS-470	**92-02-110** (Cold Weather Altimetry)	Continue to track the issue and develop consolidated recommendation for PARC. Also, report results of MITRE study.
AFS-410 AFS-470	**96-01-166** (Descent Point on Flyby Waypoints. Originally "on course")	Jointly evaluate feedback from the AFS-41 paper and develop AIM and other pilot educational material based on MITRE study.
AFS-470 AFS-410	**98-01-197** (Air Carrier Compliance With Climb Gradients)	AFS-470: Monitor PARC actions and report progress. AFS-410: Form sub group with NBAA to further assess this issue and 09-02-287.
AJR-32	**02-01-238** (Departure Minimums and DP NOTAMs)	Report progress on re-write of Order 7930.2 to include SID/STAR NOTAMs under the FDC process. provide update on development of the Federal NOTAM System (FNS).
AJT-28	**02-01-241** (Non-radar Level and Climbing Holding Patterns)	Ensure controller awareness and education on what holding patterns are authorized for Climb-In-Hold.
AFS-450	**03-01-247** (Holding Pattern Selection Criteria)	Continue research/evaluation on the issue and report.
AFS-220 AFS-800	**04-01-250** (RNAV and Climb Gradient Missed Approach procedures)	AFS-220/800: Jointly provide PTS information to AFS-600 AFS-800: Consider FAAST involvement.
AFS-470	**04-02-258** (VNAV IAPs using DA(H) and OpSpec C073)	AFS-470: Continue to develop operational guidance (AC-CDFA).
AFS-420	**05-01-259** (Visual Climb Over Airport)	Continue working the issue through the USIFPP and report.
AFS-450 ACF-IPG Chair	**06-02-267** (Option to Use Standard Timing for RNAV Holding Patterns)	AFS-450: Assess use of timing in lieu of ATD for RNAV holding. ACF-IPG Chair: Request priority be given the issue
AFS-420 AJT-22 AJE-31	**07-01-269** (Diverse Vector Areas)	AFS-420: Ensure DVA criteria are developed through the US-IFPP. AJT-22 and AJE-31: Jointly develop controller guidance for vectoring departures at airports with an ODP.
AFS-420 (US-IFPP)	**07-01-270** (Course Change Limitation Notes on IAPs)	Continue to track issue through the US-IFPP.

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
OPEN AGENDA ITEMS FROM MEETING 10-01

OPR	**AGENDA ITEM (ISSUE)**	**REQUIRED ACTION**
AFS-410 AJT-28	**07-01-272** (Use of ODP in Lieu of Published Missed Approach)	AFS-410: Coordinate AFS-1 response to AJT-2 memo and evaluate NBAA proposal for AIM 5-4-21h. AJT-28: Review preamble for Part 91.116 (now 91.175) and re-assess the need for the requested airport review.
AFS-450	**07-02-278** (Advanced RNAV (FMS/GPS) Holding Patterns Defined by Leg Length)	Address the issue in conjunction with the other holding pattern studies.
AFS-410 AJW-372	**09-01-282** (Glide Slope Intercept Altitudes on ILS Parallel Approaches)	AFS-410: Evaluate NBAA suggestion to add explanatory note to AIM paragraph 5-4-5b to clarify early glidepath intercept AJW-372: Track LAX ILS RWY 24/25 amendments
AFS-410	**09-01-283** (Intermediate Fix Altitudes & ILS Glide Slope)	Review NBAA proposed new AIM paragraph 5-4-5b5.
AFS-410 AJT-28	**09-01-284:** (Question of TERPs Containment with Late Intercepts)	AFS-410: With support from AJR-37and NBAA, continue to track the issue through ATPAC and report. AJT-28: Report status of proposed changes to Order 7110.65.
AJT-28 AJE-31 AJR-37	**09-02-286:** (Initial “Climb & Maintain” Altitude on SIDS)	AJT-28, with support from AJE-31 and AJR-37, to form a sub group to address the issue.
NBAA AFS-410	**09-02-287:** (Operator Training Concerning OEI Contingency Planning For IFR Departure Procedures	Jointly form and lead an ad-hoc working group to address the issue in conjunction with issue 98-01-197.
AFS-420	**09-02-288:** (VNAV Minimums vs. Circle to Land)	Re-assess the issue considering comments from ACF-IPG 10-01 and report.
AFS-420 (US-IFPP)	**09-02-289:** (Use of Leg Combinations and Altitude Constraints on RNAV Departure Procedures)	Provide status update for the next meeting.
AFS-420 (US-IFPP)	**09-02-290:** (Call for Review and Revision of ARINC Leg Types Used in Construction of RNAV DPs)	Provide status update for the next meeting.
AFS-420 (US-IFPP)	**09-02-291:** (Straight-in Minimums NA at Night)	Re-assess the issue considering comments from ACF-IPG 10-01 and report

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
OPEN AGENDA ITEMS FROM MEETING 10-01

OPR	**AGENDA ITEM (ISSUE)**	**REQUIRED ACTION**
AFS-420 AFS-410 WSC-OSG	**10-01-292:** (Removal of VCOA Option at Mountainous Airports)	AFS-420: Revise 8260.46 to add pilot notification requirement and develop IPH guidance AFS-410: Develop pilot VCOA guidance for the AIM/AIP. WSC-OSG: Work with ATC Managers at Eagle and Aspen to resolve VCOA issues
AFS-420 (US-IFPP)	**10-01-294:** (RNP SAAAR Intermediate Segment Length and ATC Intervention)	Assess issue and report.
AJR-321	**10-01-295:** (Official Source for Charting Fix Make-up	Develop better fix makeup distribution methodology for civil chart producers.

