

**Aeronautical Information Services Working Group (AISWG)
Meeting Minutes 16-02 July 12, 2016
FAA Aeronautical Information Services
Silver Spring, MD and Oklahoma City, OK**

1. Opening Remarks:

- a. Charter updates.
 - i. Close to fruition
 - ii. Robert Goodson will be on sabbatical and replaced on the AISWG by Derrick Savage
- b. Attendance.

Present	Name	Organization	Phone	Email
In SS	Krystle Behrms	FAA / AJV-5614	301-427-4820	krystle.a.behrms@faa.gov
	George Bland	AFFSA	405-582-5010	George.bland@us.af.mil
In OKC	John Bordy	FAA / AFS-420	405-354-0980	John.bordy@faa.gov
In SS	Robert Carlson	FAA / AJV-5641	301-427-5134	robert.d.carlson@faa.gov
	Lance Christian	NGA	571-557-3870	lance.d.christian@nga.mil
In OKC	Michael Clayton	AFFSA	405-582-5012	Michael.clayton@us.af.mil
	Michael Couchman	USAF	571-557-7143	Michael.R.Couchman@nga.mil
Called in	Chris Criswell	FAA / AAS-100	202-267-4634	Christopher.criswell@faa.gov
	Anna Cushman	FAA / AST-500	202-267-8264	Anna.cushman@faa.gov
In SS	John DeMaria	FAA / AJV-5222	301-427-4960	john.a.demaria@faa.gov
	Larry Evers	Army	011-49-1622 704478 (Germany)	Larry.d.evers.civ@mail.mil
	Frank Fortunato	AFFSA	405-739-9996	Frank.Fortunato.3@us.af.mil
	Robert Goodson	NGA	571-558-1714	Robert.l.goodson@nga.mil
In SS	John Graybill	FAA / AJV-552	202-267-6384	john.graybill@faa.gov
In OKC	Don Harmer	FAA / AJV-553	405-954-9930	donald.r.harmer@faa.gov
Called in	Tom Harris	FAA / AJV-5332	202-267-6399	thomas.g.harris@faa.gov
In SS	Jennifer Hendi	FAA / AJV-553	301-427-4816	jennifer.l.hendi@faa.gov
In OKC	Paul Hoegstrom	AFFSA	405-734-7108	paul.hoegstrom@us.af.mil
Called in	Ken Holden	Army	703-806-3568	kenneth.d.holden.civ@mail.mil
	Kadija Jah	FAA / AJV-5331	202-267-6495	Kadija.ctr.jah@faa.gov
	Lynette Jamison	FAA / AJR-B11	540-422-4761	Lynette.M.Jamison@faa.gov
	Scott Jerdan	FAA / AJV-533	301-427-5088	Richard.s.jerdan@faa.gov
	Michael LaJuene	FAA / AJR-B	202-267-9373	Michael.ctr.lajuene@faa.gov
	Jacquie Lee	FAA / AJR-B11	540-422-4552	jacquie.lee@faa.gov
	Lincoln Lounsbury	FAA / AJV-21	202-267-6433	lincoln.ctr.lounsbury@faa.gov
In SS	Langston Majette	FAA / AJV-0 (D)	202-267-3426	Langston.r.majette@faa.gov
In SS	Rick Mayhew	FAA / AJV-5331	202-267-6441	Richard.p.mayhew@faa.gov
In SS	Carolyn Meushaw	FAA / AJV-553	301-427-4852	Carolyn.meushaw@faa.gov
In SS	Justin Nahlik	NGA	571-557-8803	justin.m.nahlik@nga.mil
In SS	Jill Olson	FAA / AJV-553	301-427-5172	Jill.m.olson@faa.gov
In OKC	Chris Pillifant	FAA / AJV-553	405-954-0623	Chris.pillifant@faa.gov
	Terry Rhea	FAA / AJV-56	301-427-4773	Terry.l.rhea@faa.gov
In OKC	Charlie Rose	FAA / AFS-460	405-954-3222	Charlie.l.rose@faa.gov
In SS	Alex Rushton	FAA / AJV-553	301-427-5186	Alex.ctr.rushton@faa.gov
	Derrick Savage	SFA	571-557-5404	Derrick.R.Savage@nga.mil
	Bill Schwinn	USN		William.schwinn@navy.mil
	Tom Schneider	FAA / AFS-420	405-954-5852	thomas.e.schneider@faa.gov
Called in	George Sempelles	FAA / AOV-110	202-267-9290	george.p.sempelles@faa.gov
In OKC	Steve VanCamp	FAA / AFS-420	405-954-5327	steve.ctr.vancamp@faa.gov
	Mike Wallin	FAA / AJV-5331	202-267-6494	michael.wallin@faa.gov
In SS	Valerie Watson	FAA / AJV-553	301-427-5155	valerie.s.watson@faa.gov
	Greg Yamamoto	FAA / AJV-56	301-427-4750	Gregory.yamamoto@faa.gov

