

AERONAUTICAL CHARTING MEETING (ACM)
MEETING 21-01 April 26, 2021
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 20-02: Steve VanCamp, Digital iBiz, advised there were no comments, and the minutes were accepted.

3. Informational Briefings

a. Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), provided a status update of Order 7910.5 and selected 8260-series orders and noted this would be the last IPG meeting in which these orders would be briefed. FPAG Section S has taken on numerous additional directives and Jeff explained that continuing to single out these specific orders would only provide a partial overview of all of the applicable directives, and briefing all of them would require too much time. Applicable items of interest in these directives are addressed in discussion of individual recommendation documents.

- (1) Order 7910.5E, Aeronautical Charting Meeting Briefed from attached [slide](#).
- (2) Order 8260.3E, United States Standard for Terminal Instrument Procedures (TERPS) Briefed from attached [slide](#).
- (3) Order 8260.19I, Flight Procedures and Airspace Briefed from attached [slide](#).
- (4) Order 8260.42B, United States Standard for Helicopter Area Navigation (RNAV) Briefed from attached [slide](#).
- (5) Order 8260.46G, Departure Procedure (DP) Program Briefed from attached [slide](#).
- (6) Order 8260.58B, United States Standard for Performance Based Navigation (PBN) Instrument Procedure Design Briefed from attached [slide](#).
- (7) Order 8260.61, Charted Visual Flight Procedures Briefed from attached [slide](#)

b. Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), provided a briefing on the topic of ATS route designators on SIDs/STAR with a [slide](#). There is no guidance in FAA Orders 8260.19/8260.46 for charting ATS route designators on SIDs and STARs. Route designators on departures are charted by charting specification when a departure segment is coincident with an ATS route, and are charted on arrivals when specified on the 8260-series form. However, none of this is codified in 8260-series orders. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), said they would like to see this addressed in the orders, if it is even necessary. To determine if the users find these designators useful or necessary, Jeff wanted input from the attendees.

As an example, Jeff showed the [KSFO BIG SUR THREE](#) arrival, noting a discrepancy between the MEA on an arrival segment and the charted MEA on the low en route chart. Rich Boll, NBAA, agreed the MEA discrepancy was an issue. Dan Wacker, FPAG, noted the Departure Working Group has this issue as a working item, however it has been low priority.

Jeff also showed the [KLAS MCCARRAN SIX](#) departure, and pointed out a segment on the departure with both Jet and Victor route designators depicted. He identified a fix on the segment that is only on some of the airways, and noted the changeover point depicted on the departure segment is on the Victor route, but not on the Jet route. He also pointed out an MEA discrepancy similar to that on the BIG SUR THREE arrival.

Vince Massimini said pilots have a specific clearance, so there is no need to have the ATS route designator information on the SIDs and STARs. Pat Mulqueen, FAA Aeronautical Information Services (AIS), agreed with Vince, and explained the MEAs would often be expected to be different. Gary McMullin, Southwest Airlines, agreed, saying pilots will file and fly the published procedure, adding the criteria needs to be reviewed for transitions to the airway structure. None of the group disagreed with the idea of removing ATS route designators from the SIDs and STARs. Dan said there are many issues linked to the SIDs being reviewed by the Departure Working Group, that ATC has interest in this particular issue, and that the working group will continue to work the issue. Dan added this discussion was very helpful.

Valerie inquired about the possibility of changing the specification to not show coincident airways, and Jeff recommended since there was still work to be done to determine if they should or shouldn't be charted, that it was premature to update the charting specifications at this point. Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group, added the clearance needs to match what is on the SID and STAR charts. Jeff said additional feedback and any status updates would be provided at the next ACM.

4. Old Business (Open Issues)

a. 15-01-320: Common Sounding Fix Names: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). Jeff recapped the last ACM discussion on the fixes in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. While there are already requirements to avoid common sounding fix names in close proximity, and there are not any feasible automation solutions to prevent this, the issue was held open to address the concern of unresolved safety issues.

