

December 8, 2016

Dear Forum Participant

Attached are the minutes of the Aeronautical Charting Forum, Instrument Procedures Group (ACF-IPG) meeting held on October 25, 2016. The meeting was hosted by the Pragmatics Inc. at their Reston, VA facility. An office of primary responsibility (OPR) action listing ([VIEW](#)) and an attendance listing ([VIEW](#)) are appended to the minutes.

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

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

Copy to: Mr. Steve VanCamp
FAA/AFS-420 (ISI/Pragmatics)
P.O. Box 25082
Oklahoma City, OK 73125

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

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

The AFS-420 web site contains information relating to ongoing activities including the ACF-IPG. The home page is located at:

https://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/avs/offices/afs/afs400/afs420/acfipg/

This site contains copies of minutes of the past several meeting as well as a chronological history of open and closed issues to include the original submission, a brief synopsis of the discussion at each meeting, the current status of open issues, required follow-up action(s), and the OPR for those actions. There is also a link to the ACF Charting Group web site. We encourage participants to use these sites for reference in preparation for future meetings.

ACF meeting **17-01** is scheduled for **April 25-27, 2017** with USGS as host. ACF meeting **17-02** is scheduled for **October 24-26, 2017** with host TBD.

Please note that **meetings begin promptly at 8:30 AM**. Dress is business casual. Forward new agenda items for the 17-01 ACF-IPG meeting to the above addressees not later than April 10, 2017. 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

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM (ACF)
MEETING 16-02 October 25, 2016
HOST: Pragmatics, Inc.

I. OPENING REMARKS: Tom Schneider, AFS-420, Flight Standards co-chair of the Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF), and Chair of the Instrument Procedures Group (IPG), opened the meeting at 8:30 am on Tuesday, October 25, 2016. Pragmatics hosted the meeting at their Reston, VA facility.

II. PRAGMATICS WELCOMING COMMENTS: Richard Silver, Chief Business Development Officer, provided welcoming comments on behalf of Pragmatics. The group was very appreciative of Pragmatic's willingness to host the Forum and for the outstanding facilities.

III. INTRODUCTIONS: Attendees introduced themselves and whom they represented. A sign in roster was circulated and lists attendees.

IV. REVIEW MINUTES OF LAST MEETING, ACF 16-01: Steve VanCamp, AFS-420, (Pragmatics - Contract Support), briefed that the minutes of ACF-IPG 16-01, which was held on April 26, 2016, were electronically distributed to all attendees and contacts on the ACF Master Mailing List on June 21, 2016. There were no changes submitted, and the minutes were accepted as distributed.

V. BRIEFINGS:

Tom Schneider (AFS-420), provided a status briefing ([view](#)) on relevant FAA Orders: Order 7900.5D (ACF) is ready for signature with an anticipated publication date of December 1, 2016; Order 8260.3C, change 1, is estimated for publication in March 2017 and is on a fast track to completion (in coordination); Order 8260.58A, change 1, is estimated for publication in March 2017 (in tandem with Order 8260.3C, change 1); Order 8260.19H is estimated for publication on Jan 1, 2017 (industry should see the coordination draft shortly); Order 8260.46G is estimated for publication on April 1, 2017 (just starting coordination). John Bordy (AFS-420), briefed that Order 8260.3C changes are mostly editorial in nature, with the exception being harmonization of ILS and LPV criteria. Tom said many Order 8260.58A changes came from the PARC group work.

VI. OLD BUSINESS (Open Issues)

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

Rich Boll (NBAA) briefed ([view](#)) the rewrite work was completed for AIM holding guidance and submitted to the ATO, but a corresponding guidance change for the AIP was not done. Andy Duda (AJV-83) informed Rich that a DCP is now in progress, no issues are expected, and a November 10th publication is projected for both. Gary Fiske (AJV-82) concurred.

Status: Item Open: AJV-83

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

Tom Schneider (AFS-420), briefed the memo establishing Cat C & D minima in support of circle to land, and the status of Order 8260.43 rewrite (as shown on slide): ([VIEW](#)). AFS-460 is the POC and a complete rewrite is underway, with a meeting scheduled for November 1-3. John Moore (Jeppesen) asked if the proposed executive oversight is adding another layer. Tom said yes, and that prioritization of projects is in the order. Rune Duke (AOPA) asked if there will be any change allowing external users/stake holders to be able to participate in the process. Tom said he did not know, but would take the question back to AFS-460.