Called in	Deb Copeland	FAA / AJV-561	301-427-5070	deborah.l.copeland@faa.gov
In SS	Rick Fecht	FAA / AJV-5223	301-427-4929	Richard.f.fecht@faa.gov
Called in	Andrew Goldsmith	FAA / AAS-100	202-267-6549	andrew.e.goldsmith@faa.gov

2. Old Business:

- a. **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 04-03-12: New issue initiated by Paul Eure, AJE-31. During discussion of the NFDCs plan to database certain activity areas, Paul Eure stated that six UAS training and research areas are being established across the US, and asked what group should be contacted to coordinate charting and publication of these areas. Val Watson responded that coordination should go through the UAS Office (AFS-80). Paul responded that this office has been somewhat non-responsive to date, and added that En Route has been trying to coordinate development of separation standards for UASs through this office with little success. Mike Foster added that the military services are working with FAA HQ on this issue as well. Paul responded that he was only referring to civilian UASs at this point. Chris Criswell responded that coordination should involve both the civilian and military UAS offices. George Bland stated that the military services are incorporating UASs into the NAS, not just at designated areas. Paul responded that the same process is happening on the civilian side, as it was mandated by Congress, which is why En Route is developing the separation standards, but that these research areas must also be included on the VFR charts once they are established. Lance Christian stated that the Las Vegas UAS Center for Excellence has a lot of experience with these activities and would be a good source of information. Paul responded that to implement these standards in six months as anticipated, they need a solution now. Val stated that AeroNav Products already has a specification available for charting these areas, but just needs the data. Chris added that the UAS Office is the authoritative source of this data, and that the NFDC relies on the authoritative source for publication and charting data. Greg Pray and Mike Foster volunteered to coordinate this issue through the civilian and military UAS offices, respectively.

IOU:

- 1) Paul Eure will report on the separation standards being developed by En Route, and provide more information on the six UAS research areas being established at the next AISWG meeting.
- 2) Greg Pray will contact a representative of the UAS office handling civilian UASs and invite them to the next AISWG meeting to provide more information.

- 3) Mike Foster will contact a representative of the UAS office handling military UASs and invite them to the next AISWG meeting to provide more information.

Status 07-10-12: The following status update of the three open IOUs from the last meeting was provided:

- 1) Paul Eure briefed that since AFS will not develop standards because no safety case has been made, En Route will attempt to reverse engineer standards from the recommendations of the safety panel. He stated that Congress has mandated that standards must be established by 2014. IOU OPEN.
- 2) Greg Pray contacted Mike Connor and invited him to the AISWG to brief the group. Mike C. briefed that Congress has set strict guidelines for developing procedures involving UASs, and that he will keep Greg updated on changes through the end of the year. Chris Criswell asked what groups in the FAA were handling the new guidelines regarding UASs. Mike C. responded that these were handled by AJV-115 along with AFS-407. Chris asked if there was any guidance on charting for UASs. Mike C. responded that there is no published guidance for submitting requests, but they must go through AJV-115. Brad Rush stated that only areas with continuous UAS activity should be charted to avoid chart clutter. Mike C. responded that he can work to establish the criteria for charting, but needs contacts to help. Brad responded that Val Watson should be the contact for charting, and that Chris Criswell should be the contact for data. Chris asked when guidance on UASs would be available. Mike C. responded that 7210 series notice was being developed to provide guidance to Air Traffic, but did not have a date for release. IOU OPEN.
- 3) During the discussion of item (2), Mike C. also provided information on UAS coordination with the military. Lance Christian asked if AJV-115 and AFS-407 were also coordinating with the military. Mike C. responded yes, they are coordinating with the DoD and NASA. Mike Foster responded that military COAs are going through the OE/AAA system. Mike C. agreed and added that outside of COAs, the military is going through AJV-115. Lance added that military UAS experts will need to be consulted for criteria, and Michael Clayton agreed. Mike F. responded that USAASA was representing the US Army on all UAS matters. Mike C. added that coordination on UAS matters has currently been handled through the DoD Policy Board on Federal Aviation (PBFA). George Bland responded that Col. Carl King (email: carl.king@pentagon.af.mil, phone: 202-385-4594) is involved with the PBFA and would serve a contact for military coordination. Val asked how many military UAS areas have been established. Mike F. responded that approximately 50-100 have come through the COA process. John DeMaria responded that to his knowledge there has only been one UAS area submitted for charting. Chris added that a