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
ATTENDANCE LISTING - MEETING 10-01

Becker	Hal	AOPA	703-560-3588 FAX: 5159	hal.becker@att.net
Boll	Richard	NBAA	316-655-8856	richard.boll@sbcglobal.net
Ball	Al	NETJETS	614-239-4873	ball@netjets.com
Bollin	John	FAA/AFS-220	202-493-5615	john.bollin@faa.gov
Carrigan	Tom	FAA/AJW-372 (LM)	301-427-5146	thomas.ctc.carrigan@faa.gov
Christian	Lance	NGA/MRNF	703-735-2862	lance.d.christian@nga.mil
Church	Gary	AMA	703-518-9923	gary.church@avmgt.com
Clayton	Michael	AFFSA/A3IS	405-739-9542	michael.r.clayton@tinker.af.mil
Criswell	Chris	FAA/AJW-352	301-713-2932	christopher.criswell@faa.gov
Davis	Edward	AJW-3754	301-427-4780	edward.e.davis@faa.gov
Dutch	Keith	FAA/AJE-36	202-385-8459	keith.dutch@faa.gov
Eure	Paul	FAA/AJE-31	202-385-8459	paul.eure@faa.gov
Ewing	Paul	AJR-37 (AMTI)	850-678-1060	pewing4@cox.net
Fiske	Gary	FAA/AJT-28	860-386-3508	gary.m.fiske@faa.gov
Frank	Mike	FAA/AJT-28	202-385-8447	mike.frank@faa.gov
Funk	Adrienne	FAA/AJR-321	202-267-9282	adrienne.l.funk@faa.gov
Hammett	Bill	FAA/AFS-420 (ISI)	603-521-7706	bill.ctr.hammett@faa.gov
Heller	Martin	FAA/AJR-321	202-493-5752	martin.heller@faa.gov
Herndon	Al	MITRE/CAASD	703-983-6465 FAX: 6608	aherndon@mitre.org
Hilbert	Michael	FAA/AJR-37	202-385-4832	michael.hilbert@faa.gov
Hinson	Chris	MITRE	703-983-4578	chinson@mitre.org
Hope	Francie	FAA/WSC-OSG	425-203-4533	francie.hope@faa.gov
Jacobson	Aaron	Jeppesen	303-328-6800	aaron.jacobson@jeppesen.com
Kernaghan	John	NBAA	610-996-2977	jkernagh@its.jnj.com
Kuhnhenn	Juergen	Lufthansa (LIDO)	41 44 828-6546	juergen.kuhnhenn@lhsystems.com
Laroche	Pierre	Transport Canada	613-991-9927	pierre.laroche@tc.gc.ca
Loney	Tom	Canadian Air Force	204-833-2500 x5512	thomas.loney2@forces.gc.ca

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
INSTRUMENT PROCEDURES GROUP
ATTENDANCE LISTING - MEETING 10-01

Majauskas	Catherine	FAA/AFS-470	202-385-4725	catherine.majauskas@faa.gov
Maxwell	Roy	Delta Air Lines	404-715-7231	roy.maxwell@delta.com
McGray	Bruce	FAA/AFS-410	202-385-4625 FAX: 4937	bruce.mcgray@faa.gov
Moore	John	FAA/AJW-372	301-427-5154	john.a.moore@faa.gov
Mulvihill	Kelly	ISI NextGen Support	202-385-4846	kelly.ctr.mulvihill@faa.gov
Oudemans	Michael	FAA/AJR-32	202-267-9296	michael.oudemans@faa.gov
Pittman	Justin	Federal Airways & Airspace	321-777-1266	jjpittman@gmail.com
Pittman	Clyde	Federal Airways & Airspace	321-777-1266	airspace@airspaceusa.com
Ponchetti	Emmy	Jeppesen	303-328-4880	emmy.ponchetti@jeppesen.com
Prichard	Lev	APA	214-212-6357	lhp4@swbell.net
Reed	Mark	ALPA	703-689-4231	mark.reed@alpa.org
Roiss	Daniel	Lufthansa (LIDO)	41 44 828-6526	daniel.roiss@lhsystems.com
Rush	Brad	FAA/AJW-372	405-954-0188 FAX: 4236	brad.w.rush@faa.gov
Saenger	Philip	SAIC NextGen Support	202-651-2471	philip.r.saenger@siac.com
Saini	Meredith	FAA/AFS-820 (SAIC)	202-493-4789	meredith.ctr.sani@faa.gov
Schneider	Tom	FAA/AFS-420	405-954-5852 FAX: 2528	thomas.e.schneider@faa.gov
Serur	Steve	ALPA	703-689-4333	steve.serur@alpa.org
Singletary	Ron	FAA/AJT-28	202-385-8558	ron.singletary@faa.gov
Smet	Michael	NAVFIG	202-433-3541 FAX: 3458	michael.smet@navy.mil
Smith	Tim	FAA/AJVE2	404-305-5579	timothy.d.smith@faa.gov
Thompson	Ted	Jeppesen	303-328-4456 FAX: 4111	ted.thompson@jeppesen.com
Ward	Ken	FAA/AJW-41	202-267-9080	ken.ward@faa.gov
Ward	Edward	Southwest Airlines	214-792-1023	edward.ward@wnco.com
Waterman	Jeff	NGA/PVP	314-676-0588	geoffrey.d.waterman@nga.mil
Watson	Valerie	FAA/AJW-372	301-427-5155	valerie.s.watson@faa.gov
Wiseman	Larry	FAA/AOV-330	202-267-3047	larry.wiseman@faa.gov