



CENTENNIAL AIRPORT COMMUNITY NOISE ROUNDTABLE MINUTES

August 5, 2026

Approved September 2, 2026

Chair: Pam Thompson **Vice Chair:** Vacant **Treasurer:** Andy Jones **Secretary:** Alison Biggs

VISION – QUIETER SKIES FOR OUR COMMUNITIES

MISSION – CACNR WILL BRING TOGETHER AIRPORT, COMMUNITY, FAA, AND AVIATION INDUSTRY REPRESENTATIVES TO COLLABORATIVELY IDENTIFY AND DISCUSS NOISE ISSUES AT CENTENNIAL AIRPORT AND RECOMMEND COURSES OF ACTION THAT COULD REDUCE NOISE OVER AFFECTED COMMUNITIES.

1. **CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, and QUORUM:** The meeting was called to order at 6:31 p.m. by Chair Pam Thompson. The following were in attendance, and a quorum was present:

Arapahoe County:	Rhonda Fields	Foxfield:	Pam Thompson
Douglas County:	DJ Beckwith	Greenwood Village:	Donna Johnston
Douglas County:	Alison Biggs	Highlands Ranch Metro:	Andy Jones
Elbert County:	Brenda Dyche	Parker:	Bryce Matthews online
Aurora:	Brad Pierce	ACPAA:	Michael Fronapfel
Castle Pines:	Chris Eubanks online	AOPA:	Joe Patton
Centennial:	Don Sheehan	CABA:	Don Kuskie
Cherry Hills Village:	Dave Heller online		

Also present: FAA Senior Program Analyst, Northwest Mountain Region Jennifer Redding, online; Elbert County Alternate Representative Diedra Dyche; ACPAA Alternate Representative Zach Gabehart; AOPA Alternate Representative Mike Koscielniak; and ACPAA Staff Matt Frenette, Luis Gonzales, Jeremy Gunn, Brycen Hoover, and Lauren Wiarda.

Representatives from Aspen Flying Club and Epic Flight Academy were also in attendance, as were citizen Kim Hellweg online; citizen Mark Horton online; Alpine Design Agency's Dave Johnson online; citizen Randy Johnson; citizen Joe Panem; citizen Bette Todd; pilot/instructor Bill Ward; and citizen Alan Y online.

Finally, CACNR was pleased to welcome Eric Dahl – Airport Director, Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport; Eric Vences – Airport Director, Boulder Municipal Airport; and Levi Brown – Airport Director, Longmont Airport.

Absent: Arapahoe County:	Sreenivasan Alakappan/Vacant	Lone Tree:	Mike Parr/Chuck Darnell
Elbert County:	Mike Buck/Shawn Fletcher	CDOT Aeronautics Div:	Todd Green/Vacant
Castle Rock;	Laura Cavey/Sandy Vossler	Wings Over the Rockies:	Bill Wasmund/Vacant

SPECIAL APPOINTMENT TO CACNR VICE CHAIR POSITION: There were no volunteers for the position of CACNR Vice Chair. Chair Pam Thompson indicated the topic would be revisited before the closure of the meeting.

2. **CONSENT AGENDA:** The Consent Agenda included the draft CACNR Minutes from June 3, 2026; the Treasurer's Report from July 31, 2026, showing a balance of \$27,587.53; and the CACNR Attendance Record through July, 2026. On the motion of Andy Jones, duly seconded, the Consent Agenda was approved.

3. **ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA:** None.

4. **PART 150 STUDY UPDATE:**

A. **UPDATE** – Kate Andrus was present from Mead & Hunt to present the report which had been included in the meeting's Emailed materials, and which was appreciated.

It was again noted the group the consultants call the FAA Study Group was actually CACNR's Study Group Committee.

In the Spring, there had been discussion about pros and cons of the alternatives that were being considered and what the modeling would look like. This presentation included the anticipated Part 150 recommendations to be made to the FAA. The draft noise compatibility program would be published for public review and comment in the Fall. It was noted the ACPAA did not show up on the Part 150 Study Process slide, even though the program would have to be submitted to the FAA in the name of ACPAA – where did it fit? It was apparently subliminally part of the Public Hearing and Adoption Step 10. Following the Fall public hearing, any revisions the consultants felt necessary would be made for the ACPAA to consider and agree to before submittal to the FAA.

