

**AIR TRAFFIC PROCEDURES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
(ATPAC)**

SUBJECT: Minutes of the ATPAC 140th Meeting

SUMMARY: The 140th meeting of ATPAC was held on February 15-17, 2011, in Jacksonville, FL. Representatives were present from FAA, NATCA, ALPA, PWC, U.S. Navy, NASA, Delta Air Lines, AOPA, ATCA, UAL/COA and APA

The meeting was called to order by the Chairperson, at 8:56 a.m. on Tuesday, February 15, 2011.

J Garver discussed the logistics for the meeting, (Administrative, and introduction of new Executive director). Introductions were made by name and group/organization represented.

The Executive Director presented his report.

Recurring Agenda Items, IOUs, and applicable AOCs were reviewed and discussed; and the next meeting date and location were established. All business finished, the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM on February 17, 2011.

AGENDA:

- Call to Order/Roll Call
- Recognition of Attendees
- Executive Director's Report
- Chair Report
- Call for Safety Items
- Review of Agenda Items, Recurring Agenda items, Status updates to Areas of Concern (AOC)
- Airport Briefing
- Introduction of New AOCs/Miscellaneous
- Locations/Dates for Future Meetings
- Site visits to NAS JAX ATC facilities
- Adjournment

TUESDAY, February 08, 2011

CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL: The Chairperson called the meeting to order at 8:56 a.m. The Chairperson introduced herself and performed introductions around the room.

RECONGITION OF ATTENDEES:

Dennis Roberts, ATPAC Executive Director, dennis.roberts@faa.gov (202) 870-9577, FAA

Danny Aguerre, ATPAC Chair, dannynatca@aol.com (954) 309-8514, NATCA

Kerry Rose, kerry.rose@faa.gov (202) 267-3191, Manager, ATC Procedures Office (ATCPO)

Jay Garver, j.garver@faa.gov (202) 493-5266, ATC Specialist (ATCPO)

Gordon Rother, gordon.rother@faa.gov (612) 713-4229; representing Leo Hollis of AFS-220

Doug Thoman, dthoman@ipupilot.org (502) 387-1162; IPA-UPS pilots

ACCM Tony Corpus, anthony.corpus@navy.mil (703) 614 2639; US Navy OPNA N8853E

Michael Lister, michael.lister@navy.mil (703) 614-2635; US Navy (OPNAV N8853E)

Allan Twigg, allan.twigg@united.com (571) 212-5368; United Airlines

Marc Gittleman, marcgittleman@yahoo.com (571) 723-7524; ALPA

Andy Brand, andy.brand@alpa.org (404) 667-4478; ALPA

John Dutton, john.dutton@faa.gov (202) 385-4920; AJV-14

Ed Drury, edward.f.ctr.drury@faa.gov ((904) 375-2122; AJV-14

Patricia Bynum, patricia.bynum@faa.gov (202) 385-4920; Professional Women's Controllers (PWC)

Wilson Riggan, wilson@riggangroup.com (305) 588-0273; APA

Harvey Hartmann harvey.hartmann@nasa.gov (408) 541-2821; NASA/ASRS

Jeff Williams, jeffery.williams@tetrattech.com (703) 841-2699; ATCA

Kevin Gallagher, kevin.gallagher@faa.gov (202) 385-4844; AJS

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT: Executive Director provided a short bio of his career, and spoke of the programs and projects he is currently responsible for, i.e. ATC procedures, RNAV/RNP, UAS, Obstruction Evaluation (wind turbines, etc), airspace optimization, airspace redesign, and the Metroplex Initiative.

Dennis also discussed the FAA "monitor group", which looks at groups, organizations etc, with the intent of reducing/eliminating duplication of effort and inefficiencies, mission and structure. There might be another reorganization to align the ATO more functionally with a COO allying all support functions under one group. They are also are looking at groups providing input into the agency. Too many groups have been formed and are operating, possibly creating overlap and/or redundancy. He asked that we think about relevancy and structure of the ATPAC group for discussion on Thursday.

Budget discussion: \$100 million in cuts might be necessary for 2011. The FAA may receive a \$234M cut for NexGen in 2011. The continuing resolution ends March 4, 2011. More cuts are still necessary.

