FAA Control # 18-02-337

Subject: Improve remote altimeter airport notes.

Background/Discussion: Currently, notes that have an optional remote altimeter setting usually just list the city or airport name.

Example: If local altimeter setting not received, use Springfield altimeter setting...

In many cases, there may be several airports with similar names. There may also be more than one city with the same name nearby but located in different states.

One example of confusion over remote altimeter airport is located on the RNAV (GPS) RWY 7 at 4M7. The note reads "Use Springfield altimeter setting." There are two airport in two different states nearly in a town named Springfield. The Springfield AWOS is listed on the plate as 119.725. The closest Springfield airport is 17 NM south at M91, but the AWOS frequency does not match. The AWOS matches the Springfield airport at 6I2, 90 NM away.

Recommendations: Garmin recommends adding the airport identifier and appropriate frequency to the note. This will reduce pilot workload and possibility of confusion when selecting a remote altimeter setting.

Submitted by:	**Andrew Lewis**
Organization:	**Garmin**
Phone:	**913-440-5845**
E-mail:	**Andrew.Lewis@garmin.com**
Date:	**10/1/2018**

Initial Discussion – Meeting 18-02: Andrew Lewis (Garmin) briefed a new RD issue, with a recommendation to add an identifier to procedure notes dictating use of a remote altimeter. Andrew mentioned the example of a note specifying use of "Springfield Altimeter" setting; however, the note did not uniquely identify which Springfield setting to use even though there are multiple Springfield altimeters. Andrew suggested either using the AWOS frequency or ID as a means to specify the intended setting. Valerie Watson (AJV-553) indicated she like the idea of using the identifier within the procedure note, but cautioned against using a frequency since those do change which would in turn require a procedure amendment. John Bordy (Flight Procedures and Airspace Group) asked if this would be a workload increase on developers, to which some discussion followed. It was determined that developers currently use the identifier now to select an AWOS facility to use, but that changes to the automation system may be needed to add the identifier to the note intended for charting. John mentioned FAA Order 8260.19 would need to be amended to make this change; he will coordinate with Aeronautical Information Services to determine impact before drafting a change.

Action Item: John Bordy will coordinate with Aeronautical Information Services to determine impact, and if feasible, draft the required change within FAA Order 8260.19.

Status: Item open

Meeting 19-01: John Bordy, Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue directly from the slide: discussing a summary and current status. A review of Order 8260.19 found that there's already a requirement to include a state identifier whenever confusion could exist when there's more than one city with the same name in close proximity, for example, "When local altimeter setting not received, use Springfield, MO altimeter setting…" He also mentioned that the altimeter setting frequency on the RNAV (GPS) RWY 7 procedure at Russellville, KY has been corrected (although no state identifier was added). In light of the existing Order 8260.19 requirement, and the corrections made to the frequency on the procedure used in the original recommendation, is any change to policy actually really needed? Valerie Watson, AJV-A, stated there are stand-alone weather systems that aren't at airports, and; therefore, may not be associated with a city that has an airport. She also mentioned there are cities with multiple airports, so using city/state could be ambiguous whereas identifying weather systems with an identifier would be a means to identify them uniquely. Rich Boll, NBAA, prefers using the location identifiers of the airports of where the systems are located as opposed to cities/states. Valerie Watson suggested using the identifiers of the AWOS systems as that would address the stand-alone systems as well. John Bordy mentioned these suggestions would require changes to processes within AJV-A's Instrument Flight Procedures Group, so he took an action to obtain their feedback. John Bordy indicated he would introduce this item to the IFPP for consideration.

Action Items:
- John Bordy will coordinate with AJV-A Instrument Flight Procedures Group to determine impact.
- John Bordy will brief this at the US-IFPP 19-02.

Status: Item open

Meeting 19-02: John Bordy, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group, briefed the issue summary and current status from the slide. The issue is related to the use of city names to identify altimeter sources. John added Order 8260.19I language to specify that airport location identifiers would be used. Valerie Watson, FAA/AJV-A25, said the AWOS location identifier should be in the notes. John will discuss with Valerie to make sure the charting specification and 8260.19 document requirements are aligned, and will report back at the next meeting.

