

GOVERNMENT/INDUSTRY AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM
Instrument Procedures Group
(Transcribed/Re-Formatted)
HISTORY RECORD

FAA Control # 98-02-211

SUBJECT: IACC Mandatory Profile View Specifications

BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION: The Inter-Agency Air Cartographic Committee's (IACC) Flight Information Publication, "Low Altitude Instrument Approach Procedures, is the controlling document for the "nuts and bolts" of the official U.S. Government charting of standard instrument approach procedures (SIAPs).

Because of the TWA 514 crash at Dulles Airport on December 1, 1974, which had a casual factor of a deficiently-charted profile view, the industry and government were reminded that the profile view of any charted FAA SIAP is to include any and all segments with less than en route obstacle clearance, including the course-reversal segment.

Thus, the intent set forth and restated during the ensuing TWA 514 investigation was that not only is the procedure turn or hold-in-lieu-of to be shown in the profile view, so is any procedural track starting at an intermediate fix or point. The pertinent present language from the IACC spec is:

*4d (1) Instrument Approach Procedures (Charts),
Profile: General:*

(a) A profile diagram of the instrument approach procedure shall be placed in the space provided below the planview. Those facilities, intersections, fixes, etc., identified in the procedure to be used in executing a course reversal and/or involved in the intermediate/final approach segment with minimum altitudes, as required by the procedure, shall be shown. Size and style of type shall be as indicated in the appendices.

(b) When the procedure provides differing altitudes for with and without a procedure turn, a dual profile shall be provided

(c) Dual profiles to parallel runways shall also be provided by a dual profile.

The Sheridan, Wyoming SIAP is attached to the "NoPT/DME" agenda item is a case in point.

RECOMMENDATION: This group needs to review the human-factors issues of a chart such as the Sheridan VOR chart. ALPA believes such charting leads to potentially complex, confusing charting and should be prohibited. Also, the group needs to address whether there is an absolute requirement to 'chart each flight track in the profile view that is an intermediate segment independent of the course reversal.

COMMENT: This affects FAA charting policy and Handbook 8260.19C.
Submitted by: Captain Tom Young, Chairman

Charting and Instrument Procedures Committee
PH:(703) 689-4176 FAX: (703) 689-4370
October 9, 1998

INITIAL DISCUSSION (MEETING 98-02): Position paper presented by ALPA; however, due to time constraints, there was no discussion of this issue. All attendees are requested to review the issue paper for discussion at the next meeting. ATA-130, as the FAA IACC representative, should have a preliminary FAA position for the next meeting. ATA-130 to brief at the next meeting. **Action: Item Open (ATA-130).**

MEETING 99-01: Time precluded discussion of this issue. ATA-130 will provide a FAA position at the next meeting. Status: ATA-130 to report at the next meeting. **Action: Item Open (ATA-130).**

MEETING 99-02: Wally Roberts, ALPA, reviewed the issue stating that IACC specifications require a profile depiction of all portions of a SIAP with less than en route obstruction clearance. Art Dodds, NOS, noted that Order 8260.19 states that the profile view shall include the intermediate fix on IAPs that do not authorize a PT or holding pattern. He added that NOS will check this on future IAP forms. It was recommended that AFS-420 research the issue and make appropriate changes, if required, to Order 8260.19. AFS-420 will work the issue and report at next meeting. **Action: Item Open (AFS-420)**

MEETING 00-01: Dave Eckles, AFS-420, presented a status update paper and briefing on the issue. AFS-420 agrees with ALPA that charting multiple profiles could cause chart clutter and pilot confusion. FAA Order 8260.19 provides FAA policy that reflects human factors consideration to provide plan view and profile view information so as not to introduce unnecessary chart clutter. Where the procedure includes a PT, the policy is to provide profile data relating to the PT, and not to depict any additional profile segment information. Where a PT is not authorized on the procedure, intermediate segment information is provided on the form for charting purposes, including instruction as to the starting point of the profile view. However, where the procedure contains both a PT and another intermediate segment, only the PT is depicted on the profile; i.e., the PT depiction has precedence. In the latter case, it is the FAA's position that the plan view provides sufficient altitude and course data for the pilot to safely navigate to the FAF, and the human factors issue of profile chart clutter is avoided. It is AFS-420's position that the current guidance is acceptable and that FAA order 8260.19 need not be amended. John Moore, NOS, added that IACC specifications are not directive on this issue and that charting will conform to the applicable 8260-series form. Dave recommended this issue be closed. ALPA agreed that the profile charting of multiple intermediate segments is confusing. However, they also believe that establishment of policy restrictions in procedure design to preclude NoPT routes within procedure turn areas will eliminate the problem. They requested AFS-420 take another look at the issue. The item will remain open. AFS-420 will re-study the issue and report. **Action: Item Open (AFS-420).**

MEETING 00-02: Dave Eckles, AFS-420, presented a status update paper and briefing on the issue. AFS-420 has re-studied the issue and believes that the current policy in Order 8260.19 is satisfactory. The group agreed to close. **Status: Item Closed**