Also, severe travel restrictions are in place. VPs have to approve all their organizational. travel. FAA focus is on operational facilities and honoring the union agreements.

Questions on budget and authorizations for FAA were asked and Dennis responded on Congressional budget process. We are frozen for the CR at 2010 level. There is talk about freezing FAA budget at 2008 levels. Appropriations bills are being worked in both Senate and House.

Status of Areas of Concern:

- Number of open AOCs are **10**,
Note: AOC 123-2 Part 2 was moved to recurring agenda item;
- Number of Closed AOCs from Mtg #139 are **2**,
116-3 Part 2,
123-2 Part 3;
- Deferred AOCs from Mtg #139 to Mtg #140 are **6**.

They are AOC 116-1, 123-7, 123-6, 125-4, 136-1, 137-1;

- Deferred AOCs from Previous Meetings #137/138 to Mtg #140 is **1**, That is AOC 102-2 Parts 2 & 3 Recommend Closure;
- Deferred AOCs to future ATPAC's Meetings are **3**, AOC 102-2 Parts 1, 116-1, 116-3 Part 1, 123-4, 126-2, These are deferred due to publishing date for changes to 7110.65. Verification of AOC's changes to directive will close these AOC's.

CHAIR REPORT: Chair discussed the partnership for safety, of which she is a member. 70 airlines, operational and management personnel, were visited to give the PFS briefing and most responded with positive feedback.. Safety partnership is working on a training DVD that will be going out to the airlines and will debut it in a Safety Seminar next month. The DVD will include an introduction to safety and three scenarios depicting 3 different issues between pilots and controllers to enhance awareness of pilot/controller communications.

Harvey Hartmann, NASA ASRS, handed out the data he collected for ATPAC members to review.

APPROVAL OF MEETING #139 MINUTES: The minutes from Meeting #139 were completed approximately 1 month after the close of the meeting, sent out for comment, and approved, following the new process.

CALL FOR SAFETY ITEMS: Further discussion on the “ATC” altitudes on charts:

Background: NASA and IPA have expressed concern that pilots and air traffic control are confused about the new notation “(ATC)” as it relates to ATC required altitude and/or speed restrictions on published procedures. Apparently, the referenced paragraphs are confusing in Order JO 7110.65 and the AIM, it has been irregularly briefed to pilots/ controllers and not all charts have been updated.

“ATC” crossing altitudes was a proposed AOC from ATPAC Mtg #139. John Dutton gave a briefing on “ATC” crossing altitudes on charts for STARS. Discussion followed regarding the ability of Terminal to be able to cancel those annotated altitudes. With no notation, pilots say they should be able to climb. Terminal wants to get rid of the “ATC” until the issues are resolved. Jeppeson would not change the charts until there was an additional change. Currently only 50 of the 1200 charts have the “ATC” restrictions. Confusion as to what “ATC” annotations mean is rampant.

Recommendations:

- Charting Forum still working issue. ATPAC should support the Charting Forum's recommendation to get rid of the ATC on charts;
- Dennis to take back to Flight Standards and AIM and do whatever it takes to clean up the charting;
 - John Dutton to support Dennis making sure right people are in on the meetings
- Dennis will brief at ATPAC Mtg. #141 what the status is. This is not an AOC
- Copy of MBI 10-04 to be sent to the group by Doug Thomson
- Terminal can reissue the MBI as a refresher

AGENDA ITEMS:

Status of Airport Signage: It was decided that two recommendations should go forward from ATPAC.

1. A letter to airports office, airport safety team, and terminal, recommending that they consider the use of signage in lieu of VHF communications wherever possible. **Letter still needs to be sent.**

2. Letter to the DATA COMM office that they consider use of existing ACARS/DATA LINK and other non-voice communications in the near term as a start to the eventual full DATA COMM implementation. **Closed no letter to DATA COMM office due to NextGen budget cuts.**

ATPAC recommendation to Airports is for more extensive use of signs that will include IFR as well as VFR aircraft. Dennis asked that members give specific recommendations: LAX, DFW were cited as good examples where this has already been implemented and is working well.

