

**Government / Industry Aeronautical Charting Forum 11-02
Charting Group**

October 26-27, 2011

MINUTES

I. Opening Remarks

The Aeronautical Charting Forum (ACF) was hosted by FAA AeroNav Products at the FAA Silver Spring facilities. Mr. John Moore, Chair of the Aeronautical Charting Forum, Charting Group, opened the Forum on October 26, 2011. Mr. Moore acknowledged the ACF Co-chair Mr. Tom Schneider, AFS-420. Mr. Schneider chaired the ACF Instrument Procedures Group meeting held on October 25, 2011. Minutes of that meeting were distributed separately.

II. Discussion of Next ACF

Mr. Moore informed the Forum participants that ACF 12-01 (April 24-26, 2012) is scheduled to be held at ALPA's headquarters in Herndon, VA.

III. Review of Minutes from Last Meeting

The minutes from the 11-01 ACF meeting were distributed electronically last spring via the AeroNav website: <http://aeronav.faa.gov/index.asp?xml=aeronav/acf>. They were accepted as submitted with no changes or corrections.

IV. Agenda Approval

The agenda for the 11-02 meeting was accepted as presented.

V. Presentations, ACF Working Group Reports, ACF Project Reports

A) SAE G-10 Electronic Symbology Committee Report

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, provided an update of the actions taken since last ACF. Mr. Thompson stated that ARP 5289A document content, associated appendices and symbol matrix were formally published in September 2011. Anyone wanting to secure a copy of the document may do so via the SAE International's web site for a purchase price of \$65.00 each. The website address is: www.saeinternational.com. Mr. Thompson added that the document itself is copyrighted by SAE, but that the symbols and shape forms contained in the Symbols Matrix (Attachment C of ARP 5289A) are not.

The SAE G-10 Charting Committee status changed to "inactive" with the publication of ARP 5289A. Mr. Thompson stated that there were no plans for the committee to reconvene unless the SAE Aerospace Behavioral Engineering & Technology (ABET) Steering Committee determines a need.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AVJ-3B, commented that the SAE G-10 project had spanned over 10 years and was one that was very important to the aviation industry. Mr. Moore acknowledged and thanked the key participants who were involved in the development of the project.

ACTION: This item is closed and will be removed from the agenda.

B) ICAO/IFPP Committee Report

Mr. Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420 and U.S. Member of the ICAO Instrument Flight Procedures Panel (IFPP), [provided an update](#) on the ICAO/IFPP Committee activities and an overview of the key topics of the recent ICAO/IFPP Integration Working Group (IWG) meeting.

IWG Working Papers: Publication and Charts for SBAS and GBAS; Depiction of RNP Accuracy Values; Consistent use of Final Approach Fix; HCH Data Quality Requirements; RNAV Route Magnetic Bearing Quality Requirements

The following papers were submitted for review and comment: *Procedure Naming for Performance; DOC 8697 Charting for PinS Approach (Helicopter); DOC 8697 Charting for PinS Departure (Helicopter)*

Working papers in progress for presentation at future meetings: SID and STAR Publication Guidance; RNAV Departures, Turning Departure Protection Area Construction; Procedure Design Construction Manual Update; Altitudes on Terminal Procedures; RNAV Charting Standardization; ARINC 424 Derived Charting

Information papers awaiting conversion to working papers: Fixes Radius Transition Requirements; Significant Point Publication Requirements; Step-down Fix Publication

Requirements; CAT III Publication Requirements; ICAO Adoption of Transition Requirements; Helicopter LPV Chart and Publication Requirements

Mr. Webb stated that the IFPP continued to work through the charting details related to RNP accuracy values (identifying different RNP values on legs). Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, inquired as to the intent of the IFPP regarding where RNP values would be published, terminal and/or enroute charts. Mr. Webb stated that the IFPP had initially looked only at charting RNP values on enroute charts, but the IFPP has expanded that to include Terminal.

ACTION: Mr. Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, will provide an update at the next forum.

C) Declared Distances

Note: Issues 07-01-192 and 07-01-215 are addressed by this WG.

Mr. Richard Boll, NBAA, reviewed the issues from 07-01-192 and 07-01-215.

ISSUE 07-01-192

Mr. Boll provided an update and overview of work done since last the ACF. Updated AIM guidance has been published covering declared distances and their uses. A related update to Airports AC 150-5300.13 is in work. The update covers the need for increased reporting by airport authorities of their declared distances, whether the same as or different than actual runway lengths. Similar updating activities are ongoing involving the guidance materials covering NOTAM activity related to improved reporting of temporary changes to declared distances.

Dr. Michael McNerney, FAA/AAS-100, noted that Change 18 to the .13 was due to be sent for comment in the coming weeks (prior to the end of the CY2011). The focus would then shift to Change 19 with changes to be made within FY2012.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, summarized all associated activity stating the RD 07-01-192 and 07-01-215 will be addressed with the revisions made in 13 and due to be published in FY2012. Potentially inaccurate Declared Distances (DD) will be addressed by Change 19. Mr. Moore added that the process of information flow regarding DD still needs to be addressed.

Mr. Moore noted that the Negative D has been added to FAA airport diagram charts to indicate where/when declared distances are published in the FAA A/FD, whether the declared distances are the same as the actual runway length or are different.

Mr. Boll voiced that the important element is to indicate when one or more of the declared distances are different than the actual physical lengths. If the negative D is shown at every airport where declared distances have been reported/published in the A/FD, different or not, the important element of the action is not clearly evident to pilots.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, then asked if the negative D were only applied when a difference existed, what would it mean to the pilot when you don't have a negative D on the chart? Is it of value to know that the declared distance assessment has been made at a given airport, and whether that assessment results in a difference from the runway lengths?

ACTION: The Declared Distances Committee to evaluate meaning and use of negative D and work on who does the calculation of the DD.

D) Airport Surveying – GIS Program

Dr. Michael McNerney, FAA/AAS-100, [gave a detailed presentation](#) on the FAA's Airport GIS Program outlining the complexities associated with system development, system ownership and funding of data collection/maintenance due to the multiple stakeholders involved within the FAA. Presentation included schematics that illustrated the flow of Airport GIS information. Dr McNerney stated that the data is now driven through satellite imagery/aerial photography of an airport. The adding of 5010/NASR program, the collection of data of non-grant airports, will take effect January 2013.

