

ELLENVILLE, NEW YORK		AL-9390 (FAA)	20198
APP CRS 227°	Rwy Idg 3538	RNAV (GPS) RWY 22	
	TDZE 290	JOSEPH Y RESNICK (N89)	
	Apt Elev 292		
RNP APCH.			
<p>⚠ NA Circling NA southeast of Rwy 4-22. Rwy 22 helicopter visibility reduction below 1 SM NA. Use New York Stewart Intl altimeter setting, when not received, use Poughkeepsie altimeter setting. Procedure NA at night.</p>		<p>MISSED APPROACH: Climbing right turn to 4000 direct LOBOS and hold, continue climb-in-hold to 4000.</p>	

Thus, after looking at two approaches and finding the “triangle A” on both charts, the pilot concludes N89 is NA as an alternate.

Scenario #2: East Hampton (HTO) as an alternate

A review of the IFR Alternate Minimums section shows the following:

EAST HAMPTON, NY
EAST HAMPTON (HTO).....RNAV (GPS) Y Rwy 28
 Category D, 800-2½.

Yet, if the pilot digs deeper and goes to the approach charts for this airport they find the following:

EAST HAMPTON, NEW YORK		AL-5016 (FAA)	20310
WAAS CH 77928 W10B	APP CRS 102°	Rwy Idg 4255 TDZE 55 Apt Elev 55	RNAV (GPS) X RWY 10 EAST HAMPTON (HTO)
<p>⚠ NA Baro-VNAV NA when using Westhampton Beach altimeter setting. For uncompensated Baro-VNAV systems, LNAV/VNAV NA below -15°C (5°F) or above 54°C (130°F). DME/DME RNP-0.3 NA. Helicopter visibility reduction below 1 SM NA. When local altimeter setting not received, use Westhampton Beach altimeter setting and increase all DA 45 feet and increase LRV and LNAV/VNAV</p>		<p>MISSED APPROACH: Climb to 2000 direct</p>	

EAST HAMPTON, NEW YORK		AL-5016 (FAA)	20310
APP CRS 102°	Rwy Idg 4255 TDZE 55 Apt Elev 55	RNAV (GPS) Y RWY 10 EAST HAMPTON (HTO)	
<p>⚠ NA DME/DME RNP-0.3 NA. When local altimeter setting not received, use Westhampton Beach altimeter setting and increase all MDA 60 feet, increase Circling Cat C visibility ¼ mile. Helicopter visibility reduction below 1 SM NA. Procedure NA at night.</p>		<p>MISSED APPROACH: Climb to 2000 direct BIGGA and hold.</p>	

EAST HAMPTON, NEW YORK		AL-5016 (FAA)	20310
WAAS CH 90332 W28B	APP CRS 282°	Rwy Idg 4255 TDZE 46 Apt Elev 55	RNAV (GPS) Y RWY 28 EAST HAMPTON (HTO)
RNP APCH.			
<p>⚠ Circling to Rwy 16, 34 NA at night. Rwy 28 helicopter visibility reduction below 1 SM NA. Straight-in and Circling Rwy 28 at night operational VGSI required, remain on or above VGSI glidepath until threshold. Circling Rwy 10 at night operational VGSI required, remain on or above VGSI glidepath until threshold.</p>		<p>MISSED APPROACH: Climb to 2000 direct MATHW and hold.</p>	

EAST HAMPTON, NEW YORK		AL-5016 (FAA)	20310
WAAS CH 40112 W10A	APP CRS 102°	Rwy Idg 4255 TDZE 55 Apt Elev 55	RNAV (GPS) Z RWY 10 EAST HAMPTON (HTO)
<p>⚠ NA Baro-VNAV NA when using Westhampton Beach altimeter setting. For uncompensated Baro-VNAV systems, LNAV/VNAV NA below -15°C (5°F) or above 54°C (130°F). DME/DME RNP-0.3 NA. Helicopter visibility reduction below 1 SM NA. When local altimeter setting not received, use Westhampton Beach altimeter setting and increase all DA 45 feet and increase LNAV/VNAV visibility ¼ mile all Cat. Night Landing: Rwy 10, 28</p>		<p>MISSED APPROACH: Climb to 2000 direct BIGGA and hold.</p>	

EAST HAMPTON, NEW YORK		AL-5016 (FAA)	20310
WAAS CH 49037 W28A	APP CRS 282°	Rwy Idg 4255 TDZE 46 Apt Elev 55	RNAV (GPS) Z RWY 28 EAST HAMPTON (HTO)
RNP APCH.			
<p>⚠ Circling to Rwy 16, 34 NA at night. Rwy 28 helicopter visibility reduction below 1 SM NA. For uncompensated Baro-VNAV systems, LNAV/VNAV NA below -15°C or above 48°C. Straight-in and Circling Rwy 28 at night operational VGSI required, remain on or above VGSI glidepath until threshold. Circling Rwy 10 at night operational VGSI required, remain on or above VGSI glidepath until threshold.</p>		<p>MISSED APPROACH: Climb to 2000 direct MATHW and hold.</p>	

Thus, after looking at five approaches and finding the “triangle A” on some charts and not others, the pilot concludes they can use KHTO as an alternate (with certain pilot judgment considerations of winds, etc.).