The point at which the aircraft switches frequencies between ramp control and ground control is not depicted on the charts. One of the concerns is the fact that there is still confusion between the exact boundary of movement and non-movement areas and ramp areas versus taxi areas. There is a need to focus on standardization of movement versus non-movement areas across all airports and regulations. There was also concern as to how this would work at airports with less than 24 hour ramp control.

Controller issues would also need to be addressed in dynamic airport closures of the movement area, i.e. construction. Dennis discussed the metroplex surface areas tying signage, data sharing, airport markings, charting, etc. If ATC could obtain the 10-7 pages that discuss ramp operations for each of the carriers. The discussion was about how the 10-7 pages are tailored to each individual airline. There is value in airlines sharing this information with local ATC.

REVIEW OF AGENDA ITEMS:**Recurring Agenda Items:**

Wake Turbulence Program (Information contained in Pre-Read Briefing) – no discussion.

The Wake Turbulence Program's focus is safely improving capacity in the NAS. The program is built around three solution sets. The first set is procedural changes only, with some of the changes requiring a controller display aid. These changes would be allowed where measured data could be used to build the safety case to simply change air traffic operational procedures, without the need of new meteorological sensors or other technology based solutions. Second will be procedural changes built upon the data that continues to be collected and adding in specific meteorological conditions and simple technology solutions. Third will be the most complex solutions requiring significant meteorological and or technology inputs to achieve the additional capacity.

- **1st Solution Set** – 7110.308 - The Wake Turbulence Program along with the Terminal Services Unit developed and, received regulatory approval of a rule change, to allow simultaneous dependent staggered 1.5nm ILS approaches to runways separated by less than 2500 feet. There were 5 airports initially approved for the procedure: SEA (34C/L, 16C/R), CLE, STL, PHL, and BOS. Three additional airport runway pairs projected to be added to the current 5 airports. They are EWR, MEM and SEA (34C/R, 16C/L). Discussions are continuing with EWR, TRACON, Continental and airport concerning startup of 7110.308 departure operations.

- **2nd Solution Set** – WTMD (Wake Turbulence Mitigation for Departures) WTMD, another Closely Spaced Parallel Runways (CSPR) project incorporates existing meteorological data and a simple technology solution to achieve additional departure capacity at 10 departure capacity constrained airports. A WTMD Operational Demonstration Prototype system is being developed by AJT-14 (Terminal field Operational Support) for 1 year operational trails at IAH, SFO and MEM. WTMD use by IAH is scheduled to begin in the 2nd quarter of CY2011, with SFO and MEM starting at six month intervals following IAH. After the 1 year trails, a decision will be made whether to continue fielding the WTMD capability.
- **2nd Solution Set** – WTMA (Wake Turbulence Mitigation for Arrivals) is another project being developed in the 2nd Solution Set. The project is collecting data and developing the concept definition for WTMA. This effort expands on the procedures-only solutions to include more types of aircraft and the number of CSPRs that can realize increased arrival capacity in less than visual conditions. This project expands on the technology and meteorological data used by WTMD to address the longer planning horizons and larger airspace with reduced separation that is necessary for the arrival solution. During CY10, the Automated Terminal Proximity Alert (ATPA) capability was expanded using prototype coding to address controller situational awareness needs for dependent instrument approaches to CSPR. ATPA will likely be the controller decision support tool to be used in connection with WTMA arrival operations.
- **3rd Solution Set** - Additionally the Wake Turbulence program is supporting a R&D project for single runway departures called CREDOS (Crosswind-Reduced Separation for Departure Operations) with the European community. CREDOS involve longer term research and development activities. Also included in this third set is a single runway arrival solution. European development continues with safety and benefit assessments being developed.
- **The Wake Re-Categorization** - International effort is currently undertaking a re-categorization of wake categories. This is a multi-phased effort which is seeking capacity gains in each phase and has application in all three solution sets. A matrix of the new categories was delivered to ICAO and then briefed in November 2010 to a wake standards working group formed by ICAO. Safety and benefits documentation will be briefed in April to the ICAO working group. This will contribute to a global harmonization of wake categories.

During CY2010, the FAA approved and implemented a revision to its current wake separation standards that places all Boeing 757 aircraft in the same wake separation category. Work is continuing by international groups in reviewing the wake separations associated with the Airbus 380 and in developing the wake separations to be associated with the new Boeing 747-8 series aircraft.