majority of the existing areas fall within restricted airspace and therefore are not charted. IOU OPEN.

IOU:

- 1) Paul Eure report on the separation standards being developed by En Route at the next AISWG meeting.
- 2) Chris Criswell and Val Watson will collaborate with Mike Connor to establish charting criteria for UASs and report progress at the next AISWG.
- 3) Mike Connor will contact Col. Carl King to coordinate military UAS standards and report progress at the next AISWG. Mike Foster will confirm that USAASA is the US Army lead for UAS.

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) Mike Connor will report back on the status of developing charting criteria.

Status 01-08-13: The following status update of the three open IOUs from the last meeting was provided:

- 1) Mike Conner indicated that the UAS Authorizations are all handled through the COA process. IOU OPEN.
- 2) Chris Criswell indicated that when draft Order 7900.3 is ready he will distribute to the AISWG. IOU OPEN.
- 3) Mike Conner briefed that a draft Advisory Circular is being written that defines UAS charting standards. Mike will provide the draft AC to Chris Criswell who will distribute with the AISWG minutes. IOU OPEN.

IOU:

- 1) Mike Connor will report back on any changes to UAS authorizations.
- 2) Chris Criswell will distribute draft Order 7900.3 to the AISWG.
- 3) Mike Connor will report back on the status of developing charting criteria.

Status 04-02-13: The following is a status update from the last AISWG.

- 1) Mike Connor stated that the FAA UAS Support Office (AJV-115) is working on an advisory circular which will provide guidance on how to submit UAS charting request and criteria for charting. Chris Criswell indicated that Order 7900.3 should be referenced with the advisory circular. IOU OPEN.
- 2) Chris Criswell reiterated that NFDC is targeting late summer or early fall for the final Order 7900.3 which will include a fillable pdf form for UAS data. IOU OPEN.

IOU:

- 1) Mike Connor will report back on the development of the UAS advisory circular which includes guidance for the submission of UAS charting requests.
- 2) Mike Connor 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.

Status 07-09-13: No status updates for were provided for the three open IOU's from the last AISWG. IOU OPEN.

IOU:

- 1) Mike Connor will report back on the development of the UAS advisory circular which includes guidance for the submission of UAS charting requests.
- 2) Mike Connor 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.

Status 11-05-13: John Graybill updated the group on the progress of the 7900.3 and the fillable pdf forms which will be used to submit UAS areas. Mike Connor was not present to provide updates. IOU OPEN.

IOU:

- 1) Mike Connor will report back on the development of the UAS advisory circular which includes guidance for the submission of UAS charting requests.
- 2) Mike Connor 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.

Status 01-07-14: John Graybill stated that no additional progress has been on the 7900.3 and the fillable pdf forms which will be used to submit UAS areas. Mike Connor was not present to provide updates. IOU OPEN.

**NOTE: Mr. Scott Gardner will replace Mr. Mike Connor as the AISWG UAS POC. Scott Gardner, 202-267-8192, scott.gardner@faa.gov*

IOU:

- 1) Mike Connor will report back on the development of the UAS advisory circular which includes guidance for the submission of UAS charting requests.
- 2) Mike Connor 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.

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.

Status 07-08-14: Scott Gardner requested that all new UAS charting requests to him. Corpus Christi TX has an example of UAS description. Scott Gardner

will use the UAS Charting criteria AC developed by Mike Connor as a starting point for establishing policy for UAS charting. Jennifer Hendi and Tom Harris will gather existing published UAS charting information and send it to Scott Gardener to be vetted. 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) Jennifer Hendi and Tom Harris will provide the existing published UAS charting information and provide it to Scott Gardner.

Status 10-07-14: Scott Gardner was not present to provide an update on the draft UAS advisory circular.