Action Items:
- FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will report on status of issue

Status: Item open

Meeting 20-02: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the slide. These changes did not make it into Order 8260.19I, but will be slated for an upcoming revision. Valerie Watson, FAA Aeronautical Information Services, said no charting specification changes were needed. Dan Wacker, FPAG,

asked if any Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) or Instrument Procedures Handbook (IPH) changes will be necessary. Doug Dixon, FAA Flight Operations Group (FOG), will check but thinks no changes will be necessary in the AIM. Joel Dickinson, FOG, will look at the IPH for any necessary changes. They both advised they will work any identified changes.

Action Items:
- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will report on status of issue
- Doug Dixon and Joel Dickinson, Flight Operations Group, will report on necessity of AIM and/or IPH changes, and report status of any revisions

Status: Item open

Meeting 21-01: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary and current status from the slide. Draft language is still being worked by the FPAG, and will be worked in conjunction with the Flight Operations Group.

Action Items:
- Flight Procedures and Airspace Group will report on status of 8260.19 language updates and initiate necessary document change proposals for the AIM and/or IPH
- Joel Dickinson, Flight Operations Group, will report on necessity of AIM and/or IPH changes, and report status of any revisions

Status: Item open

Meeting 21-02: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the work on this issue has been done in conjunction with ACM IPG RD **19-01-343: Clarify Text of Notes that Affect Minima,** so the decision was made to brief and discuss the issues together. Jeff discussed both issues from the briefing slides. Rune Duke, FPAG, said he, Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group (FOG), and Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, have discussed the issue internally and included Garmin as the proponent of both issues, and have made substantial progress (slides). Rune discussed the two issues separately from slides, adding the Chart Modernization working group, chaired by Rich Boll, NBAA, was looking at similar proposals, and so those efforts were considered. This resulted in a revised scope of work (slide) for these two issues, and the decision was made to consider only clarification of remote altimeter setting source (RASS) adjustment notes in the briefing strip, to be implemented on a day-forward basis. Rune discussed RASS (slides) and showed possible note examples and formats. A standardization guide was discussed with word usage and location identifier guidelines. Formats and examples for both simple and complex RASS notes were displayed , noting this is an effort to clarify, not change the notes. Draft AIM language for paragraph 5-4-5.a.4 was shown, as well as what would potentially change in RASS criteria. Rune is requesting feedback via the shown address. Diane added use of location identifiers would be in the next version of

Order 8260.19. John Barry, FAA Aircraft Certification, inquired about use of the word "by" (applicable to increases of minima), with no examples regarding visibility. Rune will work on modifying the slides to show this and update the presentations for the minutes. Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, likes the presentation overall, but would prefer use of the ICAO airport identifier to distinguish from NAVAIDs. They also would prefer the use of a consistent word in front of all numbers ("by" or "to"), somewhat similar to John's previous comments. Rune said the group would consider both. Andrew Lewis, Garmin, suggested adding a few examples with step down fix minima. Dan Wacker, FPAG, said they struggle in the Departure Working Group when industry changes words without a safety case. This process can take many years creating disconnect in the AIM, and said there would need to be explanations and examples of both old and new language. Joshua said this is not a change, just a better-worded note, and hopes it is an easy change. Dan asked if the AIM will be changed simultaneously with Order 8260.19 changes, and Diane said current AIM language is not clear. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), added if this is clarifying the text and making it easier to read, it should not add workload since the change would be day-forward. The issues both remain open and a specific date for the requested feedback (as discussed and requested by Rune) will be published in the minutes.

Actions: Request group feedback via attached link by February 11, 2022. Status updates to be provided at the next ACM.

Status: Item open

Meeting 22-01: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), said there are several open issues that are somewhat related, and briefed this item in conjunction with open ACM issue **19-01-343: Clarify Text of Notes that Affect Minima (slide)**. These issues were submitted at different meetings. Rune Duke, FPAG, and Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, briefed the issues at ACM 21-02. Rune said they presented some solutions to provide clarity for the notes, received comments prior to and during ACM 21-02, but received no additional comments since the meeting. Rune said they incorporated the previous recommendations into the proposed revision. Order 8260.19 and Aeronautical Information Manual (AIM) guidance updates continue on both of these items. Criteria already exists to not require a backup altimeter when the airport weather is on WMSCR. Order 8260.19J is currently in coordination, and has the revised requirement to use the airport identifier instead of the city/airport name for the backup altimeter source. Steve Madigan, Garmin, asked how industry would know if a backup altimeter is on WMSCR service, and would there be any chance of providing a public distribution channel for 8260-9 forms that contain the remote backup altimeter setting information. Pat Mulqueen, FAA Instrument Flight Procedures Group (AJV-400), said the form access request is already being investigated. Jeff recapped the FAA is working on Order 8260.19 changes and AIM updates. Both issues will remain open.