Dr. McNerney went on to state that it will take at least 5 years to survey all the commercial service and tower serviced airports, provided funding exists.

The FAA is working with airport authorities to develop the capability to enable airports to provide/report changes directly to the FAA using FAA-developed web based interface and applications.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, inquired as to whether the GIS Program airport mapping standards for accuracy comply with standards developed by RTCA SC-193/217. Dr. McNerney stated that it was the intent of the GIS program to comply with RTCA DO-272. It is intended that airports that receive FAA grants will meet RTCA accuracy requirements, however, non-FAA grant airports (5010 program airports), would not meet those accuracy requirements.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, inquired as to whether accuracy will be indicated within the GIS database. No answer was given.

There was an inquiry as to whether the GIS program intended to capture SMGCS data. Mr. Chris Criswell, FAA/AJR-21, replied that the physical airport elements (hold bars, lights, spots, etc.) supporting SMGCS operations have placeholders within Airports GIS, but that the routes/procedures could not at this time be accommodated. The SMGCS office is working on the issue to find a way for SMGCS data to be included in the GIS program.

ACTION: Dr. Michael McNerney, FAA/AAS-100, will provide an update at the next forum.

E) RNAV (RNP) SAAAR to AR (Authorization Required)

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, provided an update stating that AJV-3B has been updating procedures via P-NOTAM. Currently, 34 approaches remain to be changed. Project is expected to be wrapped up by early 2012.

ACTION: Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, will provide an update at the next forum.

F) Discontinuation of VOR Services

Mr. Ken Ward, FAA/AJW-911, [provided an update](#) on the FAA's plans to decommission over 400 VOR NAVAIDs by 2020. Mr. Ward briefed on the analytical work associated with insuring that sufficient VOR services that remain to support would the NAS. Early estimates show that 50 to 60 VORs per year would need to be decommissioned to meet the 2020 deadline.

Mr. Ward stated that a Federal Register notice which announces the elimination of VORs from the NAS, was close to being approved, awaiting for the NextGen Management Board's sign off.

Criteria is being worked on the how the FAA will evaluate VORs that currently in use to determine which can safely be decommissioned and which will need to remain operational.

Mr. Ward did not have any guidance regarding timelines for the decommissioning or for the establishment of any working groups, both within the FAA and with the aviation community.

Mr. Paul Eure, FAA/AJE-31, stated that Enroute, to date, had not been included in any discussions, meetings, etc., on the subject and have had to inject themselves into such proceedings. Mr. Eure expressed his concern regarding the lack of involvement of both Enroute and Terminal organizations in the coordination process. Mr. Eure noted that ATC Facilities should be given time and resources to be able to be engaged in the VOR analysis process to insure service and safety to users of the NAS.

ACTION: Mr. Ken Ward, FAA/AJW-911, will notify the Chair of ACF-Charting Group should a briefing be warranted at the next ACF.

G) Denver RNAV Project

Mr. Ted Goodlin, FAA/AJR15-D01 and Mr. Chris Laschinger, FAA/TWB-DEN, [presented a proposed RNAV-based design serving the Denver area](#), utilizing RNAV STARs, RNAV DPs & RNAV transitions to traditional ILS procedures. The original design involved IAP procedures with multiple altitudes at a single fix, but Mr. Goodlin mentioned that the team would eliminate those instances.

Seven prototypes were developed and evaluated by pilots and controllers from the Denver area.

An internal FAA technical (peer) review of the proposed procedures took place in early October. The results from the peer review lead to a simplified solution utilizing current procedure design criteria and charting specifications. Mr. Goodlin indicated that he believes the simplified proposal will work in the interim; however, he reiterated that he is hopeful that in the long-term, a more complete solution, requiring more in-depth analysis can be arrived at.

A general discussion took place involving Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, Mr. Laschinger, Mr. Goodlin and Mr. Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, on how to best address the unique situation to incorporate complex RNAV transitions into conventional ILS approaches. Mr. Thompson offered to lead the coordination effort and aid the Denver Project Team in developing charting guidelines for formal submission at a future ACF.

ACTION: AFS-420 and Denver TRACON to establish an ad-hoc group outside the ACF.

Denver RNAV Project Ad-Hoc Group

Name	Organization	Phone #	Email
Mr. Chris Laschinger	FAA/TWB-DEN		Christopher.a.laschinger@faa.gov
Mr. Ted Goodlin	FAA/AJR15-D01	303-342-1563	Ted.goodlin@faa.gov
Mr. Rick Dunham	FAA/AFS-420	405-954-6633	Rick.dunham@faa.gov
Mr. Brad Rush	FAA/AJV-3B	405-954-0188	Brad.rush@faa.gov
Mr. Mark Steinbicker	FAA/AFS-470	202-385-4613	Mark.steinbicker@faa.gov
Mr. Tom Schneider	FAA/AFS-420	405-954-5852	Thomas.e.schneider@faa.gov

ACTION: Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, to coordinate with Mr. Ted Goodlin, FAA/AJR15-D01 and Mr. Chris Laschinger, FAA/TWB-DEN, on developing charting guidelines for formal submission at a future ACF.

H) PARC Procedure Naming Action Team Report

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, [provided a report on the recent PARC Action Team](#) working on Procedure Naming conventions for RNAV terminal procedures. The Action Team met in Seattle in mid-August 2011. The team was co-led by Mr. Moore and Mr. Pedro Rivas, Delta Air Lines and ALPA.

Action Team proposals are that all PBN Approaches be titled RNAV, that they contain a suffix to differentiate, that they include the Navigation Specification in parentheses in the title, and that all PBN-related notes are grouped in a standardized location. Mr. Moore provided an overview on the rationale of the proposals. (See PPT Presentation Attached with minutes).

Mr. Moore stated that the AT Final Report was sent to the PARC with recommendations for follow-on actions by the US-IFPP for policy issues and the ACF for charting issues. The ICAO IFPP Integration of Working Group, the ICAO Approach Classification Task Force and the ICAO PBN Study Group have all addressed the naming issue and have come out with different proposals. Current discussions are ongoing. A general agreement has been reached pertaining to the PBN Information 'box' and RNAV as first part of PBN procedure titles. However, use of a parenthetical in the title remains undecided and if used, its content is undecided.