Various Operational Measure alternatives had been considered, and the actions taken on them were reviewed. Following review or modeling, the reasoning behind dropping some of the alternatives was explained and those which remained were discussed.

All of the listed Facility Measure, Land Use Measure, and Administrative (program management) Measure alternatives which had been seen before remained to be included. Recommendations from the last Part 150 study had been studied to see what had been appropriate, what conditions were new, and if changes were to be recommended. Comments from the jurisdictions related to the airport influence area had been considered, resulting in some revisions. Other areas such as the fly quiet program, airspace redesign and the noise monitoring program had received some revision since the last Part 150 but were not substantially new.

Question was asked if exits from the recommended high-speed taxiways might increase the number of runway incursions because of potential separation or lack of separation resulting from the exits. Based on the proposed locations, coming off the runway that they'd be coming off of onto an adjacent taxiway, there would not be direct access onto the next runway. The FAA apparently had some funding planned to assist with implementing this recommendation, and it was included in the airport's capital improvement plan for next year.

In the airport influence area, a recommended change was extending the Transit Oriented Development Buffer Zone (TOD BZ) from its smaller existing area to Havana Street. Apparently, the idea was to have multifamily residential units within a half mile from transit oriented development such as light rail stations. Question was asked why we would be willing to recommend putting housing underneath where there already was noise when putting noise on the west side it I25 had been turned down. The idea was to utilize stacked multifamily structures where insulation was included in the construction standards. Some of this was in response to already existing development pressure. It was acknowledge that this would still present an increased noise challenge.

That only 3% of complaints had come from multifamily residences over a year, possibly because of how they were constructed, having only one exposed wall, having a higher noise level with people living closely around, and the proximity to highway noise had been part of the consideration of this recommendation. Observation was made that the same conditions exist on the other side of the highway, so why was this area selected? There had apparently been similar concerns expressed by some pilots in relation to the difficulty of avoiding overflights here because of how close the area was to the flight track approach zones.

In addition to the airport influence area, a notification program was being recommended for an ILS flight corridor noise notification program due to the large number of overflights in the ILS area where there was considerable development and development pressure. Those moving into that area should have notification about what will be occurring overhead. The designated area extends to just north of Castle Rock, approximately ten miles. The jurisdictions involved would be responsible for implementing the recommendation, so the specifics of how that would occur would likely vary considerably, if implemented at all, and if it would be carried through to subsequent buyers.

Andrus welcomed ideas on how the process should work, perhaps linked to the plat, or could there be a mandatory requirement for listing agents to do the notification. That might take legislation or working with the agents' professional association to make it similar to other required disclosures. It was anticipated there would be strong resistance from the real estate and development communities, but the consultants felt it was something to be advanced to see if there was any support. She indicated they would help in any way possible. It could be something to take to city councils to see if they would support implementation of the recommendation.

It was noted CACNR has had numerous discussions about the need for such notifications to be provided long before closing when buyers are faced with so many things to sign that the notification gets lost and becomes essentially useless. There did not seem to be any examples of anywhere where this has worked earlier in the buying process, although Florida, California and Washington state might have something which the consultants would explore.

The consultants would be speaking to the Study Advisory Committee on August 12, and make revisions based on what they had heard that group and CACNR. The document would then be scheduled for a public hearing, probably in late October. Revisions from there would be done and that draft taken to ACPAA for approval to be submitted to the FAA, hopefully before the end of the calendar year. Andrus was thanked for her presentation.

B. PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE – No report.

5. NOISE REPORTS:

A. The May 2026 Noise Report included the following information:

May Local Operations:	14,095	May Total Operations:	27,957
Year to Date Local Operations:	62,417	Year to Date Total Operations:	126,994

27,957 Total Operations in May resulted in 912 complaints from 71 households.