IOU: Scott Gardner will report back on the development of the UAS advisory circular which includes guidance for the submission of UAS charting requests.

Status 02-03-15: Scott Gardner has been replaced by Eric Lautenschlager. John Graybill provided an update that NFDC will coordinate with Eric Lautenschlager regarding what UAS data should be included in NASR and the process for submitting that data to NFDC

IOU: John Graybill will report back on the status of adding UAS data to NASR. John will request that Eric Lautenschlager provide an update on the development of the UAS advisory circular which includes guidance for the submission of UAS charting requests.

Status 04-07-15: John Graybill reported that he met with Eric Lautenschlager. John stated that they are defining a shared vetting process for UAS charting provided an update that NFDC will coordinate with Eric Lautenschlager regarding what UAS data should be included in NASR and the process for submitting that data to NFDC.

IOU: John Graybill will report back on the status of adding UAS data to NASR. John will request that Eric Lautenschlager provide an update on the development of the UAS advisory circular which includes guidance for the submission of UAS charting requests.

Status 07-07-15: John Graybill reported that requirements for storing Unmanned Aircraft Activity (UAA) area data in NASR were included in the Activity Area Resource specifications submitted to the NASR team in June. Currently, requests to chart UAA areas are submitted to Visual charting from the UAS office. Visual Charting creates a NFDD add-on page for the entry

and then, subsequently, adds the symbol to the chart. Once NASR has been modified to store UAA data, NFDC will take over responsibility for accepting and publishing UAA data in the NFDD.

IOU: John Graybill will report back on storing UAA data in NASR and the publication of UAA.

Status 10-05-15: John Graybill and Langston Majette will work with the UAS office on finalizing the charting criteria. John will update the group on UAS incorporation into NASR. IOU Open.

**Note: Langston Majette now works in the FAA UAS office.*

Status 04-05-16:

- 1) Langston Majette provided the following update from his detail to support UAS work in the Mission Support Services AJV-0 office: The ATO UAS Integration Team is working to see if a UAS symbol should be added to VFR charts but unsure of the scale of the work. They are currently developing a policy for model and hobbyist UAS operators (who want representation on VFR charts). The UAS symbol was not developed to chart model aircraft activities. However if it is deemed a safety concern, it could be used. This angle of the issue is still under discussion.
- 2) Langston Majette shared that the ATO UAS Integration Team is also working to establish criteria for UAS entries for the "Special Notices" section of the Chart Supplement. With the current absence of criteria, too many generic entries provide minimal safety value to pilots.
- 3) John Graybill said UAS symbology on VFR charts / Charting Supplements relates to populating miscellaneous activity areas into the NASR database.

IOU: Langston is working to engage AJV-115 to establish charting and chart supplement guidance by this summer. Updates from Langston Majette next AISWG meeting. IOU OPEN.

Status 07-12-16:

- 1) Langston Majette provided the following update from his detail to support UAS work in the Mission Support Services AJV-0 office: Work to establish VFR charting & Chart Supplement publication criteria has been temporarily put on hold due to the UAS Integration Team's focus on rolling out Part 107, effective August 29th, which will identify UAS activity that does not require charting. Langston reassured the working group that the ATO UAS Integration Team knows that the current box used for charting is not an adequate long-term charting solution. UAS access will be granted to Class E airspace first, followed by Class D, and ending with Class B access in December.

- 2) John DeMaria has received charting requests affecting Brownsville, El Paso, San Antonio, Albuquerque, Billings, Great Falls and Washington sectionals.
- 3) Val Watson shared that once charting criteria is established; the old boxes can be replaced.

IOU: Langston Majette will re-enter the AISWG request to establish VFR charting & Chart Supplement publication criteria into the ATO UAS Integration Team work after the first phase of airspace access is granted. He will provide an update at the next AISWG meeting. **IOU OPEN.**

- b. 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 07-10-12: New issue initiated by Val Watson, AJV-3. Val briefed that NASR lists 100+ "Joint Use" airports, Order 5000.5 lists 24-30 "Joint Use" airports, an Office of Airports website (http://www.faa.gov/airports/aip/military_airport_program/index.cfm?sect=joint) has a list, and asked which source of data is correct. Brad Rush added that the Office of Airports need to identify the single authoritative list, and publish this list in both the order and online. Bill Hammett responded that CFR Part 139 defines what constitutes a "Joint Use" airport, and added that in addition to the Office of Airports defining the list, that the definition in Order 8260.15 must be revised. Lance Christian agreed, stating that most of the military define a "Joint Use" airport as an airport with a "Joint Use" agreement, which is a smaller list of airports than those with both military and civil operations. Bill added that this definition does not match the one listed in CFR Part 139. Tom Schneider added that a joint meeting between the NFDC, Office of Airports, and DoD was held in October of 2011 to establish airport definitions, but that no progress from that meeting has been reported. Ray Zee stated that he will coordinate with the Office of Airports on this issue.