Once final FAA decisions have been made, charting and procedure requirements will be submitted as appropriate at future ACFs.

CLOSED

VI. Outstanding Issues

A) 05-02-179 Attention All-Users Page for Simultaneous Parallel RNAV Departures & PRM Approaches

Mr. Kel Christianson, FAA/AFS-470, reviewed the action items from the last ACF. Mr. Christianson [presented to the Group the AAU Concept pages](#) created by AeroNav Products; the first page would be a boiler plate and the second page would be airport specific.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, asked whether these AAU pages would have an amendment number. Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, commented that such a numbering system could be added within the FAA Form 8260 and expresses his support for an amendment number.

Ms. Watson asked if the TPP location following the Airport Diagram and prior to the Departure Procedures was where the group believed the AAU pages should be published. The group concurred.

Discussion shifted to the naming convention of the AAU Pages. Ms. Watson asked if the chart title “RNAV Departure AAUP” was appropriate, or if the word(s) “Simultaneous” and/or “Parallel” should be included. It was decided that “RNAV Departure AAUP” was sufficient.

Mr. Bill Hammett, FAA/AFS-420, asked if all AAU pages for Simultaneous Parallel RNAV Departures and PRM Approaches must be 2 pages when all the information could fit on one. Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, replied that it depended upon the amount of information that is airport specific – the boilerplate portion occupies one page, the airport-specific is variable.

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, commented that he was concerned over the length and wording of the title for each AAU page.

Mr. Gary McMullin, Southwest Airlines, worked with Ms. Suzette Rash, FAA/AFS-470, on getting the wording down with the air carrier pilots. The text has gone through several iterations and wording in the concept reflects those tests.

The issue came up of whether it was really appropriate to have such pages in the TPPs as some members of the Group felt that this was more of a training issue and that the information might be better located in the AIM. Ms. Watson voiced that Mr. Mark Steinbicker, FAA/AFS-470, had indicated that the boilerplate guidance might, at a later date when users were more familiar with these types of procedures, be removed from the TPPs.

Mr. Roy Maxwell, Delta Air Lines, suggested that AAUPs might be published in the A/FD as individual Special Notices instead of in the TPP. Representatives from United Airlines and Southwest Airlines noted that they preferred the information be published in the TPP at affected locations. They stressed that the pilots need this information

when reviewing arrival and departure charts in the cockpit as these procedures are infrequent for the airlines.

Mr. Bob Lamond, NBAA, expressed concerns that the AAUP procedures in question were airline driven. The airlines are going in and out of 500 airports versus business aviation/general aviation that goes in and out of 5,500 airports. The procedures being discussed only appear to take in to account the airports used by the airlines.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, and Mr. Kel Christianson, FAA/AFS-470, to coordinate the updating of criteria for FAA Form 8260.46 to include AAUP information.

ACTION: Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to coordinate with Mr. Tom Schneider and Mr. Kel Christianson on defining internal FAA specifications. Mr. Schneider and Mr. Christianson will coordinate on dissemination of AAUP source via 8260 and subsequent publication in flight manuals.

Name	Organization	Phone #	Email
Mr. Allan Ball	NetJets	614-239-4873	ball@netjets.com
Mr. J.D. Hood	Horizon Air	503-970-6859	jdhood@horizonair.com
Mr. Lev Prichard	APA (American Airlines)	214-739-2912	LHP4@swbell.net
Mr. Bob Lamond	NBAA	202-783-9255	rlamond@nbaa.org
Mr. Gary McMullin	Southwest		gary.mcmullin@wnco.com
Mr. Terry Hill	Air Tran	407-318-5531	terry.hill@airtran.com
Mr. Kevin Allen	USAirways	480-693-4637	kevin.allen@usairways.com
Mr. Jim Arrighi	FAA/AJV-14	202-385-4680	james.arrighi@faa.gov

B) 07-01-192 Recording, Reporting and Dissemination of Usable Runway Lengths for Takeoff and Landing

See the Declared Distance Working Group report in [paragraph V. C.](#)

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Richard Boll, NBAA, will report back at the next ACF.

C) 07-01-195 Charting and A/FD Information Re: Class E Surface Areas

Mr. Paul Gallant, FAA/AJV-11, was unable to attend. No update was provided at this ACF.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Gallant, FAA/AJV-11, to provide update at next ACF.

D) 07-01-204 Continued Charting of Airports “Closed Indefinitely”

Mr. Henry Felices, FAA/AAS-100, was not able to attend the ACF, so Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed on behalf of Mr. Felices. Mr. Moore reported that there were 13 public-use airports within the contiguous U.S. that were “closed indefinitely”. Mr. Moore outlined the process in place within the FAA and the contractor responsible for review and providing information for the FAA to update its databases. It was noted that the contractor does not have the authority to officially remove the airports from FAA files and publications.

Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, offered to take the list of 13 remaining airports and attempt to contact the owners, unofficially and offline, as a personal effort toward closure of the issue.

STATUS: CLOSED

E) 09-01-213 TERPs Change 21 Circling Approaches

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, reviewed the action items from last ACF. Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, informed the audience that Mr. TJ Nichols, FAA, AFS-420, had validated the values submitted by Mr. Boll. Some changes were made by Mr. Nichols in rounding some of the figures to be more conservative. Mock-ups were generated based on the new values.

Comments were received, and subsequently read to the Group by Mr. Moore from Mr. Lev Prichard, APA, who was not able to attend.

Mr. Prichard’s email stated, in part:

It is the Allied Pilots Association position that placing this improved circling criteria on the approach plate improves safety in the event a circle approach becomes necessary. I have polled several AA pilots, and it appears that the preferred method for charting would be Option 5 on page 6 of the ACF 10-02

meeting briefing (Circling Area Radii Charting Options 09-01-213). After a brief statement that TERPS circling criteria has changed, all pilots questioned seem to immediately recognize this format without confusion.

Mr. Boll went over the three options describing where the new circling information could be provided: Option 1 – put the new values in a table in the front of the TPP; Option 2 – put the new values in a table in the AIM; Option 3 – do not do anything.