There is currently no process to pursue a safety issue a reporter feels has not been adequately addressed. Jeff said discussions on a possible resolution are ongoing, to possibly include developing an appeal process, and the item will remain open. Lev Prichard, Allied Pilots Association, appreciated the issue remaining open, but added it is concerning when an identified problem is disregarded. Gary Fiske, FAA ATC Procedures (Terminal) Team (AJV-P310), said issues with resolving common sounding fix names has been a persistent problem without an easy fix, but if cases are identified they should be corrected. He says no easy way to fix these exists, and this might warrant closing this item and starting a new agenda item. Rich Boll, NBAA, agreed with Gary that a new agenda item addressing safety concerns thru the IFP Gateway could not only include this, but bring in other potential problems and that the title of the new agenda

might grab more attention. Lev said this might just delay the original fix name conflict problem, and would like this issue to remain open until that is completed. Lev agreed that the criteria in place should stop new conflicting names, but reiterated when ASAP or other programs identify a safety issue, it is frustrating when the issue is not corrected. He also suggested there could be a “referee” to help resolve unaddressed issues submitted through the IFP Gateway or other reporting means.

Don McGough, FAA Aircraft Operations Technical Support (AJF-170), said part of their flight inspection process is identifying similar sounding fix names, and they do note them when identified. Pat Mulqueen, FAA Aeronautical Information Services (AIS), says AIS is always willing to change identified fix conflicts, but that ATC facilities are sometimes unwilling for fix names to be changed.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will continue to work with Aeronautical Information Services to determine an appropriate method to resolve disagreements related to application of JO 7400.2M, paragraph 3-3-3.b and Order 8260.19I, paragraph 8-5-1.d

Status: Item open

b. 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 current status from the [slide](#). Dan Wacker, FPAG, said the Departure Working Group (DWG) has 26 total items: 8 are closed and 18 open, with 2 new items, adding a DWG meeting will be held in May. The DWG circulated a document on new initial climb areas (ICAs) and revised obstacle and low close-in obstacle notes to all interested parties, and are now beginning work on draft criteria. Dan offered to brief any interested parties on the work so far by the DWG.

Jim Deuval, CAVU Companies, commented that as a performance engineer, the draft recommendation in this document limiting obstacles to highest/closest (remove others) will not necessarily display the most limiting obstacle and he feels this may not provide the necessary safety margins as described in the AIM and Order 8260.46, particularly as applied to reduced performance takeoff. Jim agreed existing notes are voluminous and difficult to comprehend. Jim showed an example slide with three obstacles demonstrating the limiting obstacle may not be the closest and/or highest. Jim recommends removal of all references to close-in obstacles further than 400 ft from the centerline, and addition of AIM explanatory language on how obstacles without known exact location/height are handled. Dan said TERPS assumes all engines are operating normally, and that one-engine inoperative (OEI) standards are different from TERPS. The obstacles listed are not for OEI, but are based on the TERPS departure ICA. The DWG has a plan that has been coordinated with most of industry, including engineers, and have conducted a safety management review of the proposed changes. Dan offered to brief Jim on the work to date and Jim welcomed the offer, saying the intent of the issue was to reduce overall amount of listed obstacles but still provide the pilot practical information. Dan added the DWG has already considered Jim’s suggestion, and will discuss this with Jim offline.

Action Items:

- Dan Wacker will provide Jim Deuvall a briefing of the work to date of the Departure Working Group
- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will brief the Departure Working Group status at ACM 21-02

Status: Item open

c. 16-02-327: Arrival Holding Patterns Required for Approach Entry: Mike Melssen, FAA Flight Operations Group (FOG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#), saying Aeronautical Information Manual changes had been processed and will be published this summer and recommended closure of the item. Joel Dickinson, FOG, briefed that the Instrument Procedures Handbook changes are in progress, and he is working on recommended changes to the Instrument Flying Handbook, though a different Flight Standards office is responsible for that handbook. Joel added these changes take much longer to publish and he recommends not waiting on those changes to close the issue. Rich Boll, NBAA, concurs with closing the issue based on the progress to date. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), said they have not received recommended changes to the Chart Users Guide, but will review them when received. Mike and Joel will forward necessary examples to Valerie.