IOU: Ray Zee will research the definition for "Joint Use" airports and coordinate a standard definition and list of airports with the Office of Airports. He will report his progress to the group.

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.

Status 1-08-13: Ray Zee reported that there is a new definition for “Joint Use Airport” in the code of Federal Regulations based on the most recent Defense Authorization Act. The Office of Airports is identifying the airports that fall within this new definition. Ray is working to get clarification on the scope of the new definition. IOU OPEN.

IOU: Ray Zee will report on the progress of updating Part 139 and Order 5000.5 with the new “Joint Use Airport” definition released in the most recent Defense Authorization Act. Ray will provide a list of airports that fall within the definition.

Status 4-02-13: Ray Zee reported that based on the most recent definition 94 possible joint use airports have been identified. No other progress has been made on updating Part 139 and Order 5000.5 with the new “Joint Use Airport” definition. IOU OPEN.

IOU: Ray Zee will report on the progress of updating Part 139 and Order 5000.5 with the new “Joint Use Airport” definition released in the most recent Defense Authorization Act. Ray will provide a current list of airports that fall within the definition.

Status 7-09-13: No update was provided for the IOU. IOU OPEN.

IOU: Ray Zee will report on the progress of updating Part 139 and Order 5000.5 with the new “Joint Use Airport” definition released in the most recent Defense Authorization Act. Ray will provide a current list of airports that fall within the definition.

Status 11-05-13: Raymond Zee stated that the issue is that the DOD has a different definition than what is currently in 14 CFR, Part 139.5, which has created differences in the Joint Use Airport Lists. IOU OPEN.

IOU: Ray Zee will report on the progress of updating Part 139 and Order 5000.5 with the "Joint Use Airport" definition in 14 CFR, Part 139.5. Raymond will report back on the progress AAS-300 has made on finalizing a "Joint Use Airport" list.

Status 01-07-14: Raymond Zee reported that he has not made any progress on resolving the differences between the joint use definitions. IOU OPEN.

IOU: Ray Zee will report on the progress of updating Part 139 and Order 5000.5 with the "Joint Use Airport" definition in 14 CFR, Part 139.5. Raymond will report back on the progress AAS-300 has made on providing one joint use airport definition and finalizing a "Joint Use Airport" list.

*Note: After the AISWG Meeting Mr. Raymond Zee submitted the following questions to Mr. Brian Rushforth, Manager of AAS-300.

For Airport data - How important is it for an airport to be determined as "joint use" or not? Are there any operational and practical considerations? Are there any considerations for procedure developers and maintainers? Does the new definition affect an update of Order 5000.5D - List of Joint -Use Airports?

Has AGC reviewed the new definition and does it affect language in current Joint Use Agreements between the airports and DoD?

Does this (the new definition) affect any current or future actions by the Policy Board on Federal Aviation (PBFA)?

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.

Status 07-08-14: Raymond Zee provided three different options. Raymond stated that the Part 139 definition for Joint Use Airports will not change due to its purpose. The Part 139 Joint Use definition is aligned with federal grants for the Airport Improvement Program and not intended to be used for air traffic operational purposes. It was agreed that the Part 139 definition should remain unchanged, the definition in Order 5000.5 should be removed and the list within Order 5000.5 should be updated with the DOD airports that have

joint-use agreements. The DOD list is straight forward – identifies joint-use which means civilian aircraft may use military airport. In NASR the FAA currently databases over 2000 joint-use airports. It was requested that the Office of Airports provide a memo stating that purpose of the Part 139 definition. Raymond Zee will prepare a memo the intent of the definition, including NASR data changes needed as a result of the new list. July 14 is target date for memo from Ray Zee. IOU OPEN.

IOU:

- 1) Raymond Zee will work with DOD on revising Order 5000.5.
- 2) Raymond Zee provide a memo describing the intent of the Part 139 definition and necessary NASR data changes to the Director of AJV-2/3.