May Noise Events:							
May Total:		May 60 – 69 db:		May 70 – 79 db:		May 80 – 89 db:	
Meridian	8,734	Meridian	7,025	Golf Course	2,793	Airport East	444
Golf Course	7,363	Golf Course	4,376	Meridian	1,661	Golf Course	193

Airport East	2,794	Parker	2,462	Airport East	885	Meridian	47
Parker	2,710	State Park	1,541	State Park	753	Castle Pines	41
State Park	2,302	P1 Orch/Havana	1,462	P1 Orch/Havana	302	P1 Orch/Havana	20
P1 Orch/Havana	1,786	Airport East	1,421	Parker	241	Lone Tree	14
Grandview Estates	1,526	Grandview Estates	1,385	Grandview Estates	136	Greenwood Village	8
Castle Rock	1,131	Castle Rock	1,020	Castle Rock	109	State Park	8
Greenwood Village	929	Greenwood Village	815	Greenwood Village	106	Parker	6
Lone Tree	766	Lone Tree	689	Castle Pines	62	Grandview Estates	5
Hunters Hill	447	Hunters Hill	409	Lone Tree	43	Hunters Hill	5
Castle Pines	384	Castle Pines	278	Hunters Hill	33	Castle Rock	2
Sagebrush Park	82	Sagebrush Park	74	Sagebrush Park	8	Sagebrush Park	0

May Noise Events in the 90+ decibel range: Airport East – 44 Lone Tree – 20 Castle Pines - 3 Golf Course – 1 Meridian – 1 Parker - 1

May Noise Complaints per Municipality		Numbers of Households:		YTD Complaints and		Number of Households:	
Unincorporated Douglas County	362 (40%)	UAC	25 (35%)	UDC	1,035 (32%)	UAC	38 (28%)
Unincorporated Arapahoe County	216 (24%)	UDC	17 (24%)	UAC	710 (22%)	GV	28 (20%)
Greenwood Village	154 (17%)	Greenwood Village	12 (17%)	Centennial	485 (15%)	UDC	28 (20%)
Centennial	88 (10%)	Other	5 (7%)	GV	420 (13%)	Other	10 (7%)
Unincorporated Elbert County	64 (7%)	UEC	4 (6%)	UEC	418 (13%)	Lone Tree	7 (5%)
Castle Rock	9 (1%)	Castle Rock	2 (3%)	Lone Tree	58 (2.5%)	Centennial	6
Denver	8	Centennial	2 (3%)	Other	29	HR	6
Other	8	Castle Pines	1	Denver	18	UEC	5
Castle Pines	1	Denver	1	Castle Rock	15	Parker	3
Highlands Ranch	1	Highlands Ranch	1	Highlands Ranch	9	Denver	2
Lone Tree	1	Lone Tree	1	Parker	4	Castle Pines	2
Aurora	0	Aurora	0	Castle Pines	3	Castle Rock	2
Cherry Hills Village	0	Parker	0	Aurora	0	Aurora	0
Parker	0	Cherry Hills Village	0	Cherry Hills Village	0	CHV	0

Year to Date, the top five households complaining were:

Household #1 445 (14%) Centennial	Household #4 294 (9%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County
Household #2 414 (13%) Unincorporated Elbert County	Household #5 271 (8%) Unincorporated Douglas County
Household #3 406 (13%) Unincorporated Douglas County	Remaining Households 1374 (43%)

In May, 100 noise complaint responses were completed from 912 noise complaints, with 92 of those by email and 8 by telephone.

In May 715 complaints were received from 7:00 a.m. – 9:59 p.m. (78%)
197complaints were received from 10:00 p.m. – 6:59 a.m. (22%)

In May props accounted for **92% of the complaints by aircraft type; jets** accounted for **8% of the complaints**, and **helicopters caused 0%**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed propellers had caused 91% of the complaints; jets caused 7%, and helicopters caused 2%.

In May departures were responsible for **22% of the complaints**, **training** was responsible for **66% of the complaints**, and **arrivals** were responsible for **12% of the complaints**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed training had caused 65% of the complaints, departures had caused 25%, and arrivals had caused 10%.

A graph was provided showing the **May number of complaints by the hour** in which they were made, with a peak at 5 a.m. hour matching peak at 8 a.m. hour but remains high through the 5-9 a.m. hour. A decline begins after 10 a.m. remains through the evening hours; a slight bump in complaints is observed at 9 p.m.

The map of household locations and numbers of complaints was included, as was the May Radar Track Density Map.

Question was asked if the early morning spike in complaints was outside of the study group study parameters, and they were not necessarily only those. Looking at nighttime outliers only looks at those that go north of Arapahoe Road into the study area, and there were only nine of those, so the number here included pure departures from the airport.