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, agreed with inserting a table in the front matter of the TPP.

[Seven different approach plate concepts](#) were presented and were the basis for a broad discussion with in the Group. The discussion focused on where the new table should appear and on the use/placement of the negative C.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, established a consensus in the group that the new circling table would be put in the front matter of the TPP with a negative C on the approach chart. This approach would allow for easy removal of the negative C and the table once TERPs Change 21 is fully implemented.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, inquired as to whether the old circling table should be published along with the new circling table to aid pilots in being able to discern the protected airspace for circling. The topic was discussed within the Group, but no decision was made.

The question was raised as to how the FAA would indicate on the source document that the new circling criteria have been applied. Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, stated that AFS-420 would need to modify the 8260 and associated FAA Orders. Ms. Watson recommended that a statement “Change 21 Circling Criteria Applied” be added to the Additional Flight Data section of the 8260 form, prompting cartographers to add the negative C icon to the chart. Because ultimately all affected procedures will have had the criteria applied, it will be simpler to remove the negative C icons if a “CHART” command statement regarding application of the icon is NOT included on the source document.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA to provide revised old and new circling table to Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B.

ACTION: Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to coordinate with IACC and Terminal on the placement of the negative C on the chart and the table in the front matter of the TPPs.

ACTION: Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, to create policy guidance in Order 8260.19 to indicate when Change 21 circling criteria has been applied and dictate publication of the negative C.

F) 09-01-214 SMGCS Taxi Charts

Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, [provided an update](#).

Mr. McGray anticipates FAA Order 8000 and an updated SMGCS Advisory Circular to be published within a year. Also, incorporation of SMGCS into FAR Part 193 is expected to be completed in 12-18 months. The order does not address source data flow or what airport or procedural attributes are required to be charted.

A number of prototypes have been produced since the last ACF and Mr. McGray showed the latest version of an FAA/AeroNav Products-generated sample SMGCS chart, noting that details continue to evolve.

March 2012 is a target date for a simulator testing of the FAA's prototype SMGCS chart. Testing is to be conducted with NASA, utilizing various NASA assets.

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, voice his disappointment and frustration in not being included in any of the FAA SMGCS work thus far, despite the fact that he had signed up for the original SMGCS Working Group a year and half ago.

Mr. McGray apologized and acknowledged the work done by Jeppesen and their contributions to safe SMGCS operations. Mr. McGray agreed to contact Mr. Thompson, and include him in future WG meetings, which will continue to be scheduled every 3 to 4 weeks.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, stated that the gathering, verification, maintenance, dissemination and storage of SMGCS data, was of key concern to members of the SMGCS Working Group and has yet to be resolved.

SMGCS Working Group

Name	Organization	Phone #	Email
Mr. Bruce McGray	FAA/AFS-410	202-385-4725	bruce.mcgray@faa.gov
Mr. Ted Thompson	Jeppesen	303-328-4456	ted.thompson@jeppesen.com
Ms. Valerie Watson	FAA/AeroNav	301-427-5155	valerie.s.watson@faa.gov
Mr. Juergen Kuhnhenh	LSY (Lido)	41-44-828 6546	juergen.kuhnhenh@LHSystems.com
Mr. Dale Bryan	Veracity Eng	202-243-9516	dale.bryan@veracity-eng.com
Mr. Steve Serur	ALPA	703-689-4333	steve.serur@alpa.org
Mr. George Legarreta	FAA/AAS-100	202-267-8766	george.legarreta@faa.gov
Ms. Monique Yates	NGA	301-243-1436	monique.m.yates@nga.mil
Ms. Deborah Copeland	FAA/AJV-322	301-427-5070	deborah.l.copeland@faa.gov
Mr. Chris Criswell	FAA/AJR-32	202-267-9302	christopher.criswell@faa.gov

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. McGray, FAA/AFS-410, will provide an update at the next ACF.

G) 09-01-215 Reporting and Depiction of Stopways

See the Declared Distance Working Group report in [paragraph V. C.](#)

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Richard Boll, NBAA, will report back at next ACF.

H) 09-02-218 Incompatibility Issues of Enhanced Flight Vision Systems (EFVS) and Light Emitting Diodes (LEDs)

Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, provided an update on the work being done to address the issue. Mr. McGray reported that although the previously established ACF Work Group never met, the analysis of the problem is ongoing and that currently, LEDs are being utilized in MALSR, runway, taxiway, centerline obstruction and approaching lighting systems.

Other items being looked into regarding LEDs are spectrum issues, being researched by CAMI. An SAE G-20 Committee investigated the feasibility of a heat source being coupled with an LED system to melt accumulated ice and snow. It was found that the use of a heat source coupled with an LED was more expensive to operate and used more energy than older lighting technologies. (This was to have been a “green” initiative.)

LEDs with IR emitters were also looked into and encountered different issues. IR emitters were fine for approach lighting, but for other applications, the IR emitter took up too much space within the light housing.

The roll out of LEDs continues.

Other issues related to the deployment of LEDs were brought up. Mr. Terry Pearsall, FAA/AJT-28, mentioned that three NASA ASRS (Aviation Safety Reporting System) reports had been filed by pilots for night blindness due to spectrum changes associated with LEDs and impact of brightness of LEDs.

Discussions lead to whether the FAA is aware of where LED lighting exists and type of light. Currently, the FAA does not have a requirement to gather such information. No data exists at this time to gather or to establish a data base to gather such information.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, stated that at the present time, there is no requirement to chart LEDs and that until such a requirement is established, it seems that the item could be closed. The issue may be reopened when a requirement is established for the FAA to chart or database LED deployment.