(*Editor's note:* Tom Schneider contacted AFS-460 and they stated that the draft Order 8260.43C will follow a similar process as is done now. The committees may invite outside entities if they deem necessary, but users/stakeholders will not be a member of the committee that prioritizes procedures.)

Status: **Item open:** **AFS-420**

12-01-301: Publishing a Vertical Descent Angle (VDA) with 34:1 Surface Penetrations in the Visual Segment *also includes issue 13-01-309.*

Tom Schneider (AFS-420) briefed on current Order 8260.19 guidance to publish a profile note "Visual Segment – Obstacles" and to eliminate publication of the VDA and TCH on FAA procedures when requested by Flight Inspection. Until recently, the FAA was still providing the glidepath angle and TCH data in the FAS Data Block of the source document, providing chart producers with a means to provide VDA and TCH on/in their products. An FAA memo ([VIEW](#)) was issued clarifying the intended policy. This memorandum specified that the FAA would no longer provide the ARINC data record as part of the publicly-disseminated procedure package content, but would still provide FO/FB waypoints and path terminators (for TERPS containment) along with all other FAS data block information. AIS will continue to provide an ARINC data record to Flight Inspection and to interested parties by specific request. John Moore (Jeppesen) confirmed with Tom that the ARINC data record will not be considered official state source and will not be published in the Transmittal Letter as part of the instrument procedure, but would still be available by request. John then inquired how the ARINC data record would be made available. Tom stated that details have not been worked out on how to process requests. Lev Pritchard (APA) inquired about the original problem, and Tom said that the FAA is not willing to publish/provide a VDA or TCH when Flight Inspection identifies a problematic obstacle that could cause an issue if the VDA were flown to the runway. It is believed that removing the data from the source documentation will eliminate the confusion in these cases. John Bordy (AFS-420) explained that the current requirement within Order 8260.3C (not yet fully implemented) is to attempt a redesign of the VDA to the highest allowable angle if Flight Inspection identifies a problem obstacle in the visual segment. If the redesign doesn't result in an improvement then we would publish the profile note indicating there are problem visual segment obstacles. John Bordy added that an initiative is in the works to develop and evaluate non-precision runways in the same manner we do today using the Glideslope Qualification Surface (GQS) for evaluation of vertically guided procedures (i.e., if there is a penetration of the surface, the procedure not allowed) before Flight Inspection. As the

FAA understands this will be a significant impact to the NAS, MITRE will conduct a NAS impact analysis for problem locations. When the impact study is completed, AFS will work with the Office of Airports and AJV-5 on an implementation plan. A discussion followed including the possibility of using higher angles to allow for a VDA at an airport, even with a loss of CAT D minimums, or providing no ARINC coding at all, since chart and database providers can calculate and publish angle/TCH to meet customer requests. The chart note "Visual Segment – Obstacles" will still be required by the source document as appropriate. Rich Boll (NBAA) stated we need to explain within the AIM why it might be possible for an FMS to contain an angle and TCH whereas the published procedure is absent of that information; Tom agreed. -The issue will remain open until those publications are updated. Kevin Bridges (AIR-130) added this guidance needs to include *advisory only* emphasis on any non-precision approach. The group concurred.

Status: AFS-410 will work AIM/AIP and IPH changes. **Item Open: AFS-410**

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

Tom Schneider (AFS-420) briefed there are two IOUs on the topic from the last ACF. ([VIEW](#)) Tom discussed latest version of change to draft Order 8260.19H, which most have already seen, showing examples of the equipment requirements notes and the PBN information box type notes. There still may be some changes to the NavSpec specifics for the notes, but the concept is not changing. Kevin Bridges (AIR-130) said if a box can do an approach it can do RNAV-1, adding that some old boxes may not be listed in the AC 90-100A spreadsheet. He explained that this is a manufacturer problem (not an FAA one) and suggested the user should ask the manufacturer to have their equipment listed. Rich Boll (NBAA) added that the spreadsheet has no bearing on whether or not a user can fly the approach and explained differences between AC 90-100A and AC 90-105. Valerie Watson (AJV-553) briefed the second IOU, reporting that the charting standard has been approved and is in place, and the PBN/Equipment Requirement briefing strip notes will be placed as depicted in the prototype chart examples when sourced on the 8260 procedure source document. Tom said this change will result from implementation of Order 8260.19H in January 2017, and charts with this feature should start appearing about a year later.

