

**Aeronautical Information Services Working Group (AISWG)**  
**Meeting 13-01 January 8, 2012**  
**FAA AeroNav Products**  
**Silver Spring, MD and Oklahoma City, OK**

**1. Old Business:**

**a. 09-076 (October 6, 2009) Airway Minimum Turning Altitude (MTA).**

**ISSUE:** At the closure of meeting 09-04, Paul Eure presented a question that he had received from Denver ARTCC involving a minimum turning altitude over various airway combinations over the Jackson Hole VORTAC. The MTAs are significantly above the MEAs and are documented on the Form 8260-2 for the facility/fix. Paul's question is how are controllers and pilots made aware of turning restrictions and should there be a charting standard?

**Status 10-02-12:** The following status update of the two open IOUs from the last meeting was provided:

1. Paul Eure briefed that work on the safety decision memo for the DCP is low priority at this time and other work has taken precedence. **IOU OPEN.**
2. Tom Schneider commented that the OPR is still working on updating the IPH. Rick Dunham mentioned that the Tech writer is still in the editing phase. **IOU OPEN.**

**IOUs:** 1) The ATO En Route Service Unit will continue to track the DCPs for controller guidance for JO 7110.65 and the PCG; 2) Tom Schneider to continue to track the IPH to ensure pilot educational material is updated accordingly.

**b. 12-084 (January 10, 2012): Aeronautical Data Management (ADM)**

**Initiative Briefing. ISSUE:** The source data that comprises Aeronautical Information (AI) is captured in multiple databases across the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Air Traffic Organization (ATO) business areas. The same data is often captured by different entities causing unsynchronized data inaccuracies throughout FAA systems. To prevent this reality from causing air traffic safety issues, human intervention and workarounds are used to validate data. As the Next Generation Air Transportation System (NextGen) evolves and the demand for air traffic increases, current methods for ensuring accuracy, precision and data transfer will be unable to meet demands. We must make changes that create persistent data and consistent interpretation of that data in order to enable our organization to communicate authoritative source information at the right time and place to those who need to know.

**Status 10-02-12:**

Barb Cordell briefed that three ADM initiatives were approved by the Executive Action Group.

1. Certify Data Stewards and Coordinators (Data Steward = Originator of Data)

2. Standardize FAA Geospatial and Temporal Models (including development of a standard common geodetic calculator)
3. Designate Authoritative Sources for Data: Points (including fixes), Navaids, Airports (including surveys), Airspace, Procedures, and Holding

MDM timeline has been moved up from 2017 to 2015. This timeline is considered a very aggressive schedule and is dependent on funding. **IOU OPEN.**

IOUs: Barb Cordell/Fran Hubbard to brief the AISWG at the next meeting on the status of the ADM initiatives.

**c. 12-085 (January 10, 2012): Activity Areas Data.** ISSUE: There are currently a variety of methods for disseminating data describing aerobatic activity areas (Ultralight, Glider, Hang Glider, Aerobatic Practice & Training areas): some of these areas are published in text form in the back matter of the A/FDs, some are represented on the Visual charts by symbols, others by boxed notes, but it is desired that the SOURCE be standardized. During a recent ACF Charting Group meeting (Issue 11-01-238), it was recommended that AIM maintain and disseminate data describing these various activity areas in a way similar to Parachute Jump Areas (PJA), so that the information is available directly from the FAA designated office in a data-based, standardized format.

Status 10-02-12: The following status update of the three open IOUs from the last meeting was provided:

1. Chris Criswell briefed that requirements are being developed to collect, database and disseminate activity areas from NASR via the NFDD. **IOU OPEN.**
2. John Graybill provided an update prior to the meeting: Order 7900.3 currently out for comment . **IOU OPEN.**
3. There was no update. Val Watson briefed the group that Terry Sharp is the new A/FD manager. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1) Chris Criswell will keep the group updated when NASR will begin disseminating activity (e.g., aerobatic, glider) areas data.

2) John Graybill will keep the group updated on the status of Order 7900.3.

3) Terry Sharp will brief on the status of the textual description activity area Special Notices.

**d. 12-087 (January 10, 2012): Special Purpose Surveys: Tree Clearing Projects.** ISSUE: Tree clearing projects may take place within the extents of one or more of the Airport Airspace Survey Surfaces that impact instrument procedure development. AIM in conjunction with NGS is proposing recommended processes for the collection of these new tree heights.

Status 10-02-12: Ray Zee provided an update prior to the meeting: There were changes made to the engineering brief. It will soon be distributed to the regions for comment. Chris Criswell stated that he will try to get a draft to the AISWG this week. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1. Chris Criswell will contact Mike McNerney to have the draft engineering brief sent out to the AISWG. 2. Ray Zee will update the group on the status of the engineering brief.

**e. 12-088 (April 3, 2012): Revision of the AIM.** ISSUE: During discussion of Issue 09-076 (Airway Minimum Turning Altitude (MTA)), Paul Eure presented a question regarding revision of the FAA Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM). Paul asked who the OPR of the AIM was and how changes to the AIM are coordinated? He felt that changes to the AIM may not be adequately coordinated across the domain of affected stakeholders.

