

**AERONAUTICAL CHARTING Meeting
Instrument Procedures Group
Meeting 18-02 – October 23, 2018**

RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT

FAA Control #18-02-338

Subject: Difference Between Takeoff Mins on FAA SIDS and Takeoff Mins section

Background/Discussion: I was currently reviewing an incident in which the published Takeoff Mins for BDL, RWY 33 had removed the climb gradient due to a P-NOTAM. In the process of correcting this issue, it was noted that the climb gradient listed for RWY was not the same as what was identified on the SIDS for RWY33. This caused confusion for the pilots doing pre-flight work. Which climb gradient should be used and why were they different?

After speaking to one of the FAA charting managers, the P-NOTAM did not address the SIDS. The last time the SID in question was updated was via a -15B. The manager then said this group should address it.

Recommendations: Ensure Takeoff Mins are published consistently across all pages/products affected.

Comments: An example of two SIDS published for Bradley Intl, in which the climb gradients for RWY 33 are different without any obvious reason for the difference, is attached.

Example SIDS

BDL T/O Mins

<u>Submitted by:</u>	George Bland
<u>Organization:</u>	HW AFFSA
<u>Phone:</u>	405-582-5010
<u>E-mail:</u>	george.bland@us.af.mil
<u>Date:</u>	9/26/2018

Initial Discussion – Meeting 18-02: George Bland (AFFSA) briefed a new [RD issue](#). This is similar to open agenda item ACF-IPG 17-02-331, regarding a perceived discrepancy on charts whereby two SIDs from the same runway (KBDL RWY 33) have different climb gradients. George mentioned there also appears to be some discrepancies with the low, close-in obstacles charted for this runway between the SIDs and the ODP, which could lead to further confusion. Discussion ensued regarding the potential for different takeoff obstacle notes between a SID and an ODP, and between SIDs themselves depending upon the revision dates of each procedure. John Bordy asked AFFSA if it would be acceptable to incorporate this issue into Item 17-02-331; Kevin Keszler (AFFSA) agreed that was acceptable.

Action Items: Issue will be incorporated into Item #17-02-331.

Status: Item Closed (moved to ACM-IPG issue 17-02-331).