Status: Track and report status of Order 8260.19H. **Item open: AFS-420/AJV-5**

14-01-315: 90 Degree Airway-to-RNAV-IAP Course Change Limitation; Arrival Holds.

Tom Schneider (AFS-420) briefed ([VIEW](#)) slide provided by OPR Gary Petty (AFS-420). The US-IFPP agreed to form a working group to address this issue, however John Bordy (AFS-420) stated the group has not convened yet due to higher priority issues. Rich Boll (NBAA) again voiced his concern that PBN procedures are limited to a maximum turn of 90 degrees, while 120-degree turns are allowed on-conventional procedures, even though most conventional procedures are being flown with RNAV systems. Tom said the FAA does not believe this issue presents a safety concern and although it may be a

factor for a number of procedures, most are high enough where it is not a TERPs concern. Item will remain open and US-IFPP progress followed.

Status: Open item at the US-IFPP and a working group will be formed by Gary Petty.

Item Open: AFS-420

14-01-316: RNAV Fixes on Victor Airways Used for RNAV SIAPs.

Tom Schneider (AFS-420) briefed ([view](#)) language is in the draft Order 8260.19H and will be published in January 2017.

Status: Tom will track status of FAA Order 8260.19H through the coordination process.

Item Open: AFS-420.

14-02-317: Use of GPS on Conventional (Ground-Based NAVAID) Instrument Approach Procedures (IAPs).

Mason Curling (AFS-470) advised AIM language (para 1-2-3) was published.

Status: **Item Closed**

15-01-320: Common Sounding Fix Names.

Gary Fiske (AJV-82) briefed this issue is emotional for some sites (desire for specific names), however most instances identified have been resolved or are scheduled for fix name replacement. The ATL fixes will be changed with the Metroplex project in 2017, and two STARs are being canceled. One of the similar names at Dallas has been changed already and he is awaiting word on the remaining two. Gary added the ICAO ICARD program mentioned at ACF 16-01 is not a viable option to address future similar sounding issues. Valerie Watson (AJV-553) said this will not be an easy fix, as an automated solution is not available and human checks are necessary to prevent the problem. Gary concurred and added that current orders state what is expected and what facilities are supposed to do, but the "mechanics" of the names are still part of the issue. Gary reiterated that he is fixing specific problems as they are identified. Tom Schneider (AFS-420) asked about revised language for Order JO 7400.2, and Jill Olsen (AJV-553) said her office is now the OPR for that Order. Tom said Mike Wallin (NDFC) had indicated at a previous meeting there would be expanded language for fixes considered, similar to what is now used for NAVAIDs. Language will be incorporated to prompt the procedure designer to consider the issue. Tom said once a problem is identified it takes a while to resolve, and Gary agreed adding that a single case can take as long as 18 months to resolve. Brian Townsend (American Airlines) inquired about using name/number combinations since it appears we are running out of pronounceable names. Ted Thompson (Jeppesen) said this is done in Australia and there are reported problems with this method and that human factors investigation should be done before the US considers that option.. Tom said this would involve extensive criteria/guidance

changes. Valerie concurred, adding we are not running out of pronounceable names (Gary disagreed). Valerie took an IOU to confirm with NFDC that the U.S. is not running out of pronounceable 5-letter fix names. Gary will continue to monitor identified name issues.

Status: Valerie Watson will confirm with NFDC that the U.S. is not running out of pronounceable 5-letter fix names. Gary Fiske will continue to monitor identified name issues. **Item Open: AJV-5 /AJV-82**

15-01-321: Coding of Missed Approach for ILS RWY 31L and ILS RWY 31R at KJFK.