Observation was made that there had been a long time promise the portable noise monitor in Greenwood Village was going to be included in the Part 150 study, and it did not seem to be mentioned. It would be considered as part of the administrative measure that recommended looking at the noise monitoring system as a whole, and it would then be determined if it fit. There was concern that did not seem to be meeting past commitments. For the purpose of the Part 150, the FAA would no longer pay for noise monitors outside of the 65 DNL as this one was, so specifically including it would not receive a positive response from the FAA. There would be a need for local funds to make the P1 monitor permanent.

It was noted this area consistently had one of the highest numbers of complaints yet being listed only as portable with no name to identify where it was located made it appear the noise was not of an important nature. The key for it not being specifically included in the Part 150 seemed to hinge around the knowledge that because of its rule change, the FAA would not pay for making it permanent.

But having the broader recommendation might open the door for its specific reconsideration if the FAA's rules changed again. It was noted the airport indicated it could look to include making the monitor permanent in its budget for next year.

Question was asked about the higher noise event numbers in Lone Tree. Staff had gone back eight years and had noted the same increase trend every year.

B. The June 2026 Noise Report included the following information:

June Local Operations:	13,877	June Total Operations:	28,354
Year to Date Local Operations:	76,294	Year to Date Total Operations:	155,348

28,354 Total Operations in June resulted in 1045 complaints from 60 households.

June Total:		June Noise Events:			
		June 60 – 69 db:	June 70 – 79 db:	June 80 – 89 db:	
Golf Course	9,509	Meridian	7,594	Golf Course	3,994
Meridian	9,280	Golf Course	5,328	Meridian	1,625
Airport East	2,438	Parker	2,220	Airport East	747
Parker	2,392	State Park	1,631	State Park	743
State Park	2,385	P1 Orch/Havana	1,540	P1 Orch/Havana	283
P1 Orch/Havana	1,837	Grandview Estates	1,362	Parker	171
Grandview Estates	1,475	Airport East	1,340	Grandview Estates	111
Castle Rock	1,062	Castle Rock	1,017	Lone Tree	85
Lone Tree	940	Greenwood Village	830	Greenwood Village	67
Greenwood Village	903	Lone Tree	781	Castle Pines	71
Castle Pines	356	Hunters Hill	303	Castle Rock	44
Hunters Hill	328	Castle Pines	278	Hunters Hill	23
Sagebrush Park	123	Sagebrush Park	118	Sagebrush Park	5
				Airport East	325
				Golf Course	180
				Meridian	59
				Lone Tree	45
				P1 Orch/Havana	14
				State Park	10
				Castle Pines	7
				Greenwood Village	5
				Hunters Hill	2
				Parker	1
				Grandview Estates	1
				Castle Rock	1
				Sagebrush Park	0

June Noise Events in the 90+ decibel range: Airport East – 26 Lone Tree – 29 Golf Course – 7 Meridian – 2 Grandview Estates – 1
State Park - 1 Greenwood Village - 1

June Noise Complaints per Municipality		Numbers of Households:		YTD Complaints and		Number of Households:	
Unincorporated Douglas County	328 (31%)	UAC	18 (30%)	UDC	1,363 (32%)	UAC	46 (29%)
Unincorporated Arapahoe County	324 (31%)	UDC	13 (22%)	UAC	1,034 (24%)	UDC	32 (20%)
Unincorporated Elbert County	132 (13%)	Greenwood Village	9 (15%)	Centennial	590 (14%)	GV	29 (89%)
Greenwood Village	130 (13%)	Other	7 (12%)	GV	550 (13%)	Other	13 (7%)
Centennial	105 (7%)	Centennial	5 (8%)	UEC	550 (13%)	Centennial	9 (6%)
Other	16 (1½ %)	Denver	2 (3%)	Lone Tree	59 (1%)	Lone Tree	7 (4%)
Denver	4	Highlands Ranch	2 (3%)	Other	45	HR	5
Castle Rock	2	Denver	2 (3%)	Denver	22	UEC	5
Highlands Ranch	1	Castle Rock	1	Castle Rock	17	Parker	3
Lone Tree	1	UEC	1	Highlands Ranch	11	Denver	2
Parker	1	Parker	1	Parker	5	Castle Pines	2
Aurora	0	Aurora	0	Castle Pines	3	Castle Rock	2
Cherry Hills Village	0	Castle Pines	0	Aurora	0	Aurora	0
Castle Pines	0	Cherry Hills Village	0	Cherry Hills Village	0	CHV	0

Year to Date, the top five households complaining were:

Household #1 546 (13%) Unincorporated Elbert County	Household #4 393 (9%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County
Household #2 545 (13%) Centennial	Household #5 365 (9%) Unincorporated Douglas County
Household #3 522 (12%) Unincorporated Douglas County	Remaining Households 1878 (44%)

In June, 83 noise complaint responses were completed from 1045 noise complaints, with 79 of those by email and 4 by telephone.