Discussion regarding “wake remnant” was brought up. It is outside the wake separation criteria. Rules for controllers are now getting ‘deals’ for taking an aircraft through wake remnants. Safety put these rules in effect via the TARP program. The offload program calculates “wake remnants”. A new QA, QC order is coming out that might clarify the issue. Kevin Gallagher from Safety clarified the issue of wake remnant via email.

“The Traffic Analysis and Review Program (TARP) identifies wake remnant events that must be reviewed. Upon review they find that in some cases the prescribed wake turbulence separation

was provided (i.e. pilots providing visual separation), sometimes an error may of occurred. So the issue brought up in the meeting that they are seeing a new type of error (wake remnant) is not correct. What they are seeing is TARP identifying wake remnant events that sometimes maybe an operational error.”

Kerry mentioned the six new wake categories that are being proposed.

NAVAID Naming Protocol (AJV-11):

Status: The DCPs for changes for FAAO 7110.65 were out for comment within OSG with a December 28th due date. I have asked for a status update on the disposition of comments. Should there be significant changes to the DCPs because of the comments received there will need to be another comment period. If there are no significant changes, the proposal can be finalized for NOTICE format. AFS has verbally responded to the OSG memorandum that requested help with solutions to the problem. It appears the changes to FAA Order 7110.65 will resolve the issues raised to AFS. A response to the memorandum is forthcoming.

Action to ATO Operations Steering Group (OSG):

- Issuance of a NOTICE and associated DCP to clarify the descriptions contained in 7110.65, Chapter 2, Section 5 and clarify Chapter 4, Section 3. The required documentation is in development. Update: DCPs are going out for comment, and the OSG is looking at between 90 and 100 days from mid October complete process and generate Notice.
- Tasking the Service Centers to study the magnitude of the problem and estimate costs for modifications. The estimate was due by September 30, 2010. No current update.
- Examine whether the guidance in 7400.2 concerning NAVAID naming requires modification concerning the co-locations of NAVAIDs on airports and the allowable distances. No current update.

Runway Safety (Information contained in Pre-Read Briefing) – No update

- **NTSB Recommendation A-00-67:** The FAA submitted the required documents for proposed rule making to amend 14 CFR, Section 91.129(i). In the interim, N JO 7110.532, Taxi and Ground Movement Operations, effective June 30, 2010, has been issued to require controllers to issue an explicit clearance for all runway crossings.
- **NTSB Recommendation A-00-68:** N JO 7110.532, Taxi and Ground Movement Operations, effective June 30, 2010, has been issued to prohibit air traffic controllers from issuing blanket clearances to cross multiple runways and provides for an exception for those airports where the taxi distance between runway centerlines is less than 1,000 feet.
- **NTSB Recommendation A-00-70:** Through the Safety Management System (SMS) process, the FAA evaluated this recommendation and several other mitigation strategies to reduce the number of active landing clearances and require landing clearances to be issued closer to the threshold. The other alternatives included: Different distances of 5, 7, 10, and 15 miles from the threshold at which the landing clearance can be issued (effectively limiting the number of active landing clearances). A cognitive analysis of controller memory, workload, and situational awareness under MLC and a human-in-the-loop evaluation of pilot response to the SRMD proposed distance caps of 5, 7, 10, and 15-mile points have already been conducted by MITRE. Human-in-the-Loop evaluations with air traffic controller participation took place August 31-September 10 and December 1. The results are pending. An answer is expected 3rd quarter FY11.

- **NTSB Recommendation A-00-71:** N JO 7110.536, Line Up and Wait (LUAW) Operations, effective September 30, 2010, made the change from FAA phraseology “position and hold” to the ICAO phraseology “line up and wait.”

AOC-123-2...Vertical Performance Data (J Garver)

Overall Status: A/C characteristic database **web site still under construction.**

PROPOSED NEW AOCS: No new AOCS proposed:

STATUS OF AREAS OF CONCERN:

AOC-102-2 Instrument Approach Clearances to Other than IAF Parts 2&3 (M. Hilbert/ M Frank)
(Note: Part 1 deferred to future ATPAC)

Overall Status: SRM Panel met for three days. The SRMD panel had issues with the RF leg portion. The meeting was ended without resolution. No date on when the panel will meet again.

