Subject: IFR Alternate Minimums Presentation in FAA TPP

Background/Discussion:
The FAA U.S. Terminal Procedures Publication (TPP) “IFR Alternate Minimums” section purports to show:

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 (1st paragraph, TPP, IFR Alternate Minimums Section).

The next two scenarios demonstrate the inconsistency of the information in the IFR Alternate Minimums section with this introduction as well as pilot workload issues.

Scenario #1: Ellenville Airport (N89) as an alternate
A review of the IFR Alternate Minimums section shows the following:

Ellenville is not found. The pilot may assume N89 therefore has standard alternate minima (800-2 in this case).

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