Actions: FPAG will provide continuing status updates to Order 8260.19 and AIM changes.

Status: Item open

Meeting 22-02: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue from the slide. For years, the city name was used to reference the source and the suggestion was to use the airport identifier. Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, said this change was incorporated in Order 8260.19J, Flight Procedures and Airspace, which will be published soon. Jeff added there were no negative comments received related to this revision during coordination. Associated AIM changes will be coordinated and will be published relatively concurrent with the order publication. There will be some time after the order is signed before the criteria changes are fully implemented and further time before amended procedures will be promulgated, so the time between order publication and AIM revision should not be an issue. Jeff confirmed this will be a day-forward effort and feels the issue can be closed. Vince Massimini, NavTec, does not object to closing the issue but did wonder if we should keep it open pending AIM revisions. Andrew Fenwick, Garmin, said this was his original RD, and asked if the ICAO airport identifiers would be used. Diane said when there is an ICAO identifier it will be used. Andrew does not have any objection to the issue closing. Jeff said there is no example of AIM language yet, but it will be worked as the order language changes. Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group (FOG), said they are currently working several AIM changes, and this change is part of that effort. Jeff showed the slide with example language from Order 8260.19J. Vince pointed out that some U.S. airports do not have ICAO identifiers, and that is what the language is trying to reflect. Andrew suggested changing the wording to use ICAO identifiers when available, such as in Alaska. Valerie Watson, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), agreed with Andrew adding that procedures would typically use FAA identifiers in the Continental U.S. and thinks the Order 8260.19 language should be modified. Bruce McGray, FPAG, suggests only using ICAO when appropriate. Krystal Kime, FAA Aeronautical Information Services Terminal Charting, suggests using FAA identifiers for CONUS airports. Doug Willey, Air Line Pilots Association (ALPA), suggested using ICAO when available and FAA identifiers otherwise to avoid confusion for foreign pilots. Diane said she will consider the draft order language for possible changes to ensure clarity. Andrew said he prefers using just the ICAO identifier.

Actions: FPAG will consider modifying the Order 8260.19J language prior to publication and will report status at ACM 23-01.

Status: Item open

Meeting 23-01: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue summary, actions, and status from the slide. An AIM update to describe remote altimeter notes is under consideration. Criteria revisions have been incorporated into Order 8260.19J which will be published soon. Examples of the new criteria language were shown on a (slide). Joshua Fenwick, Garmin, said this effort is helping their original concern, though expressed that it would be more desirable to use the identifier KSKF rather than SKF on the example slide. Jennifer Hendi, FAA Charting Products Integration Team (AJV-A250), said they use FAA identifiers within the contiguous U.S. and use ICAO otherwise. Joshua said it would help if ICAO nomenclature was always used. Jeff will discuss this with Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, though pointed out that it was too late to change the language as shown in 8260.19J.

John Barry, FAA Aircraft Certification, asked Garmin about 4-letter FAA airport identifiers, and Joshua said they are not an issue for Garmin. Rich Boll, NBAA, said entering a three-letter identifier without the preceding "K" (for example, "ICT" instead of "KICT") on a METAR weather website would not find the location. Rich suggested using the ICAO identifier would probably be the best solution. Joshua suggested this is an infrequent issue, and Rich agreed it doesn't occur often, but still does occur.

Mark Mentovai, Manhattan Flight Club, suggested not delaying the existing language based on identifier questions as it will be an improvement, and the identifier issue would be an infrequent occurrence. Jeff will discuss the possibility of using ICAO identifiers with Diane but assured there will be no delay in publication of Order 8260.19J over this issue.

Mike Stromberg, Independent Pilots Association (IPA)/UPS, added the standard in aviation weather is the 4-letter ICAO identifier and fixing the language now would be desirable. Jeff noted the consensus seems to be that a change to ICAO identifier would be desirable.