Status: Item closed

d. 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 and current status from the [slide](#). Order 8260.19I was published June, 2020. There were no examples received following ACM 20-02 for suggested changes to order 8260.46 verbiage. Lev Prichard, Allied Pilots Association, said speed restriction notes should be facility specific and not too verbose. Gary McMullin, Southwest Airlines, said there is a lot of confusion and no limits on notes, and for SIDs he would prefer examples be reviewed in a small working group with Lev and others. Lev agreed with Gary, and thought this should be a PARC PCPSI discussion to include pilots, with feedback brought back to the ACM. Doug Willey, Airline Pilots Association, added an example at DEN that caused a lot of confusion, and others brought up additional examples. The group suggested the Departure Work Group (DWG) would be a good place to address these concerns. Dan Wacker, FPAG, commented there is an open item in the DWG on ATC notes with an interest in reducing the number of notes on procedures, and this would fit well there. Dan suggested the DWG bring the work to the PCPSI for pilot feedback, then back to the DWG for criteria changes. Rich Boll, NBAA, agreed this should be discussed in a larger group, and that the DWG would work well. Lev added there is an upcoming PCPSI WG, and Dan added they have time already scheduled to discuss these items at that meeting and bring back to the DWG.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group Departure Working Group (DWG) will work on examples and specifics, take to the PARC PCPSI, then return to the DWG for criteria work
- FPAG will brief status at ACM 21-02

Status: Item open

e. 18-01-334: Charting PBN Requirement Box on RNAV DPs and STARs: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). Order 8260.46H should be signed very soon, and he suggested closing the item. Rich Boll, NBAA, inquired from Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group, about any supporting changes for the AIM, AIP, IPH, and IFH explaining the meaning of PBN requirements. He said there is still confusion on the approach plates, with STARs now being added. Joel said there is already text in the AIM and the TPP front matter describing the PBN box, adding the goal is publication as close to the same time as possible. Rich said the explanation is not complete, and asked about the table previously worked on. Joel said the table is in the AC, and agrees work needs to be done, adding that improvements are being made. Rich agreed the criteria work on the RD has been completed, though more explanatory language is needed, but agreed with closure of the item.

Status: Item closed

f. 18-02-337: Improve Remote Altimeter Airport Notes: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). Draft language is still being worked by the FPAG, and will be worked in conjunction with the Flight Operations Group.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will report on status of 8260.19 language updates and initiate necessary document change proposals for the AIM and/or IPH
- Joel Dickinson, Flight Operations Group, will report on necessity of AIM and/or IPH changes, and report status of any revisions

Status: Item open

g. 18-02-339: Revision of Takeoff Obstacle Notes: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). Dan Wacker, FPAG, added the Departure Working Group (DWG) has decided to not follow the recommendation to put coordinates on departure obstacles. Dan added the DWG has combined the takeoff obstacle note issues, so he recommends combining this with other notes issues. LIDO has received the briefing. Jeff suggested closing this item since the broader issue is covered in other issues. Zann Hawkins, LIDO, concurs with closing the issue since they are now included in the discussions. All the related efforts from this issue on this will be included in open issue 15-02-323.