EFVS & LED Compatibility Working Group

Name	Organization	Phone #	Email
Mr. Alvin Logan	FAA/AAS-100	202-267-8743	alvin.logan@faa.gov
Ms. Terry Stubblefield	FAA/AFS-410	202-385-4588	terry.stubblefield@faa.gov
Ms. Valerie Watson	FAA/AeroNav	301-427-5155	valerie.s.watson@faa.gov
Mr. Steve Serur	ALPA	703-689-4333	steve.serur@alpa.org
Mr. Jeff Williams	Jeppesen	303-328-6531	jeff.williams@jeppesen.com
Mr. Bruce Beard	FAA/AJV-14	817-838-1996	bruce.beard@faa.gov
Mr. Dick Temple	FAA/AFS-410	202-385-4611	dick.temple@faa.gov

STATUS: CLOSED

I) 09-02-219 CAST Recommendations

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, summarized the issue and provided an update. Mr. Jim Fee, FAA/AVP-200, was unable to attend ACF. Mr. Moore conveyed that Mr. Fee had presented the proposals that came out of the ACF 11-01 (including the AeroNav Products' creation of detailed Class B depictions of all Class B areas, to be available for free download) to the CAST committee and that they were accepted.

Refer to 09-02-221 regarding the briefing given by Mr. Ron Haag, FAA/AJV-321, of the implementation of enhancements.

STATUS: CLOSED

J) 09-02-221 Navigation of Class B Airspace Using US Government-Produced VFR & IFR Charts.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, reviewed the action items from ACF 11-01.

Mr. Ron Haag, FAA/AJV-321, [briefed the audience](#) that his office is moving forward with the production of 30 special Class B graphics. The decision was coordinated with FAA Mission Support Services and CAST. The new graphic Class B depictions will be available in a digital format, downloadable for free on the FAA's website. Mr. Haag emphasized that the Class B graphics will NOT be available in paper format. He further clarified that the graphics are being created for safety enhancement purposes only and are not intended to be used for navigation. They will be marked "Not for Navigation".

Mr. Haag added that the three Class B depictions that currently appear on VFR Terminal charts (LAX, SAN and PHX Terminal Charts) will remain, but the remaining 27 will only be available online. Mr. Haag proposed an alternate solution in which airspace and supporting information fits standard 8.5" by 11" paper.

Mr. Haag proposed that the Class B graphic depiction is to appear on the first page and that supporting information and reference data, appear in tabular form on the second page. He reported that CAST concurred with the format.

Mr. Moore asked that consideration be given to producing a digital file with all the information on a single 'page'. Rationale being that since it would be a digital file, it would be downloaded directly into an EFB-type device and not constrained in its depiction like a paper product (8.5" x 11") would be.

Mr. Haag stated availability of the new Class B graphics will be announced and released primarily through the FAA's web site. Mr. Haag added that the FAA would coordinate with AOPA and EAA, and that those organizations indicated that they would also provide availability announcement for their members.

STATUS: CLOSED

K) 10-02-230 Note RNAV Q Route Note on IFR En Route High Altitude Chart Legend

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, reported that revision of legend note was implemented for the October 2011 chart cycle.

STATUS: CLOSED

L) 10-02-233 Removal of (ATC) Crossing Restrictions from Stars

Mr. Jim Arrighi, FAA/AJV-14, was not able to attend the ACF, so Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, and Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, summarized actions taken since last ACF. Mr. Schneider briefed that AFS 420 had issued a Stop Action Plan Memo (not a GENOT). AFS 420 has updated FAA Order 8260-46D with new guidance for ATC altitudes as previously agreed in the special working group.

It was noted that Mr. Arrighi was to have reconvened the Work Group between ACFs. This never occurred.

Mr. Kevin Allen, US Airways, conveyed on behalf of Mr. Arrighi his recommendation that the RD be closed. Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, objected because NBAA's concerns with Lost Comm had not yet been discussed or addressed.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, will follow up regarding changes to the AIM.

ACTION: Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to coordinate with Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, concerning changes to AeroNav Products' affected charting

specification(s) after all of the affected procedures have been revised.

ACTION: Mr. Jim Arrighi, FAA/AJV-14, to coordinate with NBAA.

M) 11-01-234 VOR Test Frequencies (VOT)

Mr. Bob Carlson, FAA/AJV-322, and Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AVJ-3B, reported that 99 locations are affected and that adding VOT information to airport diagrams was manageable.

There was a consensus to proceed with adding VOT frequencies to the Comm data of airport diagrams where on-airport VOTs exist.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to prepare an IACC Specification change and process accordingly. Ms. Watson will report on progress at next ACF.

N) 11-01-235 Removal of RP* from VFR Charts

Mr. Ron Haag, FAA/AJV-321, [provided an update](#) of progress made since last ACF. Mr. Haag stated that a new explanation was being included in the 2012 edition of the Chart User Guide (scheduled for release January 2012) and new wording is also going in to the AIM. Mr. Haag commented that an explanation may also be added to the FAA FAQ's web site.

New explanatory text will read as follows:

“Right traffic information is shown using the abbreviation “RP” for right pattern, followed by the appropriate runway number(s). Special conditions or restrictions to the right pattern are indicated by the use of an asterisk (RP*) to direct the pilot to the Airport/Facility Directory for special instruction and/or restrictions.”

Mr. Haag added that in a review of all airports where RP* is charted; only 50 airports were found. Of those, over half were due to helicopters/ultralights/gliders traffic pattern/operations at those airports.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Ron Haag, FAA/AJV-321, to report back at next ACF.

O) 11-01-236 Depiction of Wind Turbines on VFR Charts

Mr. Ron Haag, FAA/AJV-321, reviewed current charting practices for depicting Wind Turbine Farms and Wind Turbines on FAA VFR Charts. The current depiction consists of a dashed line, same symbology as all other obstructions and a boxed note. Wind Mill farms have a high density of obstruction symbols within a dashed boundary line.

Mr. Haag [showed prototype depictions utilizing the newly proposed symbolization](#). The new wind turbine symbology being proposed utilizes the ICAO wind turbine symbol. The ICAO symbol reduces density of the symbols within the wind turbine farm dashed boundary line and the elevation, in MSL information of the highest wind turbine within the area would be depicted in a simple information box positioned inside the dashed line.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, commented that the IACC was amenable to adding the ICAO-compliant Wind Turbine symbology to the specifications.

Mr. Haag reviewed the timetable for implementation upon approval of an IACC RD. Implementation could begin as early as this winter, with the first charts depicting the new symbology published by summer 2012. Implementation across all FAA VFR charts could then be completed by the end of 2014.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Ron Haag, FAA/AJV-321, will coordinate with Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, on the submission of an IACC RD.