John Moore, Boeing/Jeppesen, discussed that in other countries ICAO identifiers are used only for the international airports.

John Collins, Foreflight/Boeing, suggested caution, pointing out that just adding a "K" in front of the identifier can create issues, for example 35A versus K35A. In addition, John suggested that could create ERAM filing issues if incorrect ICAO identifiers were used and considers this a general issue rather than specific to these notes.

Actions:

- FPAG will consider using ICAO identifiers for the altimeter setting notes as a possible future Order 8260.19 revision and report decisions.
- FPAG and FAA Flight Operations Group will continue to address potential AIM updates in conjunction with those from RD 19-01-343.

Status: Item open

Meeting 23-02: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue from the slide. As previously briefed, the changes were incorporated in Order 8260.19J which was published in June 2023. Regarding the inquiry from ACM 23-01 about revising the order to use only ICAO airport identifiers, Jeff briefed that it was considered previously, but the decision was made to use FAA identifiers for CONUS airports for consistency with charting norms. FPAG and Flight Operations Group (FOG) have completed a draft update for AIM paragraph 5-4-5.a.4 (slide) which was presented. Rich Boll, NBAA, suggested incorporating all the possible variations of city, city/state, or airport names might not be necessary and suggested adding examples as a note at the bottom of the paragraph instead; one with names, and one with identifiers. Andrew Lewis, Garmin, likes the proposal and agrees with Rich's suggestion on revisions to the proposed AIM language.

Actions: FPAG will revise the proposed AIM language and coordinate with Rich Boll to make sure Rich's suggestions were understood, and FPAG and FOG will submit a DCP for the AIM change.

Status: Item open

Meeting 24-01: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue from the slide. The criteria was changed several years ago to utilize airport identifiers. The proposed AIM/AIP language was adjusted due to discussions at ACM 23-02, and the document change proposal (DCP) for those changes will be processed along with changes associated with AC 90-119 updates. The proposed changes were shown (slide) and discussed.

Gary Fiske, FAA ATC Procedures (Terminal) Team (AJV-P310), likes the change but does not see the benefit of the extra language describing the old and new note standards. Jeff said this language is due to the day-forward implementation since both methods will be present until all affected procedures have been amended at which point the AIM would be revised to only reference the airport identifiers.
Bill Tuccio, Garmin, suggested elimination of the note altogether by incorporating the most adverse altimeter adjustment. Jeff explained that the most adverse adjustment would be quite large and would significantly impact those procedures that have minimal adjustments.
Steven Madigan, Garmin, echoed Gary's concerns, pointing out it could appear the different methodologies might lead developers to think they could use either. Jeff said the change is not ambiguous for developers since they use Order 8260.19 and would not use the AIM for documentation policy information.

Michael Stromberg, Independent Pilots Association (IPA)/UPS, suggested alternate verbiage to say backup altimeter notes use the airport identifier but older procedures may show the city or airport name. Diane Adams-Maturo, FPAG, agreed with Michael's suggestion. Joel Dickinson, FAA Flight Operations Group, Diane, and Jeff revised the proposed language and presented it to the group later in the meeting and the group expressed support for the revised language (slide).

Steven asked Pat Mulqueen, FAA Instrument Flight Procedures Group (AJV-400), about implementation timelines, especially with respect to P-NOTAMs, and mentioned that a relatively recent NOTAM that appeared incorrect. Pat explained that changes have been implemented for full and abbreviated amendments and asked Steven to forward the information regarding that specific NOTAM for investigation.

Jeff explained that this item would be moved to action pending status since the only work remaining is the AIM/AIP DCP processing which will be scheduled for a later date. (Editor's note: The decision was made following the meeting to proceed with initiation of the DCP for this AIM/AIP change. Due to that decision, the action to initiate the DCP has been added, and the status will remain as "item open.") Actions: Jeff Rawdon, FPAG, will initiate the Document Change Proposal (DCP) to revise the AIM/AIP with the proposed language.

Status: Item open

Meeting 24-02: Jeff Rawdon, FAA Flight Procedures and Airspace Group (FPAG), briefed the issue from a slide. The AIM/AIP document change proposal (DCP) has been submitted with publication expected in September 2025.

Status: Moved to action pending status.