Part 1 - Mike Hilbert – AJR- 37 - reorganization and clean up of Order 7110.65S Para 4.8.1.

Part 2 - Mike Hilbert – AJR- 37 - Suggest other place more prominent for information on SI approach clearance other than in the example.

Part 3 - Mike Frank – AJR-22 - look at and respond to Mike Hilbert’s suggestions.

Status:

Part 1 – Update -12/16/10 - The NextGen Procedures Integration Group (AJT-28), the PBN Integration Group (AJV-14) and their contractor support, Terminal Procedures, (AJT-24), and Enroute Safety and Operations Support (AJE-3) personnel have been working for over a year to re-write Par 4-8-1 due to industry requests from within the Aeronautical Charting Forum Issue 09-01-284, and ATPAC Issue 102-2, since 2008. The changes include allowing RNAV equipped aircraft to operate on direct to clearances to Intermediate fixes on both RNAV and conventional procedures from unpublished routes, introduction of procedures in the conduct of RNAV procedures with radius to fix (RF) legs, robust procedures in the handling of straight in approaches from unpublished routes, and other editorial changes to clean up old legacy language that is no longer required due to changes to in TERPS from years ago.

In the last six months, a version of the DCP was fielded and an SRM panel was conducted. The SRM proved challenging and was not completed in total due to the complexity of the change. Many industry partners had issues, and AFS has concerns due to TERPS containment not being fully addressed when not within a radar environment.

Today we completed a newly reviewed and re-formatted version of the DCP content in the interest of simplifying the content, graphics, and flow of the paragraph. This was necessary to due all of the complexities and feedback. This will go to the PDG for proper formatting and we believe needs to go back out to the field for comment again. We also believe it will be necessary to meet again at an SRM panel after field comment is reviewed and incorporated. We originally tried to hit the cutoff for Change 3 to the 7110.65 in February 2011 but did not make it due to various factors. Date will be moved to 7110.65U due out 02/09/12

Status: Redoing DCP, will miss directives change 3. Flight Standards had issues and the paragraph has been reformatted. DCP will be put through the procedures processes and sent back to Safety. ***Still in Terminal for action.***

Discussion: PARC and RNAV approaches. Is PARC the referral organization for these issues? Should ATPAC be referring to PARC?

Part 2 & Part 3 – 01/22/10 - request sent about whether this information was moved to a more prominent place in the new DCP. Mike Hilbert replied: I think the issue is with the statement in the example that states ATC must say "Cleared for straight in" if ATC does not want aircraft to do a hold in lieu of procedure turn. This was only listed in an example and is now in the paragraph and the example. Do not think further discussion is needed. We simply added the statement that was in an example to the paragraph to make it more prominent / obvious to readers. The example remains unchanged.

Recommend closure on Part 2 & 3.

Action: Hold to meeting 141 for members to look at draft DCP for review and comment to ensure DCP takes care of all aspects of the AOC. Defer Part 2 & 3 until next meeting to see effects on field and get feedback.

AOC 123-6 Precision Obstacle Free Zone

Action: Proposal that 7110.65S, paragraph 3-7-6, for POFZ is changed to say something along the lines of: if the POFZ is compromised before an arriving aircraft has entered it, issue go-around instructions. If the POFZ is breached after an arriving aircraft has entered it, allow the arrival to land.

Status: AFS-420 has recommend that AFS-400 non-concur on the attached DCP on the basis that it's inconsistent with the intent of AOSC DD#1b, the AFS-400 clarification memorandum, and the language agreed on when AFS/ATO jointly established the POFZ GENOT. **Terminal has asked that this closed out.**

Discussion: ILS critical area not always coincidental with POF-Z. Terminal does not want to take on the liability for keeping area clear during conditions above 800/2 or knowing what the POF-Z parameters are for each airport. **Terminal still recommends closure of this AOC.**

AOC 123-7 Four Digit Express Carrier Call Signs

This is a concern of the Partnership for Safety effort Randy Babbitt launched on July 1, 2010.

Action: AJL is developing controller training around the "hear back/read back" and like call signs. They will stress the option to read call signs in single digits when there is any cause for confusion.