Status 10-02-12: Guy Copeland briefed the group that management of AIM changes has been transferred to Gary Norek's group (AJV-11). Bill Hammett responded that the AIM OPR master list has fallen out of use and needs to be updated so that changes can be properly coordinated. Guy Copeland believes the AIM will be incorporated into JPAMS. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: Chris Criswell will request that Gary Norek (AJV-11) provide a briefing on submitting and coordinating changes to the AIM at the next AISWG meeting.

**f. 12-089 (April 3, 2012): UAS Standards and Charting.** ISSUE: During discussion of Issue 12-085 (Activity Areas Data), Paul Eure stated that as UASs become more prevalent, the FAA must develop standards to accommodate these new aircraft. Paul stated that the En Route Service Unit is in the process of developing separation standards for UASs, but is having difficulty attempting to coordinate with the UAS office (AFS-80). Paul also briefed that six Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) training and research areas are being established across the US. Paul asked who should be contacted to coordinate the charting and publication of these areas?

Status 10-02-12: The following status update of the three open IOUs from the last meeting was provided:

1. Paul Eure briefed that no progress has been made on defining separating standards for UAS. Paul Eure, Randy Willis and Brad Rush recommended that this issue be removed as an ASIWG issue. The group agreed. **IOU CLOSED.**
2. Mike Conner briefed that the UAS test sites have been postponed. Chris Criswell asked about the current symbology and notations used to mark UAS operations on charts. Mike Connor responded that current operations are conducted using a Certificate of Authorization (COA) and many operations are within existing restricted airspace. Valerie Watson asked if we could have someone from the UAS office involved with making a charting reference or symbol. Valerie Watson also indicated that the draft Order 7900.3 contains a process for submitting UAS charting requests. **IOU OPEN.**
3. Mike Connor introduced Randy Willis (AJV-115) as the POC for UAS operations. Randy Willis briefed that current UAS operations will continue to involve waivers and coordination between the Military and operators of airspace and airports. Randy said he will need to reevaluate the subject related of temporary vs. permanent UAS operations and the difference between short and long term authorizations. Some “temporary” authorizations are over 2 years old. Current goal is to have integration with NAS in 2015. **IOU OPEN.**

**IOU:** 1) Randy Willis will report back to the group on UAS authorizations.  
2) Chris Criswell will provide Mike Connor a copy of draft Order 7900.3.  
3) Mike Connor will report back on the status of developing charting criteria.

**g. 12-090 (July 10, 2012): UTC vs. Local Time for Aeronautical Data. ISSUE:** NFDC has highlighted an issue with the use of UTC and Local Time when distributing aeronautical data to the public. Proponents submit these data (e.g., Tower hours) to the NFDC in UTC time. NFDC converts the hours to local time for entry in the NASR database, and these data are distributed to the public via the subscriber files and online airport lookup. AeroNav Products converts these hours back to UTC time for inclusion in publications such as the A/FD. These differences can cause confusion to the aviation community, and also may cause issues if pilots don't properly convert from UTC to Local (e.g., if they don't account for daylight savings time).

**Status 10-02-12:** Thomas Harris reported after the meeting that NFDC will change all local times to UTC and is exploring methods to notify users of the UTC change to the NFDD and NASR subscriber files. **IOU OPEN.**

**IOU:** Thomas Harris will report back to the group on converting local time to UTC within NASR. .

**h. 12-091 (July 10, 2012): Mini-IFR Supplement. ISSUE:** NGA currently sends a copy of all changes to the upcoming IFR Supplement publication (known as the “Mini-IFR Supplement”) to AeroNav Products to ensure that the same changes are made in the FAA Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD). However, if changes are made to the A/FD that did not originate from a NFDD from the NFDC, there will be discrepancies between the A/FD and the NFDC’s NASR database, and its corresponding subscriber files. AeroNav Products will generally coordinate with the NFDC to make the necessary changes, but there are still several instances where the changes may not be completed within the cycle, leading to the discrepancies. This process should be discussed to develop a plan to mitigate these discrepancies.

**Status 10-02-12:** Chris Criswell responded that requirements are currently being collected to automate the ingestion of FIL data into NASR. **IOU OPEN.**

**IOU:** Chris Criswell will provide an update on automating FILs data into the NASR database.

**i. 12-092 (July 10, 2012): AISWG Webpage. ISSUE:** AIM is planning to develop a webpage to support the AISWG by providing information for upcoming meetings, hosting minutes from past meetings, etc. Chris Criswell would like to gather feedback from the AISWG on this proposal, and straighten out any logistical details, such as whether the webpage should be publicly available or only available to AISWG members.

**Status 10-02-12:** Chris Criswell briefed the group that the AISWG Web Page is still under development. **IOU OPEN.**

**IOU:** Chris Criswell will update the group on the status of the AISWG webpage.

**j. 12-093 (July 10, 2012): Joint Use Airports List. ISSUE:** The "Joint Use" airports list contained in the NASR database does not agree with the military "Joint Use" airport list. AeroNav Products is requesting that the NASR database be updated with the correct "Joint Use" airports so that the Airport/Facility Directory (A/FD), which uses the NASR database as source, is published with the correct data. AIM is requesting that the Office of Airports update FAA Order 5000.5, LIST OF JOINT USE AIRPORTS, so that the NASR database can be updated.

