

**AERONAUTICAL CHARTING MEETING**  
**Instrument Procedures Group**  
**Meeting – April 23, 2019**

**RECOMMENDATION DOCUMENT**

**FAA Control # ACF-IPG RD 19-01-342**

**Subject:** Charting “NA WHEN LOCAL WEATHER NOT AVAILABLE” for Alternate Minima

**Background/Discussion:**

When alternate minima are approved for a procedure, FAA Order 8260.19 currently has a requirement to chart the note “NA WHEN LOCAL WEATHER NOT AVAILABLE” if the procedure has a backup altimeter source (regardless if charted, or documented as a contingency on FAA Form 8260-9).

This note appears to be relative to rules in **14 CFR Part 97.169 IFR Alternate Airport Weather Minima**, which provide ceiling and visibility requirements when selecting alternate airport/procedures during flight planning.

It should be noted that the CFR requirement is intended for all procedures with approved alternate minima, not just the ones with a backup altimeter source. Presumably, the intent of the note is to serve as a reminder to pilots that if the primary altimeter is not available, use of the backup altimeter does not provide relief of the ceiling and visibility requirement when selecting an alternate airport during flight planning.

While this seems reasonable to a certain degree, there are unintended consequences.

1. This note immediately causes the Alternate Minima approval to be non-standard, thus the “NA WHEN LOCAL WEATHER NOT AVAILABLE” note is inserted into the TPP Alternate Mins page. By itself, this would not be an issue, however **ALL non-standard alternate minima and notes are consolidated in TPP**. The resulting effect is that some airports will have this note, and others will not. This situation has led to pilots concluding that the airports and/or procedures that do not have this note are exempt from the ceiling & visibility requirement when selecting the airport as an alternate.

Excerpt from [Askacfi.com](http://Askacfi.com):

*The way I read it, you can use the ILS, LOC, VOR/DME approaches for alternate minimum planning even WITHOUT local weather being available.*

Here’s the airport that was being considered:

**DES MOINES, IA**

DES MOINES INTL ..... ILS or LOC Rwy 5<sup>1</sup>  
                                  ILS or LOC Rwy 13<sup>1</sup>  
                                  ILS or LOC Rwy 31<sup>1</sup>  
                                  RNAV (GPS) Rwy 5<sup>2</sup>  
                                  RNAV (GPS) Rwy 13<sup>2</sup>  
                                  RNAV (GPS) Rwy 31<sup>2</sup>  
                                  VOR/DME Rwy 23<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Category E, 900-2<sup>3</sup>/<sub>4</sub>.

<sup>2</sup>NA when local weather not available.

<sup>3</sup>Category C, 800-2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub>; Category D, 800-2<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub>.

Only the RNAV procedures have the LOCAL WEATHER requirement; therefore, this pilot concluded that ceiling and visibility was not required for alternate planning, which is not in compliance with 97.169.

2. When all airports and procedures with non-standard minimums are consolidated into a single product, this may lead to reasonable conclusions that are unintended.

NAME	ALTERNATE MINIMUMS	NAME	ALTERNATE MINIMUMS
<b>ADA, OK</b> ADA RGNL (ADH).....	RNAV (GPS) Rwy 18 RNAV (GPS) Rwy 36	<b>BATESVILLE, AR</b> BATESVILLE RGNL (BVX).....	RNAV (GPS) Rwy 8 RNAV (GPS) Rwy 26
1 NA when local weather not available. Category C, 900-2¼; Category D, 900-2½.		4 NA when local weather not available.	
<b>ALTUS, OK</b> ALTUS/QUARTZ MOUNTAIN RGNL (AXS).....	RNAV (GPS) Rwy 17 RNAV (GPS) Rwy 35 VOR-A <sup>1</sup>	<b>BENTONVILLE, AR</b> BENTONVILLE MUNI/LOUISE M THADEN FIELD (VBT).....	RNAV (GPS) Rwy 18 RNAV (GPS) Rwy 36 VOR-A
2 NA when local weather not available. <sup>1</sup> NA when Altus tower closed.		5 NA when local weather not available.	
<b>ALVA, OK</b> ALVA RGNL (AVK).....	RNAV (GPS) Rwy 18 RNAV (GPS) Rwy 36	<b>BLACKWELL, OK</b> BLACKWELL-TONKAWA MUNI (BKN).....	RNAV (GPS) Rwy 17 RNAV (GPS) Rwy 35 VOR-A
3 NA when local weather not available. Category C, 800-2¼.		6 NA when local weather not available.	
<b>ARDMORE, OK</b> ARDMORE DOWNTOWN EXECUTIVE (1F0).....	RNAV (GPS) Rwy 17 RNAV (GPS) Rwy 35	<b>BLYTHEVILLE, AR</b> BLYTHEVILLE MUNI (HKA).....	RNAV (GPS) Rwy 18 RNAV (GPS) Rwy 36
Category D, 800-2½		7 NA when local weather not available.	
<b>ARDMORE</b> MUNI (ADM).....	ILS or LOC Rwy 31 <sup>14</sup>	<b>BURNS FLAT, OK</b> CLINTON-	

13 SEP 2018 to 11 OCT 2018

All of the airports on this page have the note, except this one. Does that mean this airport is exempt from ceiling & visibility requirements when selecting an alternate?

3. RNAV (RNP) procedures will never have a backup altimeter, and therefore will never have the “NA WHEN LOCAL WEATHER NOT AVAILABLE” note. This may lead to a reasonable conclusion that the RNP procedures are available for alternate purposes, regardless of ceiling & visibility availability.