Status 10-07-14: Raymond Zee reported that no progress has been made towards identifying those airports considered to be “joint use” based on any of the existing definitions. Raymond suggested using a different designation other than “joint use” because “joint use” suggests there is funding involved. Raymond Zee will continue to work towards a potential solution. IOU OPEN.

IOU: Raymond Zee will report at the next AISWG on potential solutions.

Status 02-03-15: Drew Goldsmith has replaced Raymond Zee as The Office of Airports AISWG member. At this time Drew did not have an update. IOU OPEN.

IOU: Drew Goldsmith will report at the next AISWG on potential solutions.

Status 04-07-15: Drew Goldsmith reported that the Office of Airports will be using the Part 139 definition when the new Airport Data and Information Program (AC19) is stood up in October. Order 5000.5 should be recognized as out of date, and APP is aware of the need to update it. IOU OPEN.

IOU: Drew Goldsmith will report back at the next AISWG.

Status 07-07-15: Drew Goldsmith reiterated The Office of Airports statement from the April 7, 2015 AISWG meeting. The Office of Airports will be using the Part 139 definition when the new Airport Data and Information Program (AC19) is stood up in October. Order 5000.5 should be recognized as out of date, and APP is aware of the need to update it. Charting should develop a definition that can be used to support their operational requirements. IOU OPEN.

IOU: Val Watson and Drew Goldsmith will report back at the next AISWG.

Status 10-05-15: No one from the Office of Airports was in attendance. IOU OPEN.

Status 04-05-16:

- 1) There are several legal definitions of what is considered to be a 'joint use' (JU, military / civil use) airport; one in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), one for budgetary purposes, one in the 'Joint Use Agreement', and one based on if the airport is military or civil owned. In the airports section of the NASR database, there is a check box for 'joint use' and a check box for 'military landing agreement' (was a DoD field originally). The military list (approx. 25), NASR database (190 airports), and the FAA Order list (approx. 25) of 'joint use' airports all disagree.
- 2) The FAA Airports Line of Business (ARP) has the original list contained in FAA Order 5000.5, effective 1990. The Order is 'owned' by the Airports Planning & Environmental Division (APP-400) and Patrick Magnotta is the point of contact in the responsible office. Sharon Glasgow of FAA Airports APP-400 (Sharon is currently on detail; contact Luis Loarte), knows the military point of contact.
- 3) ISSUE OPEN: What definition of JU should the source used be based upon? Should the list updated by FAA Airports (ARP), civil airports, and the DoD be used to update the NASR database? Which source should populate the NASR database? Should the two forms of JU annotation remain in the NASR database or only one?

Status 04-05-16: Rick Mayhew shared that AJV-5 accepts the APP-400, Office of Airport Planning & Programming – National Planning & Environmental Division, rule of thumb that in order for an airfield to be to be categorized as joint-use it must be owned by the Department of Defense, it must be open to the public, and it must allow civilian use of the airfield.

- 1) The two NASR Database classifications under the Airport Usage, Rules & Regulations are broken down as thus:
 - a. Joint Use Military/Civil Airports, military airfields allowing civilian operations.
 - b. Airports with Military Landing Agreements, civil airfields allowing military operations.
- 2) Rick Mayhew explained that there are only 21 airports approved by APP-400 and by NGA/Military Service Branches as being true Joint Civil-Military Use status.
 - a. He presented the working group with a spreadsheet (see 20160712 Attachment 12-093 Minutes.csv) containing the 191 airports in the NASR Database that are currently listing Joint Civil-Military Use status.
 - b. Most of the airports on this list will be revised within the NASR Database to reflect a change of status from JOINT CIVIL/MIL

AGRMT to MIL LANDING AGRMT and will appear in the NFDD as such.

- 3) In the future any airports self-reporting Joint Civil-Military Use to the NFDC should be directed to APP-400 (Luis Loarte, Sharon Glasgow, Patrick Magnotta) for vetting of the information before a use status revision to the NASR or AIRNAV Databases is accomplished.
- 4) Val Watson shared that this takes care of primarily Visual, Enroute and the Chart Supplements. There are a scattering of airport symbols on Area Arrivals (STARs) that may be affected, but this is minor & they will react as the airports' statuses are published in the NFDD.
- 5) Bob Carlson explained that his team will still use the IFR Supplement. It contains information that NASR does not about military tenancy that we currently put in the Chart Supplements.