John Bordy (AFS-420) briefed VIEW there are two issues. The first issue is the status of the KJFK procedures; these are being amended with a scheduled publication is of February 2017. Stephen McClain (New York TRACON) advised that the revised procedure will not contain any hold down altitudes. The second issue is the coding of hold down altitudes on missed approach procedures. John Bordy reiterated these will continue to be non-standard and will require waivers. The FAA is moving away from providing coding (as with the VDA issue) for any procedures. Ted Thompson (Jeppesen) said the issue is the wording of the missed approach procedure vs. the actual coding and stressed that the wording must be clearly written and not subject to interpretation if the coding is to be correct. John said the missed approach wording will be made as clear as possible and coding (in this case at-or-below) will have to match that, adding the FAA will discourage these type of hold down procedures. Stephen McClain mentioned that hold down altitudes have a huge impact on their congested airspace. Tom added there are locations where these may be needed but we do not want these as standard. Lev Prichard (APA) said providing the wording but no coding should fix the issue. A group discussion followed on the language as it would appear on the 8260-series form and coding. Ted said if a change is desired prior to February, then written guidance by the FAA will be necessary for the providers.

Status: Track status of JFK procedure changes. **Item open: AFS-420**

15-02-323: Depiction of Low, Close-In Obstacles on SIDs & ODPs.

Tom Schneider (AFS-420) stated there are several IOUs on this item. ([VIEW](#)) Tom showed a slide from the US-IFPP Departure Working Group (DWG), which has met several times since last ACF and has been investigating ways to reduce charting of some low, close-in obstacles. One change proposed for Order 8260.3C, change 1, is not to chart obstacles less than 35 ft above DER (height departing aircraft in the US are expected to cross the DER). Analysis of some procedures showed that this change would result in a significant reduction of obstacles. Tom showed associated Order 8260.3 and 8260.46 language to support this and advised that an associated AIM/AIP and IPH update is being worked by AFS-410. The issue is still in US-IFPP for other reduction strategies and remains open in the DWG. For the second IOU, Krystle Behrns (AJV-5614) described the efforts by AJV-5 to create a search-by-airport-ident function for the digital TPP so that users can easily access and search the textual takeoff section (which contains the close-in obstacle list for each airport). Valerie Watson (AJV-533) showed a sample of the search function to be built for every airport. The proposal

consists of removing the obstacle lists from graphic SIDs as long as these obstacles can be readily found by an electronic search of the takeoff entry for that airport. This followed with a lengthy discussion on: Will an index be furnished by the FAA; how this would work; and will it be readily available in the cockpit. FAA's responsibility is to provide source data only and let users/providers work from there. The obstacle text is provided in the Takeoff entries and will (when this function is implemented) be searchable by airport identifier. Third party providers can expand and utilize this function as they see fit. Most participants agreed FAA does not need to provide tailored solutions. The original issue of chart clutter caused by lengthy textual obstacle lists on graphic SIDs would be solved by implementing this proposal. Rich Boll (NBAA) pointed out that Alternate Minimums would work well like this too, and Krystle Behrns said that concept is a future consideration for both Alternate and RADAR entries. Valerie said this is a short term fix; the long term goal is to separate all files by airport identifier, such as Alternates, Takeoffs, Radar Procedures, etc. and make them searchable by the identifier. Tom asked the group if all agreed to move forward with this proposal on removing obstacles from SIDs, and no one objected. Rich said this must be explained in the AIM/AIP and IPH prior to implementation. Tom asked if a "boiler plate" annotation should be placed on the SID or graphic ODP referring user to takeoff obstacles in front. Valerie commented that the "T" symbol is on all SIDs now and directs users to the Takeoff entry where the obstacles are already listed. Group discussion followed on: current system; current annotations; benefits of annotations/line of text direction on chart or none; raising pilot awareness of obstacles; and whether this is a training issue.

Status: Val took IOU to work on verbiage in front matter for use of "T" symbol on SIDs. Krystal took an IOU to move forward with advancing the searchable Takeoff function. Krystal will also work to begin removing textual obstacles for SIDs after Takeoff entries become fully searchable. Tom will look at language change for Form 8260-15B to remove obstacles. Valerie pressed for leaving them on Form 8260-15A only. Tom and Valerie will discuss this part offline. AIM/AIP and IPH update is being worked by AFS-410. **Item Open: AJV-5/AFS-410/AFS-420**

16-01-324: SID/STAR Naming Policy.