Status: Item closed

h. 19-01-342: Charting “NA When Local Weather Not Available” for Alternate Minimums: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). This issue addresses inconsistent charting issues, and FPAG has not yet had a chance to work the issue. The issue remains open and will be worked, and progress will be briefed at the next ACM. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), added the Charting Office feels this note should be general

guidance in the introductory explanatory text in the alternate minimums section, since it applies to every approach procedure. Jeff said that had been a suggestion that would be in consideration, but any changes would require revision of the documentation requirements in Order 8269.19.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will work with the Flight Operations Group regarding alternate weather requirements, and possible policy changes
- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will brief the results of those discussions at the next meeting

Status: Item open

i. 19-01-343: Clarify Text of Notes that Affect Minima: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). The effort is to clarify and shorten the notes, however this work was overtaken by other work. Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, advised they are trying to determine the correct way to approach the problem, and wants to work with the Flight Operations Group toward a solution. Rich Boll, NBAA, concurred with the formation of a working group to discuss both the RASS and inoperative lighting notes. Rich wanted to ensure work continued to reduce the complexity of RASS notes on procedures. Diane said she will work initially with the Flight Operations Group on draft language, and will report back at the next ACM.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will work with the Flight Operations Group on draft language for Order 8260.19 and brief status at the next ACM

Status: Item open

j. 19-02-344: Intermediate Segment Stepdown Altitudes: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). The addition of the algorithm to Order 8260.3 has not been accomplished yet, but is planned for the next draft revision of the order. Jeff explained the intent would be to include the algorithm in an appendix, and reference usage in applicable points of Orders 8260.3 and 8260.58. Rich Boll, NBAA, asked if this would be optional or mandatory, and Jeff the plan is for the application to be optional. Rich added he is concerned about some users having issues and will want to see the language, indicating a non-concur would likely follow if the application was not mandated. He said the temperature adjustments are primarily used with simultaneous parallel independent approaches, and the vertical path has to be above the stepdown fix altitudes. He added that the stepdown fix altitudes must support intercepting the glideslope or an SBAS generated glide path. Jeff will have an off-line discussion with the Flight Operations Group, and may loop Rich in on the further discussion.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will brief the Order 8260.3 changes

Status: Item open

k. 19-02-345: Use of P-NOTAMS on SID/ODPs and STARs: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). Sue Walker, FPAG, has been working the issue in conjunction with Pat Mulqueen, FAA Aeronautical Information Services. Pat briefed there are no P-NOTAMS on SIDs and STARs. The US NOTAM Office is now part of AJV-A, and an effort is under way to reduce the number of NOTAMS in the NAS, currently with over 40,000. When this issue was brought to Pat, the thought was it would be counterproductive to increase the number of NOTAMS in the system by adding these. Pat feels the better way to address SIDs is with the abbreviated amendment process, as is already the case with STARs, which is working well with small changes. Pat suggests a similar process for departures, adding AJV-A does not want to go forward with an expanded P-NOTAM process.

Rich Boll, NBAA, restated the intent of the original issue was to get changes on SIDs and STARs out faster than the 18-24 month amendment process. Rich discussed a new STAR into SFO where an altitude was published and coded, then had to be raised due to being below the floor of Class B airspace. A NOTAM was issued to raise the altitude back to compliance, but that did not change charting or coding, and while ATC expected the pilots to be familiar with the NOTAM, many were not. Trying to get a procedure amended is difficult and can take 18 months or longer, and the interest is to have a faster method to update procedures. NBAA felt P-NOTAMS are for chart changes, and once the chart is changed the NOTAM could be cancelled. Rich asked Pat if an abbreviated amendment process would fix the issue. Pat said on the STAR at SFO, a T-NOTAM was issued, and was aware the NOTAM was missed by some pilots. Pat feels the way forward is the abbreviated amendment process, even though AJV has a heavy workload. If the criteria is defined, especially if no flight inspection is required, AJV can typically amend the procedure forms for the next available chart date. The problem is when these procedures are amended, major changes are usually requested requiring full amendments. Pat added sometimes Flight Inspection can do a table-top review rather than fly the procedure. Pat and Rich agreed too many NOTAMS is a safety issue, and having a vehicle for abbreviated amendments would help reduce these.

