

**AERONAUTICAL CHARTING FORUM**  
**Charting Group**  
**Meeting 12-02 – October 24-25, 2012**

**RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT**

**FAA Control # 12-02-258**

**Subject:** Discontinuing the publication of the LOC symbol representing the adjacent runway(s) authorized for simultaneous approaches as presently depicted on the plan view on approach plates used for simultaneous independent operations.

**Background/Discussion:**

On ILS approach charts, the LOC symbol is published on the airport diagram which depicts the adjacent runway which is authorized for simultaneous approach operations. For example, at KSFO, where simultaneous close parallel approaches are conducted for SOIA operations, the ILS PRM Rwy 28L approach plate publishes a LOC symbol which represents the LDA PRM 28R final approach course. The same symbol is published on all approach plates authorized to conduct simultaneous independent approaches depicting the other adjacent runway(s) that are used in the simultaneous operation.

On all independent simultaneous approaches, the briefing strip contains information as to the other runway(s) and runway approaches that are authorized for simultaneous operations. The LOC symbol therefore is not required in order to provide pilots with situational awareness as to these other runways. Furthermore, recent changes in charting requirements establish that all approaches, both independent and dependent, be noted in the briefing strip as simultaneous. This begs the questions as to whether the LOC symbol should also be used to depict dependent runways in a like manner to the present usage for independent operations. Finally, other simultaneous approach combinations are now being developed, such as RNAV GPS approaches, where there is not symbol equivalent to the LOC symbol. In certain instances, RNAV GPS, RNAV RNP AR, and ILS approaches in various combinations, are authorized for simultaneous operations on the same set of runways. This further complicates the requirement for determining what symbol should be used, or if any are applicable or needed.

**Recommendations:**

To remove both chart clutter and to create a standard for all simultaneous approach charts, regardless of the type of approach, discontinue the use of the LOC symbol on all simultaneous approaches. Instead, rely on the required notations in the briefing strip to provide the necessary information about the runway(s) and approach types authorized for simultaneous operations.

**Comments:**

Submitted by: Joe Lintzenich  
Organization: AFS-410/AFS-450 Contractor  
Phone: 314-994-1766  
E-mail: joe@atsi.aero  
Date: October 11, 2012

## Minutes from ACF 12-02:

Mr. Joe Lintzenich, Contractor, FAA/AFS-410, briefed the issue and [presented depictions of the current FAA charting practices depicting a Localizer Feather](#) not only to the primary runway, but also to parallel runways. Joe proposes the elimination of localizer feathers to secondary parallel runways also authorized in simultaneous operations. He points out that as the briefing strip note clarifies that simultaneous authorization is granted, the secondary feather is redundant information and only provides chart clutter.

ALPA commented that they do like the use of the primary feather for ILS approaches, but that there was no need to depict a feather for the runway not directly specific to the procedure.

Current use of the feather in the U.S. is only for ILS/LOC procedures and not for RNAV procedures.

Mike Webb, FAA/AFS-420, stated that this is an item being discussed within ICAO. Mike added that the feather indicates the presence of an ILS and calls attention to the unique nature of ILS approaches where the ground-based instruments indicate position on either side of the course line. Currently on other approaches with angular guidance that are non-ILS, no distinguishing depiction/symbology is currently shown.

John Moore, Jeppesen, inquired as to why the smaller feather was depicted on the charts on runways other than the primary one used in the approach.

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-3B, responded that the parallel feather is depicted on an approach plate when it is specified for charting in the Additional Flight Data section of the 8260 source document. The 8260 is in turn filled out as per FAA Order 8260.19.

Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, stated that he was not aware of the specific reasoning originally behind the requirement in the 8260.19.

John Gale, NBAA, commented that the Feather does provide situational awareness and that there is another ILS in the neighborhood.

Bob Lamond, NBAA, stated that the smaller feather was just chart clutter and served no specific use.

Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, commented that Jeppesen depicts localizer symbols (feathers) on adjoining or same direction runways for LOC-based procedures. Jeppesen provides this to indicate the availability of the NAVAID and that there are similar NAVAIDs in close proximity to the approach, alerting the pilot to the potential of crossing-tuning radios.

Kyle McKee, FAA/AJV-142, stated that it was his understanding that the size of the primary feather indicated the service volume of the localizer.

Valerie explained that on FAA charts, this was not the case and that the feather is simply a symbolic representation of a localizer. She further explained that the feather is extended at least as far out as the last fix using the localizer as part of its makeup.

Tom commented that similarly on Jeppesen charts, the length of the feather bears no relation to the service volume of the localizer.

Valerie inquired of the audience if there was a need for the second, smaller feather, for runways parallel to the procedure being flown?

The consensus from the group was that the second feather served little or no purpose and could safely be eliminated from the charts.

**STATUS: OPEN**

**ACTION:** Tom Schneider, FAA/AFS-420, will initiate revision to FAA Order 8260.19 and will update at next ACF.

**ACTION:** Ted Thompson, Jeppesen, will poll Jeppesen Chart users and report back at next ACF.