Tom Schneider (AFS-420) briefed ([view](#)) suggested language from Bob Lamond (NBAA) for Order 8260.19 and Order 8260.46 on naming SID/STARs. Gary Fiske (AJV-81) asked if the policy should include a prohibition against using the same first letter for different procedures at the same airport. Tom said the goal is guidance for the procedure developer to give consideration to similar sounding/spelled names, without forcing the facility to request waivers in some cases. Rich Boll (NBAA) said in a cockpit environment it is easy to confuse procedures when names are very similar (one letter apart). Gary said he has not seen any reports of problems. Russ Beatse (Memphis ARTCC) said the FAA does not use similar sounding names on purpose and when any are identified they are changed as soon as possible. He added that there are as many as 26 procedures at some large facilities. The group agreed that this is a human factors issue; specific naming policy guidance will not work all the time, and in many ways this issue is similar to fix naming issue. The FAA will continue to address same sounding procedures at a single location as they are identified.

Status: Tom agreed to remove the language changes from the current draft orders, and NBAA took an IOU to review and report at next ACF. **Item open: AFS-420/NBAA**

16-01-325: Priority of Terminal Procedure Amendments.

Tom Schneider (AFS-420) briefed from slide (used in issue 12-01-299 also) ([VIEW](#)) on proposed changes to Order 8260.43, Flight Procedures and Management Program, regarding priority of IFR procedure amendment. Rich Boll (NBAA) asked when this Order is anticipated to be published. Tom advised that AFS-460 is the POC, a complete rewrite is underway and a meeting is scheduled for November 1-3. Additionally, since this Order is signed by the Administrator, it will take longer than normal in the coordination/approval process.

Status: Track status on progress of Order 8260.43. **Item open: AFS-460**

16-01-326: FAA Order 8260.46F, "Top Altitude" Charting Constraints.

Brian Townsend (American Airlines) briefed he did not follow up with Benny Hutto (NATCA), but that based on ACF and PARC PCPSI work group discussions, changes are needed to the current restrictions allowing only two top altitudes on a SID per procedure. The issue is that many SIDs serve multiple airports and ATC often has the operational need for different altitudes for the different airports on the procedure. The recommendation is to allow two top altitudes *per airport* per procedure (if needed). Rich Boll (NBAA) has a concern that some procedures that serve 10 airports could have 20 top altitudes. Gary Fiske (AJV-82) concurred, adding that this would not be an issue on FAA charts (as an individual chart is created for each airport), but would be an issue when chart providers (Jeppesen, for example) depict multiple airports on the same chart. The appendix in Order 8260.46 provides examples of multiple situations. Gary stated that he has heard no discussion within ATC regarding the necessity for changes, and thinks we need allow the current Top Altitude policy to occur and then revisit the policy if there is an issue. The group discussed the situations at Baltimore, Dulles and other (possible) scenarios. Lev Prichard (APA) said he felt the bulk of pilots do not want to see 20 top altitudes on a SID; the potential for confusion is too large. Ted Thompson (Jeppesen) said the question is then whether you want 400 SIDs at an airport or 20 top altitudes on one. Discussion followed regarding coding altitudes with various scenarios, single named SID serving multiple airports, leaving the two top altitudes on the procedure and using climb and maintain altitudes as an alternative, leaving the policy alone and reassessing later. Gary Fiske advised DCP changes and the associated SRM document are in final coordination, with an (ambitious) publication goal of April 27, 2017. Brian added the PARC group will continue to work issue.

Status: Gary Fiske took an IOU to report status of any determinations made within the ATO regarding the number of "Top Altitudes" allowed. **Item open: AJV-82**