Discussion:

The data in the IFR Alternate Minimums section is inconsistent with the introduction of the section. Furthermore, the idea of putting some information in the IFR Alternate Minimums section and the other on the approach charts increases workload (ostensibly to save paper).

Recommendations:

Garmin suggests if any runway has non-standard alternate minimums or NA alternate minimums *all* runways should be listed in the IFR Alternate Minimums section for that airport.

Comments:

Submitted by: Dr. Bill Tuccio, Andrew Lewis

Organization: Garmin International

Phone: 913-440-6025

E-mail: bill.tuccio@garmin.com, Andrew.Lewis@garmin.com

Date: 3/30/2021

Please send completed form and any attachments to:
Valerie.S.Watson@faa.gov and Jennifer.L.Hendi@faa.gov

MEETING 21-01

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, presented the new recommendation. Bill explained that the data in the IFR Alternate Minimums section of the Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) is inconsistent with the explanatory guidance that is provided in the introduction of the section. He said that procedures with Alternate Minimums NA currently have the notation on the chart, but those procedures are not listed in the front of the TPP. He said this can lead to confusion because looking in the Alternate Minimums section, a pilot will not know if the unlisted procedures are standard or NA. Garmin suggested that any procedure that carry an “A” or an “A NA” should be listed in the Alternate Minimums section.

Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, said that if the ACM audience agrees, Terminal Charting could add those additional procedures to the Alternate Minimums. She clarified that if that step is taken, the “A NA” notation would be removed from individual charts and any chart with a listing in the front will carry an “A”. She said the explanatory guidance would also have to be updated to explain that if there is not an A notation on the charts, there is no entry in the Alternate Minimums section, and the procedure has standard alternate minimums. Bill agreed with Krystle’s suggestion.

Kevin Carter, NGA, says that the A notation on the chart is meaningless to military, but “A NA” is meaningful. He said the military would prefer to keep the “A NA” notation. Rich Boll, NBAA, Mike Stromberg, UPS, and John Moore, Jeppesen, all agreed with keeping the “A NA” on the approach chart.

Jeff Rawdon, FAA/AFS-420, asked Krystle how much effort and time would be required to make this change. Krystle said they would need to identify all the charts that contain “A NA” and then make the changes volume by volume. It would be a big effort, but she needs to investigate this further before determining a timeframe. She pointed out that this is not an automated process. Deb Copeland, FAA/AJV-A220, said this change will be a large level of effort and it might be something they need to wait to accomplish once they have an automated solution.

John Collins, ForeFlight, suggested that it would be helpful if the procedures with standard alternate minimums could also be listed so all the information can be found in a single location. Bill Tuccio agreed with that suggestion.

Jim Deuvall, CAVU Companies, said he thinks it would be better to leave things as they are. Rich said he is also concerned about moving forward and said this change will require changes in the training manuals and programs. Jim added that he thinks this could create confusion in where to look for non-standard alternate minimums and thinks this could be a problem all the way down to the flight instructor level.

There was further discussion regarding the best way to move forward. Jeff Rawdon pointed out that this effort is more complicated than it appears. He said first we need to understand the level of effort that would be required. He pointed out that this is not a safety concern and that the information is provided for pre-flight planning. He is unsure if the level of effort, potential confusion, additional training, etc., is justified. Valerie agreed and said she also has concerns about moving forward.

Valerie said the first step is for Terminal Charting to investigate this further to determine if they have the time and resources to work this issue. Once that has been determined, then the other aspects of this recommendation can be investigated further.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, will investigate this recommendation further to determine the level of effort required to add “A NA” entries to the Alternate Minimums Section of the Terminal Procedures Publication.

MEETING 21-02

Samer Massarueh, FAA/AJV-A223, reviewed the issue. Krystle Kime, FAA/AJV-A222, reported that at the April ACM, the decision was made that the “A NA” notation needs to remain on the approach charts. Krystle said Terminal Charting does not want to duplicate the “A NA” in the Alternate Minimums section of the Terminal Publications Procedure (TPP), however they would like to add some additional clarifying [text](#) to the alternate minimum explanatory text. Krystle also said there are over 3,000 charts with the “A-NA” notation so if there is a need to add those

entries to the alternate minimums section, that would have to wait until there is an automated solution.

Doug Willey, ALPA, stated that the original request was that any procedure that carries an “A” or an “A NA” should be listed in the Alternate Minimums section. He said that would still be preferable, but he understands if that cannot be accomplished at this time. Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, agreed that the additional language is helpful but is not a solution to the original request. Krystle agreed and committed to adding this to the list of changes that will be made when automation from procedure source is possible.

There was some discussion about the specific wording used in the revised text for the TPP description. Those changes have been captured in the linked document.

Bill Tuccio, Garmin, suggested that heliports should be added to the description. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-A250, said she will forward the proposed text to Joel Dickinson, FAA/AFS-410, and include the question regarding heliports.

STATUS: OPEN

ACTION: Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-A250, will process an Interagency Air Committee (IAC) specification change for the revised IFR Alternate Airport Minimums explanatory guidance.

MEETING 22-01

Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-A250, reported that the updated introductory text for the Alternate Airport Minimums section of the Terminal Procedures Publication was received from Flight Standards. The Interagency Air Committee specification change document has been approved and the [updated text](#) will be published with the 14 July 2022 effective date.

STATUS: CLOSED