AGENDA
Aeronautical Information Services Working Group (AISWG)
Meeting 14-03 July 8, 2014
FAA AeroNav Products
Silver Spring, MD and Oklahoma City, OK

1. Old Business: (Refer to AISWG meeting minutes for history)

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 04-08-14: The following status updates are from the two open IOUs from the last meeting:

1. Chris Criswell is waiting for an update from Eric Fredricks. **IOU OPEN.**

2. Tom Schneider advised that the Instrument Procedures Handbook is going out for final signature the end of April. Publication is targeted for May 2014. **IOU OPEN.**

   IOUs: 1) Chris Criswell will contact Eric Fredricks from the ATO En Route Service Unit so that we can 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 04-08-14

1. Diana Young briefed that the current Nav Lean work is currently being re-evaluated to determine if the various initiatives fall within the scope of Nav Lean. AIM will be

developing a proof of concept to test the authoritative source web service concept. **IOU OPEN.**

IOUs: Diana Young will brief the AISWG at the next meeting on the status of the Nav lean effort.

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 04-08-14: The following status updates are from the two open IOUs from the last meeting:

1. Prior to the meeting John Graybill provided an update that NFDC Manager (AJV-21), Rick Funkhouser, has re-initiated meetings to discuss the 7900.3 Order. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1) John Graybill will keep the group updated on the status of Order 7900.3 and the associated fillable pdf forms.

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 04-08-14: Raymond stated that Engineering Brief No. 91, Management of Vegetation in the Airport Environment is effective as of Novemeber 15th, 2013. The Office of Airports is currently working to educate airport owners and operators on Engineering Brief No. 91. Raymond Zee will work with Jay Jackson on establishing a process to link the new obstacles heights submitted through Airports GIS into ORS. It was reiterated that establishing the link between Airports GIS and ORS is essential for instrument procedure amendments. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1.Ray Zee will provide an update on educating users on the new process. 2. Ray Zee and Jay Jackson will update the group on the method that will used to update obstacles within in existing operational systems such as Obstacle Repository System (ORS).

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 04-08-14: Lynette Jamison and Michael LaJuene both reiterated that the future process will be built into JPAMS. Lynette took the action to contact Heather Hemdel (sp?) to verify the future process. Michael will provide a final review of the master list of AIM OPR's by the next AISWG. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1. Mike LaJuene will reviewthe master list of AIM OPR's and provide the list to the AISWG by the next meeting. 2. Lynette Jamison will update the AISWG on her discussion with Heather Hemdel (sp?) on the future process for submitting and coordinating DCP's 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 04-08-14: No updates were provided. John Demaria took the action to contact Scott Gardner for a response to the IOU's. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1) Scott Gardner will report back on the development of the UAS advisory circular which includes guidance for the submission of UAS charting requests.
2) Scott Gardner will distribute the most recent draft of the UAS advisory circular.
3) John Graybill will keep the group updated on the status of Order 7900.3 and the associated fillable pdf forms.

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 04-08-14: Tom Harris reported that NFDC will begin converting times in NASR from Local to UTC. The conversion work will begin by May 2014.
Val Watson requested that NFDC provide an example NFDD and a memo notifying the AJV-3 Directorate of the time conversion process to issue the NFDD. Tom Harris committed to providing a memo to NFDC Manager, Grge Pray by April 11th 2014. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1. Tom Harris will provide the memo sent from AJV-2 to AJV-3. 2. Tom Harris will provide a NFDD example to AJV-2 and NGA (Just Nahlek). 3. Tom Harris will provide an update on the NFDC to Local time to UTC conversion progress within NASR. 4.Val Watson will update the group on the status of the memo.

h. 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 04-08-14: Raymond Zee updated the group that at present little progress has been made by The Office of Airports on resolving the differences between the civilian and military joint use definitions. Val Watson took the action to provide Ray with suggested text for the definition. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: Raymond Zee will review the suggested text provided by Val Watson and will report back on the progress AAS-300 has made on providing one joint use airport definition.

i. 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?

Status 04-08-14: Anna Cushman updated the group that she met with AFS-800 on establishing charting and database criteria. Anna has also been working with Steve Broman and Steve Brison on NASR database requirements and Rick Fecht on VFR charting requirements. Anna believes that the database requirements for parachute jumping areas should work for the Commercial Space Launch Activity Area's. George Sempeles and Rafael Qesada from AOV asked if the Commercial Space database and charting requirements have gone through the SMS process. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1. Anna Cushman will report back on the progress made within the Commercial Spaceport data and charting group. 2. Anna will work with George Sempeles and Rafael Qesada on the SMS Process for Commercial Space Launch Activity Area's.

j. 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, Section13-1-5 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.

Status 04-08-14: Lance reported that the DATWG determined that UAS runways will be databased separate from airport runways. Lance will provide data requirements that can be used to develop requirements for NASR. It was requested that the UAS engineering brief provided by Mike Foster be posted to the AISWG website. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1. Lance Christian will provide data requirements to AIM (AJV-2) to help with NASR requirements. 2. Chris Criswell will upload the UAS engineering brief to the AISWG website..

k. 13-098 (April 2, 2013): Stand Alone DME. ISSUE: Stand-alone DME's will begin operating as a new type of NAVAID within the NAS in support of RNAV operations using airborne FMS systems. Currently there are stand-alone DME's operating where the VOR portion of the VOR/DME turned off. The VOR component is NOTAM'd OTS.

Status 04-08-14: Rick Funkhouser was not present to update the group on data basing Standalone DME's in NASR. Ms. Val Watson advised that a Requirements Document has been submitted to the IACC MPOC to update the charting specifications and the issue is also being discussed within the Aeronautical Charting Forum. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1. Rick Funkhouser will provide NASR screen shot examples and NFDD examples. 2. Val Watson will distribute the charting requirements at the next AISWG.

l. 14-099 (April 8, 2014): Standardize Elevations to NAVD88. ISSUE: Mr. Rick Fecht of Aeronautical Navigation Products (AJV-2) presented the issue. Airport elevation values appear to be charted from various datum, unknown to the user. NASR contains and publishes elevations in several or unspecified datum(s): NGVD29, EGM96, NAVD88 and NULL values. The AIM Obstacle Repository System (ORS) obstruction database is converting elevations from NGVD29 to NAVD88 within the conterminous US. Visual charting will publish obstruction MSL heights based on the ORS database NAVD88 datum. Terrain spot elevations will also be migrated to the same NAVD88 datum as well. Since elevations are captured within the database to a tenth of a foot and charted to the foot, it would appear to be both ours and our users interests if we identify or standardize the elevations to one datum. Separate datum can influence the elevation values on the order of two meters. Observation is that NASR airport/runway elevations have the option for several specified or NULL datum while NAVAID and ILS equipment elevation datum are not identified.

Status 04-08-14: Raymond Zee took the action to contact GCR and leverage the 5010 program to convert the NGVD 29 private airports to NAVD 88. **IOU OPEN.**

IOU: 1. Raymond Zee will report back on GCR NAVD conversions.

2. New Business

3. Closing Remarks

4. 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, **October 7, 2014 January 6, 2015 April 7, 2015 and July 7, 2015.** Start time is 8:30 AM and dress is business casual.