**Status 10-02-12:** Ray Zee provided an update prior to the meeting: He stated “We previously had several different definitions, but under the most recent re-authorization act it has been defined as “an airport owned by the Department of defense, at which both military and civilian aircraft make shared use of the airfield.” The Planning and operations side of ARP have been notified and they will plan to evaluate the impact to their databases.” Val Watson stated that Order 5000.5 needs to be updated. ARP is planning to update the Part 139 definition.

*Editors note: "Joint Use Airport" legally defined in 14 CFR, Part 139.5 as "Joint-use airport means an airport owned by the United States that leases a portion of the airport to a person operating an airport specified under § 139.1(a)".*

**IOU OPEN.**

**IOU:** Ray Zee will report on the progress of updating Part 139 and Order 5000.5 to the group.

**k. 12-094 (October 2, 2012): STAR NOTAMs. ISSUE:** On October 20, 2011, Change 2 to FAA Order JO 7930.2, *Notices to Airmen*, required that SID and STAR NOTAMs be issued as FDC NOTAMs vice as a "UAR" or "USD" NOTAM D. To accommodate this policy change, Aero Nav Products cancelled and re-issued all SID NOTAMs changing them from USD to FDC. No such corrective action was dictated by the ATO to require STAR NOTAM compliance with policy. The result is that one year later, there are still more than 200 UAR non-compliant NOTAMs in the system. STAR NOTAMs fall under the responsibility of the ARTCC in whose airspace the STAR originates; therefore, it is recommended that guidance be sent to all ARTCCs to cancel all UAR NOTAMs under their purview and re-issue them as FDC NOTAMs. This will ensure policy compliance and continuity within the NAS. It should also be noted that some UAR NOTAMs are in excess of 5-years old, which could be detrimental to flight safety.

**Status 10-02-12:** Bill Hammett briefed the group on the issue. Paul Eure said that a memo was sent to the ARTCC managers to cancel and/or reissue the "UAR" NOTAMs as FDC NOTAMs.

**IOU:** Paul Eure will update the group on the progress of resolving the UAR NOTAMs.

#### **4. New Business:**

- a. 13-095 (January 8, 2013): Spaceports. ISSUE:** Spaceport America in New Mexico has been identified as a "private airport" (i.e. 90NM) which came about as the result of Spaceport America officials filling out and submitting 7460-1 form to report their new runway. Consequently, since this form is usually only used by "airports", The Office Of Airports put Spaceport America into the 5010 database as an airport—an outcome not intended by Spaceport America. Spaceport America is currently stored in NASR as a pvt airport and charted on the Albuquerque Sectional as a pvt airport even though it is considered a spaceport. AST-100, Commercial Space Transportation has requested that Spaceport America be removed from NASR but remain charted with a unique symbol, labeled "spaceport" and a note referencing a corresponding "Special Notice" located in the A/FD.
- i. How should a standalone Spaceport be charted?
  - ii. How do we database and chart a dual-use (airport/spaceport) facility?
  - iii. Is an A/FD Spaceport Special Notice helpful?
  - iv. Does a Spaceport need to be stored in NASR?

1. What information is required?
- v. How does AST-100 coordinate launches with the controlling agency?

- b. **13-096 (January 8, 2013): Military Runway Naming for Unmanned Aircraft. ISSUE:** On August 18, 2012, the MSP-ADO received Form 7480-1, and attachments, with a request to add a paved Runway 155/335 (U) 1,080 feet long by 50 feet wide at Ray S, Miller Army Airfield (RYM), Camp Ripley, MN. Construction was scheduled between April 15, 2012 and November 30, 2012. ( A Form 7460-1 was also submitted for the actual construction work. It was received via electronic submittal, and was processed concurrently.) The distance between the provided runway end coordinates only calculated out to 1075 feet. Correspondence with the proponent confirmed that length would be adequate. Additional email discussion informed the proponent that our system had limitations on runway naming, recommending that the UAS Runway be named 15/33. It was also noted that the proposal conflicted with FAA airport design standards. Nonetheless, ASN 2012-AGL-6062-NRA was circulated for Division review the same as an alteration to a civilian airport, as indicated in JO 7400.2G, Section 13-1-5 a. Subsequently, the determination letter for the case was issued, and the proponent submitted a new request to revise the runway names on December 6, 2012 which would have the UAS runway should be "U", without any numbers.

#### 4. Closing Remarks

- a. **Next Meeting:** The next four meetings will be held at AeroNav Products in Silver Spring, MD with VTC from AeroNav Products in Oklahoma City, OK on Tuesday, **January 8, 2013**, Tuesday, **April 2, 2013**, Tuesday, **July 9, 2013**, and Tuesday, **October 1, 2013**. Start time is 8:30 AM and dress is business casual.