Instrument Procedure Development Process

Presented to: WSCAA

By: Dave Parker FAA Flight Procedures

Date: October 25, 2023







Part I Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) Process



Search by

Go

All requests for Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) Actions must be made via the IFP Gateway

https://www.faa.gov/air_traffic/flight_info/aeronav/procedures/

Aeronautical Information Services

Alerts/Notices

NOTAMs

Catalog of Products

Digital Products

Order FAA Products

Aeronautical Data

Obstruction Evaluation

Obstacle Data

Critical DME List

Instrument Flight Procedures

IFP Request Form

muduon

IFP Inventory Summary

Aeronautical Charting Meeting

Air Transportation Information Exchange Conference (ATIEC)

FAQs

FAA Home + Air Traffic + Flight Information + Aeronautical Information Services + Instrument Flight Procedures Information Gateway

Instrument Flight Procedures Information Gateway

The JFP Information Gateway is your centralized instrument flight procedures data portal, providing a single-source for:

• Charts — All Published Charts, Volume, and Type.

Q Enter Airport ID or City or Airport Name

- IFP Production Plan Current IFPs under Development or Amendments with Tentative Publication Date and Status.
- IFP Coordination All coordinated developed/amended procedure forms forwarded to Flight Check or Charting for publication.
- IFP Documents Navigation Database Review (NDBR) Repository and Source Documents used for Data Validation of Coded IFPs.

Sign in to Information Gateway



IFP Information Gateway Instructional Video



Advanced Search

Select IFP Request Form to request an IFP action

Instrument Flight Procedure (IFP) Request Process

Procedure Selection:

The IFP request form will ask for different information depending on the type of request

- Approach (Airport) ~ 26 questions
- DP/SID (Airport) ~ 23 questions
- STAR (Airport) ~ 17 questions
- Other (Airport) ~ 6 questions

Back << Next >>

Start Over





Feasibility: The Flight Procedures Team will perform an initial feasibility analysis to determine the feasibility of the request. Feasibility asks the question "can it be developed."

Some items considered at this time are:

- Is it duplicate request
- Does it comply with current criteria
- Is the infrastructure in place to support the request
- Determine the full scope of work
- Should it be combined with another existing project





Viability, Justification, and Prioritization: The request will then be vetted for viability and justification and prioritized. Viability asks the question "should it be developed."

Numerous FAA Orders and national initiatives are used in this process including:

- 8260.43
- 7100.41
- VOR minimum Operations Network (MON)
- National Procedure Assessment (NPA)





If the project is approved to move forward, it will then be prioritized with other work in the NAS as appropriate. Prioritization and scheduling of procedures are no longer region specific.





Coordination and Design: Once the project has an assigned publication date, coordination will be accomplished with all affected parties. Coordination requirements vary and may include:

- Air Traffic Control
- Other FAA Lines of Business
- Industry
- Airport Manager
- User Groups
- Community
- Others as required





Development and Publication: The project is then forwarded to Aeronautical Information Services (AIS) for development and publication. This process includes:

- Developing the proposed procedures designs
- Quality Control (QC) review
- Coding
- Flight inspection
- Charting and publication.





Maintenance: Active procedures are maintained by AIS and are reviewed biennially to ensure the designs meet current criteria and remain clear of obstructions. If any discrepancies are found, the procedure will be scheduled for amendment and a NOTAM may be issued if there is a safety concern (e.g. 20:1 visual surface penetration).



Part II Feasibility Analysis



Airport Design Requirements

AC 150/5300-13B Appendix K identifies airport design requirements for IFP development.

Circling only procedures may be authorized with no survey and basic (visual) markings. However, the minimums will be higher than could be achieved with a survey and/or with a straight-in procedure.

Straight-in procedures require at least:

- 3200' x 60' Rwy dimensions
 - Can be shorter with minimums adjustment
- NPI markings
- NPI FAR 77 Approach Type
- NVG Survey
- LIRL/MIRL/HIRL (as appropriate)
- Holding Position Signs/Markings

	Visibility Minimums 1			
Standards ¹	< 3/4 statute mile (1.2 km)	3/4 (1.2 km) to <1 statute mile (1.6 km)	≥ 1 statute mile (1.6 km) straight-in	Circling ² ≥ 1 statute mile (1.6 km)
HAT ³	≤ 250 ft	≥ 250 ft	≥ 250 ft	≥ 350 ft
POFZ (PA and APV only)	Required	Not Required	Not Required	Not Required
T-OFZ	Required	Not Required	Not Required	Not Required
ALP ⁴	Required	Required	Required	Required
Minimum Runway Length	4,200 ft	3,200 ft 5	3,200 ft 5	3,200 ft ⁵
Paved Surface	Required	Recommended ⁶	Recommended ⁶	Recommended ⁶
Runway Markings (See AC 150/5340-1)	Precision	Non-precision	Non-precision	Visual
Holding Position Signs and Markings (See <u>AC</u> 150/5340-1, <u>AC 150/5340-</u> 18)	Required	Required	Required	Required 6
Runway Edge Lights ⁷	HIRL or MIRL	HIRL or MIRL	MIRL or LIRL	MIRL or LIRL (Required only for night minimums)
Parallel Taxiway ⁸	Required	Required	Recommended	Recommended
Approach Lights ⁹	Required	Recommended 10	Recommended 10	Not Required
VGSI 11	Recommended	Recommended	Recommended	Recommended
Applicable Runway Design Standards, Reference online <u>Runway</u> Design Standards Matrix Fool or <u>Appendix G</u>	Lower than 3/4 mile (1.2 km) visibility minimums	Not lower than 3/4 mile (1.2 km) visibility minimums	Not lower than 1 mile (1.6 km) visibility minimums	Not lower than 1 mile (1.6 km) visibility minimums
Approach or Departure Surface to be Met Reference paragraph <u>3.6.1</u>)	See <u>Table 3-3</u> or <u>Table 3-4</u>	See <u>Table 3-3</u> or <u>Table 3-4</u>	See <u>Table 3-3</u> or <u>Table 3-4</u>	Table 3-3
Optimum Survey Type 12	VGS	VGS	NVGS	NVGS 13



Table K-1. Criteria to Support Instrument Flight Procedure Development

An IFP is not always feasible

Example:

FAR 77 Surfaces at this airfield are contained in a fairly level river basin.

Airport elevation is 919 MSL





Final Evaluation:

The feasibility analysis identified high terrain about 4 nm west of the airport that requires an almost 5° descent angle to clear.





Final Evaluation:

Offsetting the final angle more to the north encounters higher terrain 4.2 nm west of the airport and offsetting more to the south encounters higher terrain 2.3 nm southwest of the runway.





Intermediate Evaluation:

Although it could be feasible to restrict aircraft categories to mitigate the terrain in final, mountains 11 nm west of the airport cause an intermediate descent well in excess of what criteria allows. This area cannot be avoided by offsetting the intermediate segment.

Due to these issues, the procedure is deemed not to be feasible.







Dave Parker FAA Western Flight Procedures Office David.G.Parker@faa.gov