Status Update: No update.

Action: The safety group will continue to look at feasibility of adapting ICAO standards for this issue. Safety is getting ready to release the last DVD in the back to basics curriculum entitled "Back to Basics – Clear Communications".

Status Update: The Back to Basics DVD should be out to the field by the beginning of March. It is in final review now.

Action: The Chairman suggested waiting to see what comes of the Partnership for Safety's efforts before deciding on a course of action. The ATPAC group was also tasked to come up with 2 top action items to be done concerning this issue. NASA will reach out to NTSB, Chair will clarify with Bob Tarter what the ultimate objective of Partnership for Safety is.

Status Update: Chair sent letter out and got no response as of yet.

Danny to get copy of letter to Kerry, to give to Dennis to follow up with upper management.

Danny to follow up with Kim re: status of initiative with partnership for safety

Action: Link was sent to members for Eurocontrol Callsign similarity website.

Status Update: More information about the EUROCONTROL Call Sign Similarity service can be found at: http://www.cfm.eurocontrol.int/cfm/public/standard_page/cfm_programmes_css.html

This item will be closed.

MISCELLANEOUS ITEM:

Discussion: Relevancy and continued support from FAA for ATPAC in light of the budget cuts and the “monitor group”.

Action: Dennis wanted feedback from members of why ATPAC should continue, and not disband. Is there duplication of effort? There are only 17 members, including FAA and NATCA. Procedures offices are represented from all the users in the opinion of the members, and that there is a unique group to be able to “hash out” issues and come to consensus prior to putting in the change request. This group is a good monitor of the NAS because of the diversity and breadth of the group. NASA’s point of view is that this group is a good outlet for their information gathering and questions. They bring issues to the FAA and ‘alphabet’ groups through this forum. ATPAC is a ‘clearing house’ for new procedures, and with new technology like NexGen, etc. this group gets buy in from the flying community. A member made the point that a long standing AOC means that the Agency may not have taken action in a timely manner. That is not always true, as the problem gets pushed from office to office, and solutions are budget based.

The members overwhelmingly support the continuance of the group as a conduit into pilots, controllers, DoD, GA and airline organizations, controller groups (i.e. NATCA and PWC) industry (i.e. ATCA), dispatchers, and a way to bring issues to all. Members are spokesmen for their various organizations, and are the conduit for their organization’s issues. They consolidate and bring forward organizations wants and needs, and take ATPAC issue back to their organizations. Some members of ATPAC are not members of other groups and this is the only conduit to the FAA and industry. ATPAC group dynamics focuses on doing “What’s right” instead of focusing on “who’s right”. Also allows for community “buy in” to issues.

AOC 137-1 – Minimum Fuel (Danny)

Action: ATO Procedures Office (ATCPO) checked ICAO’s minimum fuel requirements and procedures and sent out to the group on 12/30/10.

Action: The chair will look for ATSAP reports of emergency fuel while NASA/ASRS will look at ASRS reports.

Status Update: Danny does not have any ATSAP reports yet. She will see if the research results are in from NATCA. Danny will provide an answer by Monday

Discussion: What min fuel means to pilots versus controllers. Pilots want controllers to give them either “no delay’ declaration or estimated time to land. Controllers cannot do this due to pattern and sequencing unknowns.

Action: Re-work the definition of “undue delay” to more closely match ICAO definition.

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned on Tuesday, February 15^h, 2011 at 4:40pm.

Wednesday, February 16th, 2011

MISCELLANEOUS ITEM:

Briefing: Todd Linder, JAX Airport Representative, “Spaceport” designation and FAA/Airports Communications. Kerry will send out electronic versions to all members with the minutes.

Definitions for autoland, coupled approaches and LPV

Discussion: Introduced definitions for autoland, coupled approaches and LPV. Members will review with their offices and get feedback to Kerry Rose by March 4, 2011.

STATUS OF AREAS OF CONCERN:

AOC 136-1 – Ambiguity on Pilot Actions during Windshear Conditions (Danny and Harvey)

Action: DCP’s to address pilot/controller action on encountering a windshear condition.