The abbreviated amendment process for STARs is in Order 8260.19. If there is a safety issue, AJV creates a T-NOTAM. Sue Walker, FPAG, said the NOTAM issue is a high priority issue and took an action item to work with Pat on defining what could be allowed for abbreviated amendments on SIDs. Pat said QC cannot approve items for abbreviated amendments that are not specifically listed, so they need to see if the list can be expanded. Items not requiring flight inspection need to be listed for an abbreviated process, and AJV is limited unless this is accomplished. Pat suggested additional items for STARs could also be addressed. TJ Nichols, FPAG, added a P-NOTAM does accomplish a chart change, but does not result in updates to navigation databases. The intent is to accomplish a chart update for a quick amendment in the shortest amount of time, but that can possibly result in a database mismatch. Rich pointed out this issue is related to and should be worked with open issue 16-01-325. John Barry, FAA Aircraft Certification Service, added a major point is ensuring the database is updated simultaneously. Pat suggested the way forward is to update the forms, resulting in the chart change, and using those forms on the coordination website as the information source for database updates.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will work with AJV-A to define parameters for an abbreviated amendment process for SIDs and ODPs

Status: Item open

l. 16-01-325: Priority of Terminal Procedure Amendments: *(Editor's note: due to an oversight, this item was briefed out of sequence from that planned in the agenda. It appears in these minutes at the point in the meeting in which it was discussed.)* Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#), and added this is related to issue 19-02-345. Sue Walker, FPAG, briefed there have been many discussions regarding the high visibility and priority of NOTAMs. The issue was addressed with the Instrument Procedures Validation Team to assign a higher priority to working procedures with NOTAMs, adding there is new work with Aeronautical Information Services on an abbreviated amendment process for SIDs. The Flight Procedures teams will be brought into the process to identify candidate procedures for the abbreviated amendments. Jeff said this will move forward in conjunction with issue 19-02-345. Pat Mulqueen, FAA Aeronautical Information Services, agreed with Sue, and said if they receive a project identified as an abbreviated amendment and not requiring flight inspection, the completion should be quicker. Gary Fiske, FAA ATC Procedures (Terminal) Team (AJV-P310), questioned what other states are doing when confronted with the same issues. TJ Nichols, FPAG, said other states operate under different regulatory framework, and it is likely easier for other states to perform those amendments.

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will brief status of the P-NOTAM process revision status at ACM 21-02, in conjunction with issue 19-02-345

Status: Item open

m. 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 and current status from the [slide](#). Language has been added to the draft of 8260.3 (currently in coordination) to address this issue.

Considerable inputs were voiced by various attendees during discussion of this item concerning past legal interpretations of 14 CFR 91.117(c) and (d). Since interpretation of these regulatory requirements is out of scope for this meeting, and due to concerns the various opinions voiced might later be erroneously interpreted as interpretations of the regulatory requirements, and since those regulatory requirements have no direct bearing on the issue discussed, those portions of the conversation are not captured in these minutes. However, Jeff did offer to investigate the process for resolving conflicts of interpretation of regulatory requirements and report back to the meeting with that process.

Gary McMullin, Southwest Airlines, voiced he had no concern with the proposed draft language, but was concerned about possible misinterpretation by procedure designers that might place a speed restriction on the procedure based on the language. Jeff clarified that there would be no requirement to place a 200-knot speed restriction on the STAR based on this language. Rich Boll, NBAA, as the submitter of the RD clarified that the intent of the RD was not to request

airspeed restrictions below Class B airspace, but to ensure that procedure designers took the requirement to slow to 200 knots into account for leg length calculations, similar to the requirement to consider deceleration to 250 knots when transitioning through 10000 MSL. The lack of this consideration results in leg lengths that are too short to allow for deceleration and descent, and some operators have experienced difficulty complying with altitude restrictions at the end of these segments. Rich raised a concern that had been previously discussed that designers had placed airspeed restrictions in excess of 200 knots below Class B airspace, putting pilots in the position of violating either the procedural requirement, or the regulatory requirement. Jeff clarified that a requirement had been previously added to Order 8260.3 paragraph 2-2-9.e that specified speed restrictions requiring aircraft to exceed 200 knots should not be established underlying Class B airspace.