ACTION: Mr. Ron Haag will update the status of the issue at the next ACF.

P) 11-01-237 MA Procedures for RADAR/Surveillance Approaches

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, reported that only 2 RADAR with Missed Approach directions were found at civil locations. They were found to have been published in error and have been removed from FAA TPPs.

Mr. Geoffrey Waterman, NGA, stated that DoD verified with the Services that the DoD procedures that were published were not within specifications, did not meet DoD guidelines and have been removed.

It was agreed to close the recommendation as the publication of the MA procedures was based on a flawed application of the policy.

STATUS: CLOSED

Q) 11-01-238 Aerobatic Area Symbols on VFR Sectional Chart

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, summarized the topic.

Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, [reviewed current charting practices, showing examples](#) from the LAX and PHX TACs and Sectionals, where boxed notes appeared over areas for Aerobatic Training and Intense Flight Training areas.

Mr. Moore brought up for discussion of whether a symbol should be used versus a boxed note (current FAA practice). In addition, what criteria should be established for use of a symbol?

The group discussed the issues pertaining to the flow and maintenance of the information. Currently, the information is managed locally at the FSDO and Regional FAA offices. If the FAA is to utilize a symbol for depicting area used for Aerobatic Training and/or Intense Flight Training areas, criteria would have be established for the use and depiction of such areas on FAA VFR Charts. It was suggested that the standards and data basing of information utilized for Parachute Jump areas could be applied to Aerobatic and Intense Flight Training areas.

Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, stated that while working through the request on charting Aerobatic Areas, that the scope be expanded to flight training areas, specifically Student Training areas. The current request doesn't include Student Training areas in the original submission, but VCAM can expand the scope to include them that may be worth while.

Mr. Moore reframed the discussion within the following areas:

1. What is the scope of the issue – aerobatic only or also flight training areas?
2. VCAM was asked to research and report on:
 - a) Number of areas (Flight Training and Aerobatic Training Areas)
 - b) Source of information
 - c) What does the FAA currently chart (VFR Products Only)?
 - d) Maintenance of to Source to see if they are still in existence and Point of Contact information, validity of information
 - e) What are the geographic boundaries that define the Aerobatic/ Intense Flight Training areas?

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, requested the FAA take steps to incorporate all training areas into the e-NASR database, with reference to the solution already implemented for inclusion of Parachute Jump Areas in e-NASR (re: previous ACF agenda item). This capability would provide improved capabilities for both the FAA and other users of the data. Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, wholeheartedly supported Mr. Thompson's request that these areas (if required for charting), in addition to the currently charted Glider Operations areas, Ultra light Activity areas and Hang Glider Activity areas, be verified and disseminated by the AIM office.

Mr. Jordan Meek, Lido, brought to the groups attention that with respect to Aerobatic Areas, consideration should be taken into account for low level aerobatic areas (Waivers are for specific areas, low level) vs. those above 3,000 ft.

Mr. Moore asked that the representatives of the VCAM group (Mr. Ron Haag, FAA/AJV-321) to determine the scope and nature of the problem (availability of source, currency of source, dissemination of source, chart depictions, A/FD, etc.)

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to coordinate with FAA's AIS Working Group to represent the need to include ALL types of Training Areas in to e-NASR. The concept being put forward would be for all Aerobatic Training, Glider, etc, area to have the same data characteristics as those found with Parachute Jumping Areas.

ACTION: Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B and Mr. Ron Haag, FAA/AJV-321, to report back at next ACF.

R) 11-01-240 SRFA Charting

Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, provided an update on progress made since last ACF. Mr. Fecht broke down his briefing into six mini updates, itemized below:

1. *SFRA Transit Guidance Section missing from A/FD* – Gary Livack, FAA/AFS-430, to pursue through his office a submission to AFS-800 of a requirement to coordinate with Potomac TRACON and summarized the SFRA transit process for publication in the “Notices” section of the Northeast A/FD. Any resulting requirement from AFS-800 would be sent to Airport Mapping and copied to System Operations.
2. *SFRA Fringe Airports* – No charting or A/FD action required for this item. Fringe airports are not an issue with pilots or ATC. Talwyn Hayley and Steve Broman will coordinate information concerning the possible abandonment of two of the fringe airports. Flying M Farms airport (MD77) abandoned in NFDD.
3. *Depiction of the Leesburg Flight Maneuvering Area on Baltimore-Washington Terminal Area and Washington Sectional Charts* – Mr. Fecht spoke with contacts at Leesburg Airport and Leesburg Aviation Adventures to locate additional landmarks to be considered for charting to aid pilots in identifying the boundaries of the Leesburg Flight Maneuvering Area. Neither contact was able to provide any additional landmarks.

[A prototype of the Baltimore-Washington TAC depicting the Leesburg Maneuvering Area](#) was generated with the training area boundary lines (blue lines) made thicker and the white masking widened to provide better visibility of the area. Both the current charting depiction and the prototyped were presented. Consensus of the forum was in favor of the new prototype.

Systems Operations and AFS-400, with AFS-800 will pursue the creation of VFR Waypoints inside the boundary lines of the maneuvering area, with AFS-800.

Dennis Boiken, Leesburg Airport, expressed his support for the concept of creating VFR Waypoints.

4. *Freeway Airport (W00) Exclusion from the DC Flight Restricted Zone (FRZ)* – There were three questions associated with this topic.

- a. One Nautical Mile radius from “airport” – radius generated from where? From the Airport Reference Point (ARP), which is published in the A/FD.
- b. Revision of airport exclusion – No action. Airport exclusion will not be revised.
- c. A/FD note in conflict with SFRA – Natalie Smith (Potomac TRACON) coordinated with Chris Criswell (NFDC) to eliminate obsolete airport note from NASR. Remark was deleted in NFDD 161 on August 19 2011 and removed from A/FD for October 20 2011 edition.

5. *Lee Airport departure procedure over water* – Not a charting issue, no action taken.

6. *Access to SFRA NOTAM updates* – Not a charting issue. NOTAMs provide information replacing or augmenting charted information. Gary Livack will pursue the issue with Barry Davis.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Rick Fecht, FAA/AJV-321, to report back at next ACF on implementation of the line and mask changes to be made to the Leesburg Flight Maneuvering Area on Baltimore-Washington Terminal Area and Washington Sectional Charts.