Status Update: En Route concurred with DCP. DCP is presently at Safety for final signature. Kevin Gallagher from Safety responded that AJS has concurred with comment on the Low Level WindShear/Microburst Advisories. 7110, 3-1-8 DCP (Wind Shear Escape). The comment was as follows: We feel that you should consider operations where standard separation is decreased such as simultaneous operations. Suggest training be developed to address these issues.

Action: Terminal will put out a mandatory briefing item (MBI) memo for the interim

Status Update: No update.

Action: NASA will check database for windshear go-around reports.

Status Update: Harvey Hartmann will bring information to the meeting.

Action: Chair will check ATSAP reports for any instances of windshear escape maneuvers.

Status Update: Danny is working on this information and will have information for the meeting.

Discussion: Safety non-concurred with DCP, sent it back to Terminal, they want to see an SRMD.

AOC 137-1 – Minimum Fuel (Danny) cont’d

Discussion: New proposed ICAO language. This is from the ICAO Fuel Document that needs to be delivered at the ATPAC meeting in Jacksonville. ICAO is proposing to define the difference between minimum fuel and emergency fuel

*The pilot-in-command should advise ATC of a minimum fuel state by broadcasting **MINIMUM FUEL**, when further delays may result in landing at the destination aerodrome with less than the required fuel.*

Note — This is not an emergency situation but merely indicates that an emergency situation is possible, should any undue delay occur.

The pilot-in-command shall declare a **situation of fuel emergency** by broadcasting MAYDAY MAYDAY MAYDAY *FUEL*, when the calculated usable fuel predicted to be available upon landing at the nearest aerodrome where a safe landing can be made is **less than the planned final reserve fuel**.

Recommendation: 2.1.8 min fuel. Clean up the note. Add “if able notify the pilot of any delays”.

Possibly change “undue” to “additional” and/or “unplanned” delays.

Delete: “Common sense and good judgment.....” *IOU to Kerry to draft DCP change for this paragraph. Additionally for ‘awareness’ training for both pilots and controllers Danny will take to “partnership for safety” group.

AOC 125-4 Confusion on Descent during non-Precision Approaches

Action: Definitions of "Established on approach", "Established in holding", and "Cleared for approach" to be submitted by ED of ATPAC to ACTPO for publication in the P/C glossary

Status Update: Bruce McGray called in to speak to this issue. AFS developed definitions and sent to group. No responses were received back. They will go forward.

Recommendation: Proposed change was accepted by members. Bruce will take below change forward for publication

Cleared for Approach Explanation: (Recommend to place in AIM) 5-4-6. Approach Clearance as subparagraph e.

The Part 91 information, 91.175 (i), is found under the title “Operations on unpublished routes and use of radar in instrument approach procedures.”

Cleared for approach [the questionable situation to clarify regards aircraft on vectors/unpublished segments] means the following:

- 1 Maintain the last altitude assigned by ATC until the aircraft is established on a published segment of a transition segment, or approach segment, or published route, for which a lower altitude is published on the chart or plate. If already on an established route, or approach or arrival segment, you may descend to whatever minimum altitude is listed for that route or segment
- 2 Continue on the vector heading/or “cleared direct” track until intercepting the next published ground track applicable to the approach clearance.
- 3 Once reaching the final approach fix via the published segments, the pilot may continue on approach to a landing.
- 4 If proceeding to an IAF with a procedure turn, or holding pattern in lieu of, then execute the procedure turn/holding in lieu of, except when cleared for a straight in approach by ATC, and then make the approach.
- 5 If cleared to an IAF with NOPT, or no procedure turn/holding in lieu of, continue with the published approach.

LOCATION/DATES FOR FUTURE MEETINGS: All members agreed to dates and locations for future meetings.

ATPAC #141: Date: June 21st & 22nd, 2011
Site: CGH Headquarters
600 Maryland Ave SW, Suite 800 West
Washington, DC

ATPAC #142: Date: October 4th & 5th, 2011
(Coincides with ATCA Conference)
Site: Gaylord Hotel & Resort
National Harbor, MD

ADJOURNMENT: The meeting was adjourned on Wednesday, February 16th, 2011 at 5:00pm.

Thursday, February 17th, 2011

9:00 Tour of JAX NAS ATC facilities.