Rich stated that the proposed language satisfies NBAA's concern but would prefer strengthening the language from "should" to "must," and Jeff agreed to take that into consideration.

Following the meeting, Jeff discussed with Rich and others the appropriate means of addressing an inconsistent, or perceived inconsistent interpretation of regulatory requirements. This issue is beyond the scope of the ACM-IPG to address, but has been addressed by [Information for Operators \(InFO\) 17005](#), dated 3/23/17. Jeff specified that anyone concerned about the regulatory requirements should follow the guidance in this InFO, and there would be no more action required from the IPG to address the regulatory requirements.

Action Items:

Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will brief the status of Order 8260.3E Chg 1 at ACM 21-02

Status: Item open

n. 20-02-349: Charting Required NAVAID Changeovers on IAPs, including SID/STAR: Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group, briefed that an ad-hoc working group was formed to discuss the value of the suggestion. The consensus of the group was this suggestion is not needed. The PARC PCPSI was coincidentally working AIM changes that would be more specific regarding vectors to final, and the WG put in DCP suggestions for a better diagram and explanation on service volumes for ILS/GLS in that DCP. Joel recommended closure of the issue.

Status: Item closed

o. 20-02-351: Unnecessary Helicopter Note on Approach Charts: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). A paragraph was added to Order 8260.19J, as shown in the slide, to address the issue. The Garmin representatives believe this will suffice. Since Order 8260.19J has not yet entered coordination, Jeff suggested the item should remain open at this time.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will report status of Order 8260.19J

Status: Item open

p. 20-02-353: Revised Guidance and Charting for Order 8260.3 Circling Area

Dimensions: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue from the [slides](#). The conversion process is limited by other work, but is ongoing. There is no time estimate for Flight Inspection to complete evaluation of the remaining areas, but once completed, AIM and IPH guidance will follow. Rich Boll, NBAA, inquired how many approaches will continue to be published without addition of the circling icon, and Pat Mulqueen, FAA Aeronautical Information Services, said he would research the number and forward to Rich, adding that T-NOTAMs have all been issued for all procedures that had been identified with higher circling minimum descent altitudes (CMDAs) based on the completed evaluations. The issue will remain open until all remaining procedures in the inventory have been evaluated by Flight Inspection and the process to remove the circling icons begins. Don McGough, FAA Aircraft Operations Technical Support (AJF-170), reiterated all CMDAs have been raised where necessary, but until Flight Inspection has evaluated the larger circling areas, they do not want an indication (the circling icon) to pilots they can operate with the larger circling radii. They are evaluating the areas at the remaining airports as they are able. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), added the Charting Group has committed to revising 1000 charts per each 56-day cycle to remove the icon, and the entire inventory should be complete within six cycles, once Flight Inspection has completed their evaluations. Rich inquired if, once the update process begins, the TPP legend could be revised to remove the original TERPs radii and just reference the revised radius guidance to eliminate confusion. He also suggested adding language to indicate all procedures have been evaluated regardless of the publication or lack thereof of the circling icon. Valerie and Jeff agreed to consider this, and pointed out it would require Flight Standards guidance to accomplish this.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will provide a status update at the next ACM

Status: Item open

q. 20-02-354: Use of Suitable Area Navigation (RNAV) Systems on Conventional

Procedures and Routes: Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group, briefed the issue [slides](#). They are consolidating the PBN guidance, including this issue, into an advisory circular. This project is ongoing, and, when published, the AIM verbiage that references this will be updated. Dan Wacker, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, inquired if this was applicable to only approaches, or if it would apply to all procedures, and Joel said it would apply to all procedures. Joel added they are working on ensuring clarity of language, and stressed this would be an operational technique, and not a TERPS protection.