**Recommendations:**

There are several options to resolve this issue.

**OPTION 1:**

Do not require the “NA WHEN LOCAL WEATHER NOT AVAILABLE” chart note and instead treat this as a pilot education opportunity with updates to AIM/IPH, etc. explaining that ceiling and visibility requirements per 97.169 are ALWAYS in effect for alternate airport/procedure selection, regardless of chart notes, backup altimeter circumstances, etc.

**OPTION 2:**

Require the “NA WHEN LOCAL WEATHER NOT AVAILABLE” chart note on all procedures with approved alternate minimums.

**Note:** This option effectively makes ALL alternate minimums non-standard. This would also require superfluous addition of literally every single airport and procedure in the inventory approved for alternate minimums.

**OPTION 3:**

Do not require the “NA WHEN LOCAL WEATHER NOT AVAILABLE” chart note and instead reinforce the ceiling & visibility requirement via use of a general note on the Alternate Mins page:



**ALTERNATE MINS**

18256

M1



INSTRUMENT APPROACH PROCEDURE CHARTS



**IFR ALTERNATE AIRPORT MINIMUMS**

Standard alternate minimums for non-precision approaches and approaches with vertical guidance [NDB, VOR, LOC, TACAN, LDA, SDF, VOR/DME, ASR, RNAV (GPS) or RNAV (RNP)] are 800-2. Standard alternate minimums for precision approaches (ILS, PAR, or GLS) are 600-2. Airports within this geographical area that require alternate minimums other than standard or alternate minimums with restrictions are listed below. NA - means alternate minimums are not authorized due to unmonitored facility, absence of weather reporting service, or lack of adequate navigation coverage. Civil pilots see FAR 91. IFR Alternate Minimums: Ceiling and Visibility Minimums not applicable to USA/USN/USAF. Pilots must review the IFR Alternate Minimums Notes for alternate airfield suitability.

---

**ALL AIRPORTS: if local weather is not available, alternate minimums are NA.**

**Comments:** None.

**Submitted by:** Tony Lawson

**Organization:** FAA, Aeronautical Information Services (AJV-A160)

**Phone:** (405) 954-2788

**E-mail:** [tony.r.lawson@faa.gov](mailto:tony.r.lawson@faa.gov)

**Date:** 04/05/2019

**Initial Discussion Meeting 19-01:** John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the [slide](#): discussing the issue for Tony Lawson, AJV-A, who was not in attendance. The current practice of annotating certain alternate minimums as “NA when local weather not available” is inconsistent. John Bordy indicated part of the reason for the inconsistency is due to an error in the Order 8260.19, whereby the determination on when the annotation was required pointed to an incorrect paragraph; this will be corrected in Order 8260.19I. John Bordy asked all attendees to review the recommendation, and to provide feedback to Tony Lawson via e-mail. Valerie Watson, AJV-A, said charting would prefer a combination of options one and three, which is AIM guidance/education, plus the general statement in the Terminal Procedure Publication (as opposed to each set of minimums). Lev Prichard, APA, added that “local weather” isn’t clearly defined. Additional discussion followed as to what type of forecast could be used when selecting an alternate (e.g., TAF, area forecast). John Bordy stated these issues will be researched and addressed as part of this issues. Rune Duke, AOPA, said this issue (as pertaining to Part 135 operators in Alaska) was mentioned as part of the recent reauthorization; John Bordy will review the reauthorization language for any pertinent information.

**Action Items:**

- John Bordy requests all review the issue, proposed options, and provide feedback to Tony Lawson via e-mail.
- John Bordy will work with the Flight Operations Group to determine local weather requirements for selecting alternate airports.

**Status:** Item open.

---

**Meeting 19-02:** John Bordy, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). John fixed an incorrect reference in Order 8260.19I indicating certain chart notes were required. In addition, the Flight Procedures and Airspace Group started to look in May at any possible changes for alternate minimums requirements, with little subsequent activity. The intent is to reengage on these discussions. John again asked the group to review the topic and provide feedback to Tony Lawson, FAA/AJV-533, since he has not received any comments. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-A25 asked if this issue applies to every airport, and John discussed how the incorrect note mentioned above led to confusion about terminal procedures publication entries regarding procedure NA when local weather unavailable. Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will work with John Blair, FAA Flight Operations Group, on the issue and will report any determinations reached at ACM 20-01. Lev Prichard, Allied Pilots Association, asked if there was progress in defining local weather, and John said that was part of the May meeting and further internal discussion was needed. Defining weather requirements will be part of these discussions, including what is driving non-standard alternate minimums. Lev and Rich Boll, NBAA, both pointed out local weather, if not clearly defined, could be assumed to be any number of sources, given the multiple data sources available to pilots in the modern era. It was also noted that the true need of local weather is unknown or unclear; it could be altimeter setting source and/or ceiling and visibility information. John noted procedure design drives non-standard alternate minimum requirements, often by circling minimums. John Bordy requested that if anyone was interested in joining in the discussion to resolve this issue, they should contact him.

**Action Items:**

- FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will research with the Flight Operations Group regarding alternate weather requirements, and possible policy changes.
- FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will brief the results of those discussions at the next meeting.

**Status:** Item open.

---

**Meeting 20-02:** Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue summary and current status from the [slide](#). The issue has not yet been worked, but will remain open and actions remain the same.

**Action Items:**

- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will research with the Flight Operations Group regarding alternate weather requirements, and possible policy changes.
- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will brief the results of those discussions at the next meeting.

**Status:** Item open.

---