S) 11-01-242 Lead Bearing/Lead DME

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed that the existing criteria provides a means to address situations such as the one in question. Such special situations locations/procedures could be handled on a case by case basis.

Mr. Daniel Lehman, NAVFIG noted that the existing guidance refers to “publishing” and it is not clear that that means on “chart depiction”.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, reminded the group that as far as the fix itself is concerned, any fix specified for charting on the source document will be depicted on the chart. If these fixes require charting, they only need to be documented as such on the -15. If the bearing is part of the published makeup of the fix, it would also be charted, but specifications would need to be revised to indicate it is a “lead bearing”.

Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, agreed that the issue is appropriately categorized as a criteria issue which warrants review and clarification by the US IFPP. Current criteria allows for the procedure to be designed. In the US, no procedures have been designed using the criteria. However, DoD used the criteria in designing a procedure in Afghanistan.

A decision is forthcoming from the US IFPP.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, to report back at next ACF.

T) 11-01-243 Charting Standards for RNP 1 STARs and DPs

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, briefed the topic as part of the PARC Procedure Naming Convention, see report in paragraph V. I.

Mr. Kel Christianson, FAA/AFS-470, agrees the issues were adequately covered by the PARC Procedure Naming Convention Action Team recommendations which have been submitted to the FAA PARC.

STATUS: CLOSED

VII. New Charting Topics

A) 11-02-244 Depicting Terrain on DPs

Mr. Daniel Lehman, USN, Naval Flight Information Group, [submitted and briefed the issue](#). Mr. Lehman went over their concern regarding the depiction of terrain on DP charts, especially with regards to DPs established in Military Areas of Operation overseas. There are airfields located in close proximity to high terrain. For example, Bagram, Afghanistan (OAIX) has terrain that rises more than 6000' within 15 miles of the runway.

This high terrain severely impacts the design of instrument approach and departure procedures. Although production specifications exist to depict terrain on approach procedures, there is no corresponding production specification that allows terrain depiction on departure procedures.

Mr. Lehman stated that the three Services are in agreement that terrain should be depicted on DP charts.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, noted that DPs are not charted to scale and inquired if the three Services had a recommendation on how to depict terrain on DPs not to scale. The Services do not.

Mr. Ron Carter, FAA/AJW-353, commented that some small number of DPs are to scale and that there would be the potential to chart terrain contours on those DPs. There would be limited possibilities.

Mr. Moore commented that there are ways to put terrain on a DP plan view when not to scale, but the criteria would have to be generated, discussed and agreed to.

Mr. George Bland, HQ AFFSA, stated that one example where terrain comes close to the protected airspace is at Nellis AFB where terrain comes within 3NM of runway threshold.

Ms. Valerie Watson, AJV-3B, stated that charting terrain on not-to-scale depictions is not possible to accomplish with accuracy and should therefore, in her opinion, not be done. She further stated that there are a number of issues with depicting terrain on only DPs that are able to be charted to scale and NOT on those (with equally precipitous terrain) that are not to scale. She pointed out that pilots may make the false assumption that since no terrain is depicted on a given chart, then there is no terrain hazard within the general area depicted. The lack of standardization in the application of terrain could potentially cause user confusion and possible safety-related incidents.

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, commented that, while approach plates generally cover an area out to 30NM from the airport and this can be depicted to scale, most standard. SIDs and STARs cover significantly larger areas and therefore have chart compression issues. Jeppesen has some more flexibility as they are able to provide

fold out SIDs and STAR charts. US Government charts do not allow for such flexibility, being constrained to Size 1.

Mr. Juergen Kuhnhenh, Lido, concurred with Mr. Thompson. Mr. Kuhnhenh displayed an example of how Lido charts SIDs and STARs to scale and with terrain depicted. Lido does not have the compression or scale issues and utilizes folds out charts to depict the procedure.

A discussion ensued regarding the migration of the aviation community from paper products to electronic products. It was commented that with an EFB that scaling of a chart and other functional elements (use of layers to depict routes, terrain, weather, etc) can be handled vastly differently than they can be on paper.

Mr. Bruce McGray, FAA/AFS-410, commented that any changes made in depicting of terrain on the charts would add a training aspect and add greater complexity to the IR Community.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Geoffrey Waterman, NGA and Mr. George Bland, HQ AFFSA, will work with one another to evaluate and see what procedures that their RD proposal can be applied to (considering a 200Ft/NM climb gradient) will determine if there are existing ICAO criteria and will report back at next ACF.

B) 11-02-245 Automated UNICOM on IAPs and Sectionals

Mr. David Wartofsky, Potomac Airfield, [submitted and briefed the issue](#). Mr. Wartofsky's company developed the Automated UNICOM system and has currently installed it for use at approximately 100 locations. [He discussed the functionality of Automated UNICOM and the current challenges](#) faced by pilots in not being able to discern from standard UNICOM on FAA products. An Automated UNICOM offers a variety functions to pilots through a series of micro phone clicks. Transient pilots may be not be aware of the existence of an Automate UNICOM and therefore may not be able to fully maximize the full potential of the service.

Mr. Wartofsky referenced the wording within the FAA Pilot Controller Glossary, which includes an explanation of Automated UNICOM and drew specific attention to the implied publishing requirement in the A/FD and on approach charts.

Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, commented that the FAA publishes Automated UNICOM and associated frequency on their products as simply "UNICOM" and does not specify that the system is automated. Pilots are provided the frequency. Use of the system (clicks, etc.) is contained in the AIM. She remarked that her office had no reports of pilot confusion with the current depiction and questioned whether users need to be aware that the UNICOM is automated or not.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, commented that the glossary definition had never been coordinated with AeroNav Products and that regardless of how long the current definition has been in existence, in and of itself, it does not establish a requirement to publish or chart. Mr. Moore added that it appeared to be more of a pilot education issue than a charting issue.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: AOPA, ALPA and NBAA will poll their respective pilot members to see what the community needs are, any associated issues and what value publishing Automated Unicom information on an approach chart would have in addition to the existing entry in the A/FD. All three associations will report back at next ACF.