ISSUE CLOSED

- c. **15-105 (July 7, 2015): Airway Altitudes shown as Feet (FT) or Flight Level (FL).** Issue: NASR has a discrepancy in how Flight Level Airway Altitudes below 18,000 are data based.

Status 10-05-15: Scott Jerdan will report back at the next AISWG. IOU Open

Status 05-04-16: In US airspace, above 18,000 feet, flight levels are used (some exceptions over in oceanic airspace). The Flight Procedures and Airspace Order 8260.19 mandates these altitudes be documented as Feet in the Form 8260-16. As a result, the NASR database stores Flight Level Airway Altitudes incorrectly as Feet following the source. The FAA directorate, Flight Standards Service (AFS-400), owns the Flight Procedures and Airspace Order 8260.19 that directs these altitudes be documented as Feet in the Form 8260-16.

IOU: Tom Schneider from Flight Standards Service AFS-420, will assess whether the 8260.19 Order should be changed to source as flight levels above 18,000 feet. IOU OPEN

Status 07-12-16: AFS-420 does not feel a change is needed to the 8260.19. The working group discussed that older -16 forms have flight levels on them, newer ones do not, STARs and departures forms do have flight levels, and the procedures themselves are mixed. Alex Rushton added that it may help to know how they are coded for use in flight management systems. Enroute automation is affected because the airway altitudes in NASR are in feet and are manually changed to flight levels when charted. Val Watson asked if the flight levels should even be shown on the charts. Don Harmer added that this is an air traffic control (ATC) communications requirement rather than a charting or specifications issue.

IOU:

- 1) Val Watson will look for the source of the original mandate to chart airway altitudes as flight levels above 18,000 feet.
- 2) Flight Standards (John Bordy / Steve VanCamp) will take the action to collaborate with operations folks to identify what users need and want and assess how inconsistent we are.

- d. **15-106 (July 7, 2015): AFS-460 Approving 3rd Party Procedures.** Issue: 3rd Party Procedures that do not have an Airport Ident in the system are being approved by AFS-460.

Status 10-05-15: The procedures are being approved because they are point in space. Tom Harris believes they are private airports and will report back at the next meeting. IOU Open

Status 05-04-16: The Ident Order does not allow for the reservation of airport ident. For NFDC to issue an airport ident a site number needs to be part of the request.

IOU: Charlie Rose of AFS-460 will check with new manager on the process at the next meeting (helipad procedures for hospitals). **Charlie Rose emailed (see 20160712 Attachment 15-106 Minutes.pdf) process submitted by Central Region to Jill Olsen on 6/13/16:**

- Starts with the owner/consultant filing a 7480-1 with the Regional Office
- Regional Office evaluates surrounding airspace and makes an airspace determination
- Regional Office will send the airspace determination and a filled out 5010 form back to the owner
- Owner reviews determination, signs 5010 form, and sends it back to the Regional Office
- Regional Office “packages” the original 7480-1, airspace determination, and owner-signed 5010 form and emails to Office of Airports HQ in DC.
- The Office of Airports will assign a SiteID.
- The package and Site ID# are then sent via email to NFDC for LocID assignment and inclusion in NASR.

Comment [cm1]: Changed from “us here in HQ.” per email discussion between CM, CR, & AG 8/3/16

Comment [cm2]: Changed from “We” per email discussion between CM, CR, & AG 8/3/16

Status 07-12-16: AFS-460 shared that the new process is being implemented. Drew Goldsmith shared that more coordination may be needed in the field for the new process to stick. Specific challenges cited included; a) an airport’s proponent must sign and submit the final 5010 form, not the 3rd party procedure developer, b) 3rd party procedure developers are ‘reserving’ LOC IDs through an AFS-400 KSN site.

<https://avssp.faa.gov/avs/afs400/IndustryFAA/SitePages/Home.aspx>

Scott Jerdan shared via email after the 7/12/16 AISWG meeting, "Please refer to Order JO-7350.9. NFDC is not issuing reserved airport identifiers. AFS should consider shutting down the link below if it is used to issue "reserved" identifiers for airports."

IQU: AFS-460 has already issued guidance through email to follow the process as outlined by ARP and not use the ksn site to reserve ids. Charlie Rose (AFS-460) offered to follow up on the ksn site originated by Mike Webb (AFS-420), with the new acting AFS-460 manager.