VII. NEW BUSINESS (New Agenda Items)

16-02-327: Arrival Holding Patterns Required for Approach Entry

Rich Boll, (NBAA) briefed ([view](#)) from the attachment slides in the RD, showing two developed procedures. An arrival hold (on the airway) was put on the charts instead of a hold in-lieu-of PT (HILPT), and because of the 90 degree turn limitations, the pilot cannot turn in on the approach from the airway. Because of the 90 degree turn limitation, there is an increase in the use of arrival holds to execute the procedure. Rich voiced that an arrival hold is in effect just a parking spot and that they are used predominantly in non-radar locations. Rich discussed that aircraft arriving on the airways must be cleared by ATC to hold in the arrival pattern and then cleared for the approach. This explanation is not in the AIM. Rich requests: do not use arrival holds unless necessary; new additional phraseology in AIM paragraphs 4-8-1 & 5-4-6 as shown in the RD attachments (Gary Fiske is against changing the language as shown); changing the criteria note language to allow an arrival as long as the hold is utilized (in these specific examples). Russ Beatse (Memphis ARTCC) liked the new proposed note better than the current note and added that ATC typically vectors aircraft to avoid the 90 degree issue. Rich then explained the proposal to allow aircraft (via chart note) permission to do the arrival hold and then the approach without further ATC clearance. Tony said this sounds like HILPT, which is currently only at an IF or IF/IAF. Tom said the language in Order 8260.19 would have to be changed to support this. Rich said the last part of their request is to add arrival holding (currently not in database) as part of the coded procedure, so pilots will not have to build it inflight. Tom asked if ATC and flight ops concurred with these suggestions. Gary said ATC agrees with the new note but not the rest, since the original design utilized IF- and IAF-only on purpose. Gary believes that if the pilot needs to make a turn in holding prior to approach they need to ask ATC. Rich said the RNAV 90 degree turn limitation is causing the problem. Gary agreed that would help and then ATC would not have to revise Order JO 7110.65. The ACF decided a work group would need to be formed [signup sheet provided ([view](#))] before a decision could be made on what exactly should be pursued. Revising policy to use an arrival holding pattern for a course reversal would reduce notes prohibiting use of the procedure from a certain direction.

Status: Rich Boll will chair the group and report back at next ACF. **Item open: NBAA (Rich Boll)**

16-02-328: Increasing Complexity of Speed Restriction Notes on SIDs & STARs

Ted Thompson (Jeppesen) presented the new item, saying the notes have become more complicated. Historically, when a speed restriction applies to the entire procedure, Jeppesen located it next to the procedure title, intending to make it obvious. In the last several years more complicated notes have emerged, and even though they may apply to the entire procedure they have been placed in the briefing section due to size (not short and simple per Jeppesen charting conventions). Pilot deviations have occurred because pilots have missed seeing the notes or misinterpreted them. Jeppesen attempted to resolve the issue with a "floating notes" concept, but with modern zoom practices, these notes can still be missed, prompting users to request consistency in placement. A discussion on speed notes followed covering: wording of the notes (examples in the RD); pilot interpretation of the notes; consistent placement of the notes on charts; simplifying & standardizing how notes are created across the NAS. The goal is to keep the notes short and succinct. Facilities write standard notes individually for

their local operation, but this standardization is not carried throughout the NAS. Volpe Human Factors study work on pilots reading chart notes was discussed, showing pilots looking for “action” vs. “non-action” items. Tom Schneider (AFS-420) showed slides on the issue prepared by AFS-420, ([VIEW](#)) showing current policy on speed notes. Only one note on STARs in Order 8260.19 shown (result of PCPSI work) is now being incorporated. SID notes example slides were discussed, including jet vs. prop “splits”. Rich Boll (NBAA) discussed content vs. placement of note (need for standard and non-standard). Discussion followed on: procedure designers using very specific language; industry partners (users) requests for speeds from ATC; need for specific and consistent language; TERPS containment requirements for some speeds, and placing these at fixes (including work at the PARC PCPSI); speed restriction as part of original clearance; speed notes where not necessary; difference with speed notes vs. speed associated with a fix; possibility of eliminating speed as part of general note. Tom discussed the five recommendations from the RD: AFS-420 will take an IOU to work with ATC and look at policy language/guidance in Orders 8260.19 & 8260.46 for consistent notes and will review VOLPE report when released for consideration on chart notes.

Status: **Item open: AFS-420**

VIII. NEXT MEETINGS

ACF 17-01 is scheduled for April 25-27, 2017, host USGS.

ACF 17-02 is scheduled for October 24-26 2017, host TBD.

IX. ATTACHMENTS (2)

1. OPR/Action Listing ([VIEW](#))
2. Attendance Listing ([VIEW](#))