Action Items:

- Flight Operations Group will report on status of any possible AC changes and publication dates

Status: Item open

r. 20-02-355: Minimum Enroute 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 summary and current status from the [slide](#). John Collins, Foreflight, asked if DME/DME only applies to MEA on a STAR, and Jeff said this assessment would only be performed where required. Rich Boll, NBAA, inquired about the status and timeline for revision of Order 7470.1. Gary Fiske, FAA ATC Procedures (Terminal) Team (AJV-P310), said the order is in coordination but was not aware of the specific timeline.

Action Items:

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will report status of the MEA/MOCA working group, and ensure clear language exists in all associated publications

Status: Item open

5. New Business (New Agenda Items)

s. 21-01-356: Common Sounding Fix Names: André Durocher, Quebec Land Surveyor, briefed his new [issue](#) from the RD. He explained his concept of fix naming and increasing to more than five alphanumeric characters, listing both advantages and disadvantages. Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), confirmed André wanted two things: more than five characters allowed in fix names and every procedure fix to use similar naming conventions driven by position and use. André showed an example slide, discussing the benefit of the new fix name convention, indicating to the pilot where on a procedure they would be headed. Jeff asked how this naming convention would work for fixes used on several approaches, such as a fix functioning as an IF/IAF on an approach to a runway and functioning as the missed approach clearance limit for the approach to the opposite end of the runway, which is a very common occurrence in the NAS. André said in this case you could leave this name alone. Michael Stromberg, UPS, brought up the problem that allowing more than five characters in a fix name would require massive expenditures due to limitations of existing navigation systems, and suggested there would be no feasible way to accomplish that part of the proposal. Michael suggested there would be human factors concerns with possible confusion on what would be very similar fix names. For example, on parallel approaches, adding distinct names provides a layer of protection. Rich Boll, NBAA, agreed with Michael, saying expansion beyond five characters would not be likely. However, Rich said they recognize a lack of pronounceable names, and this issue does bring up a possible solution. He suggested if alphanumeric fix naming was used with combinations of numbers and letters for fixes that would not be used in aircraft-controller communication, it could free up usage of some pronounceable names. Rich discussed an ICAO naming convention for waypoints on a procedure using the last two letters from the airport ID (for example CT for KICT) with three numeric characters. The convention could use the character 1 for an initial, 2 for an intermediate, 3 for final, and 4 for the missed approach segment. TJ Nichols, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), brought up data issues, specifically the way the FAA interfaces with ICAO ICARD allocation system which ensures no duplicate designators in nearby geographical areas. TJ thinks states reserve specific names or blocks, and that could be a limiting factor for this idea. Michael agreed with Rich's idea that many fixes in the NAS are never used in communication, adding this naming

convention is already being used and working well today across the world, and this would free up needed pronounceable names. Gary Fiske, FAA ATC Procedures (Terminal) Team (AJV-P310), agreed with the concept of changing fixes that will never be pronounced to use alphanumeric characters.

Jeff summarized that the original RD was not feasible, but the concept of name changing non-verbalized fixes, along with a naming convention indicating usage, could be worth consideration. TJ agreed this is open to further study, but not with this RD as submitted. Rich volunteered to submit a new RD on alphanumeric fix naming for the next ACM. The group discussed ICAO usage presently, and how to go about a proposal for NAS changes. TJ said the applicable directive is JO 7400.2, not an 8260-series order, and was not sure if this would have bearing on ACM activity. Jeff added he does not want to introduce an issue that is beyond the scope of the ACM. Gary said JO 7400.2 is an FAA ATO Missions Support order (ATO), and does not think the ATO (AJV-P) would have an issue with a change of naming convention on non-verbalized fix names, adding he likes the concept. *Editor's note: After the meeting, FPAG decided to begin initial study of the feasibility of revising the naming convention prior to the next ACM and coordinate with NBAA regarding a new RD.*

Status: Item not accepted

6. Next Meetings

ACM 21-02: Schedule, format, and venue TBD

ACM 22-01: TBD