- e. **16-107 (April 5, 2016): Addition of Miscellaneous Activity Area Resource to NASR.** Issue: AIS signed IACC RD 751 in October of 2015, which creates a mechanism for charting Aerobatic Practice Areas on VFR Charts (Helicopter Route, Flyway, Terminal Area & Sectional). Currently sourced by NFDD add-on page until NASR can be modified to accommodate them. Getting Miscellaneous Activity Areas databased in NASR is desirable for chart automation purposes, for tracking & record keeping. The FAA's ATO Program Management Office (PMO, AJM-33) is now responsible for the management of the NASR database management tool (moved from AJV-5).

Status 07-12-16: John Graybill shared that this request was submitted in May 2015, however, will not be fulfilled until the first of the new year at the earliest. The AISWG agreed this should get on the NASR priority list before the NAVLean lock out on November 28th.

IQU: CJ Meushaw will, 1) reach out to the NAVLean point of contact for a NAVLean NASR lock out summary (or headline), and 2) forward the AISWG Miscellaneous Activity Area Resource request to Nate Rahn for submission to the NASR technical control board (TCB).

CJ Meushaw followed up with the NAVLean program manager in the ATO's Program Management Office service unit, Suzanne Koppanen. Suzanne clarified that there is no NAVLean requirement 'lockout' scheduled for the NASR database maintenance to her knowledge. New requirements derived from AJV-5 SME input for NAVLean will be developed in parallel as appropriate, with other NASR requirements and then the coding will be merged. See attached slide, *20160712 Attachment 16-107 Minutes.pdf* (from the most recent NAVLean Critical Design Review, July 13th), illustrating the program proposed configuration management model, already in use for the OE/AAA Program. **CJ is still researching the internal AJV-5 process to request NASR database changes.**

3. New Business:

- a. During the May 4th AISWG meeting, Lance Christian shared that the World Geodetic System 1984 (WGS84) will be updated for the Earth Gravitational Model 20-20 (EGM2020). EGM is updated every 5 years. He asked what if any the FAA will be updating.

During the July 12th AISWG meeting, Jill Olson shared the following input from Brad Rush: AIS is currently still using NAD83/NAV88. NAD83 was affirmed as the official horizontal datum for the U.S. by a notice in the Federal Register (Vol. 54, No. 113 Pg. 25318) on June 14, 1989. NAV88 was affirmed as the official vertical datum for the U.S. by a notice in the Federal Register (Vol. 58, No. 120, Pg. 34325) on June 24, 1993 (Ref. 63). Earth Gravitational Model 2020 will eliminate the use of WGS-84 as a datum. Whether it is approved by the President for the official datum of the US is pending.

- b. AISWG web page: Align AISWG external wiki web page with initiative to consolidate external access points in support of data quality and improved customer service. What level of sensitivity is this documentation and how best to protect it? http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/Aero_Data/

During the July 12th meeting the working group decided a password was still needed moving forward regardless of what web platform the site is on.

John Graybill shared via email after the 7/12/16 meeting, that Jim Grant activated the link to the AISWG on the AJV-5 website and that the link is located on the "Aeronautical Data/NFDC" page under the heading "Resources". The AISWG link also remains on the old NFDC website where it has always been. Eventually, that will go away when the old NFDC website is disabled in the coming months. http://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/aero_data/

- c. Katie Murphy, Manager, AIS Visual Charting Sub Team B shared that the United States Hang Gliding and Paragliding Association (USHPA) has provided a list of more than 400 hang gliding and paragliding sites in the United States. The number of flights at these sites ranges from 1 to thousands per year. Visual Flight Rules charting needs to depict some of these sites on the charts. However a minimum flight activity number must be established for charting purposes. AIS Visual Charting Team believes discussing this with the AISWG would be beneficial.

During the July 12th AISWG meeting, Rick Fecht shared that VFR Charting is looking for help to develop charting criteria. It was discussed that AJV-5 Aeronautical Information Services does not decide what charting criteria is; Flight Standards or some other FAA organization does. The working group also discussed the need to catalogue the sites in a source database such as NASR. It was concluded that this will be opened as an issue with IOUs and follow up discussion at the next AISWG.

IOU: AJV-5 will find out who in the FAA: 1) is responsible for determining charting criteria, and 2) governs hang / paragliding activity.

4. Next Meeting:

- a. October 4th 2016 from 0900edt - 1200edt (0800cdt-1100cdt).