C) 11-02-246 Publication of Special Notices in the A/FD

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, [submitted and briefed the issue](#). Mr. Thompson stated as a result of the lack of an organized system within the FAA for collecting, managing, and distributing source for Special Notices, plus the lack of advance information about which Special Notices will be published by the FAA (new or revised), the potential exists for disconnects between the information provided by the FAA and the information provided by commercial flight information companies.

For example, in some cases, the FAA may publish a Noise Abatement or VFR procedure that Jeppesen does not, or vice versa. There have also been cases where the FAA provided Jeppesen with source for a new Special Notice, but source for updates was somehow overlooked.

In other cases, it has been noticed that information shown on various FAA and Local websites varies from what is published in the A/FD (i.e. Ketchikan, Alaska FSS website indicates Visual Waypoints that differ substantially from what is published in the A/FD. Alaska Airlines has noted the difference and has requested that Jeppesen publish from the FSS website instead of the A/FD due to their close relations with the FSS and Local authorities.)

Differences between government and commercial publications are often questioned by pilots, airlines, ATC, and airport operators.

It was recommended that the FAA establish a conduit for publication of these procedures (such as the NFDD), so that FAA internal charting offices and commercial flight information entities would always receive the same information from a sanctioned source, and that information would be the most accurate and current available.

Mr. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, stated that AeroNav Products agrees with and supports the recommendation and further suggested that the Aeronautical Information Management (AIM) the office within the FAA responsibilities for collection, verification

and dissemination of aeronautical information, begin publishing these procedures through one of their standard vehicles.

Mr. George Sempeles, FAA/AJR-22, offered to start providing Special Notices (new or updated) by means of the “add on” pages of the NFDD.

Mr. Thompson replied that doing so would satisfy one of the recommendations (public dissemination). Also, the NFDD represents an “approved source”.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, to coordinate with Mr. Bob Carlson, FAA/AJV-322, Mr. Chris Criswell, FAA/AJR-22 and Mr. George Sempeles, FAA/AJR-22, on ideas presented in the Recommendation Document.

D) 11-02-247 Approach Control Phone Numbers in A/FD

Mr. Rich Boll, NBAA, [submitted and briefed the issue](#). NBAA is requesting that the FAA include the appropriate Approach Control Phone numbers in the Airport/Facility Directory (AF/D). Mr. Boll provided the following rationale:

- Using Approach Control phone numbers is a more expeditious and accurate mechanism for cancelling IFR flight plans;
- Helps facilitate more efficient and timely method of sequencing of IFR arrivals at uncontrolled airports;
- Reflects current pilot/control practices at both towered and non-towered airports where pilots utilize their cell phones to file and receive clearances.

At present, pilots are able to obtain local ATC phone numbers from the FBO or airport office at the airport they are flying out of.

Various airline representatives in attendance voiced their support for the publishing of Approach Control phone numbers as it would aid their flight dispatchers and Management teams.

Mr. John Moore, FAA/AJV-3B, discussed the challenges and processes associated with the request. Specifically, issues pertaining to the coordination, sourcing, collection, storage and dissemination of Approach Control phone numbers. One item for consideration within ATC is which TRACONS will or won't consent to having their phone numbers published. Authorization would have to be given by each Approach Control Facility, unless there was an overall ATC Policy established.

Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, commented that feedback needs to be received from the FAA Service Centers.

Mr. Rich Boll stated that there would need to be coordination with ATO-T (AJV-2 Terminal) and ATO-E (AGT-3 Enroute) and asked the Chair if they would invited representatives from those offices to attend the next ACF.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Rich Boll, NBAA, to report back at next ACF.

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, to coordinate with ATO-T (AJV-2 Terminal) and ATO-E (AGT-3 Enroute) to have representation at the next ACF.

VIII. Closing Remarks

Mr. Moore noted that the ACF Charting Group has traditionally discussed requirements only for paper products and recommended that consideration should be given to expanding the scope of the ACF to include discussion of electronic and digital charting. This could be done through a standing Working Group (WG) as part of the ACF or as a separate Committee or Working Group outside the ACF. His recommendation was that it be done as a WG under the ACF so that specifications and requirements for paper and electronic/digital charts could be more easily harmonized.

Mr. Moore announced that ACF 11-02 was his last ACF as Chairman and announced that Ms. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, would be taking over as Chair of the ACF Charting Group. Mr. Moore expressed his appreciation and gratitude to all the ACF attendees for their hard work and for having the privilege of serving as Chair of the ACF Charting Group for the last 7 years. He asked that they give their full support to Ms. Watson as the new Chair.

Attendees acknowledged Mr. Moore's leadership and contributions with applause.

Mr. Hal Becker, AOPA, expressed his appreciation for all the Mr. Moore had done as Chair on behalf of AOPA.

Mr. Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, presented Mr. Moore with an Honorary Degree in "TERPSology".

Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, shared a PowerPoint presentation titled "10 Things You Didn't Know About John Moore".

Mr. Brad Rush, FAA/AJV-3B, presented Mr. Moore with an official FAA Certificate of Appreciation for his service as Chair of the ACF Charting Group.

Notice of the official minutes will be announced via email and provided via the Internet. The two website addresses (CG and IPG) are provided below:

- CG - <http://aeronav.faa.gov/index.asp?xml=aeronav/acf>
- IPG - http://www.faa.gov/about/office_org/headquarters_offices/avs/offices/afs/afs400/afs420/acfipg/

Please note the [Office of Primary Responsibility \(OPR\)](#) listing for action items. It is requested that all OPRs provide the Chair, Ms. Valerie Watson (with an information copy to Mr. Alex Rushton) a written status update on open issues no later than April 5, 2012.

Note – These status reports will be used to compile the minutes of the meeting and will be the “for the record” statement of your presentation. A reminder notice will be provided.

The ACF 11-02 Attendee List is at **Attachment: Attendee Roster.** 

A special thanks to Mr. Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, for providing his meeting notes for use in these ACF minutes.

IX. Next Meeting

ACF 12-01 is scheduled to be held April 24-26, 2012, location TBD.

ACF 12-02 is scheduled to be held October 23-25, 2012, location TBD.

X. Attachment

11-02 Attendee Roster