In June 840 complaints were received from 7:00 a.m. – 9:59 p.m. (80%)
205 complaints were received from 10:00 p.m. – 6:59 a.m. (20%)

In June props accounted for **91% of the complaints by aircraft type**; jets accounted for **7% of the complaints**, and helicopters caused **2%**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed propellers had caused 91% of the complaints; jets caused 7%, and helicopters caused 2%.

In June departures were responsible for **30% of the complaints**, training was responsible for **56% of the complaints**, and arrivals were responsible for **14% of the complaints**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed training had caused 55% of the complaints, departures had caused 31%, and arrivals had caused 14%.

A graph was provided showing the **June number of complaints by the hour** in which they were made, with a peak at 7 a.m. hour. A decline begins after 7 a.m. and remains steady through the evening hours; a slight bump in complaints is observed at 7 & 9 p.m.

The map of household locations and numbers of complaints was included, as was the June Radar Track Density Map.

It was noted that complaints by operation type for training flights had changed from 66% in May to 56% in June, but numbers of complaints were up.

C. PORTABLE MONITOR REPORT:

**Portable Noise Monitor Location – Greenwood Village
4.1 NM Northwest of Centennial Airport
Report Date Range – 5/21 – 16/18/2026**

Centennial Airport Associated Flight Track within 1 Mile of NMT by Aircraft Type

Propeller 956	Jet 400	Helicopter 21	Total 1,377
---------------	---------	---------------	-------------

Centennial Airport Associated Flight Track within 1 Mile of NMT by Operation Type

Arrival 173	Departure 613	Training 591	Total 1,377
-------------	---------------	--------------	-------------

Airport	Arrival	Departure	Training	Total
Centennial (KAPA)	173	613	591	1,377
Denver Intl (KDEN)	127	96	1	224
Colorado Air & Space Port (KCFO)	1	4	2	7
Rocky Mountain Metro (KBJC)	14	17	8	39
Northern CO Regional (KFNL)	2	1	0	2
Colorado Springs (KCOS)	1	1	0	2
Pueblo (KPUB)	0	0	0	0

Noise Data

Aircraft DNL (The 24-hour average sound level of aircraft with a 10dB penalty for nighttime noise events.)	41.5 dB
Community DNL (The 24-hour average sound level of the community with a 10dB penalty for nighttime noise events)	52.9 dB
Total DNL (The 24-hour average sound level with a 10dB penalty for nighttime noise events)	53.2 dB
Average Aircraft LMax (dB) (The peak noise level for a single aircraft noise event)	67.4 dB

Noise Events

Centennial Airport Aircraft Noise Events at Noise Monitor	617
Non-Centennial Airport Aircraft Noise Events at Noise Monitor	29
Total Aircraft Noise Events at Noise Monitor	646
Total Community Noise Events at Noise Monitor	833

Noise Events at Noise Monitor

Decibel Range (dB)	Centennial Airport Aircraft	Non-Centennial Airport	Community
60-69	496	25	503
70-79	68	0	158
80-89	1	0	43
90+	0	0	2

The monitor had been placed at the request of the resident, and the results reported back. Next month there would be another report, from a location straight east of the crosswind runway. The altitude of flights over this location were probably around a thousand feet or slightly below. 1,300 flights also did present a frequency problem, perhaps more than an actual noise level concern. This resident had not responded back after receiving the report, but was invited to contact the airport if any support or other response was desired. Roundtable Representatives were asked to take note of the noise reports, particularly as they might relate to their constituents.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT:

A. MEETING ATTENDEES/VIRTUAL ATTENDEES –

- Bill Ward, pilot and flight instructor at Centennial Airport remembered this Part 150 was first initiated because of the increase in traffic pattern work and the amount of pattern work done at the airport. But the pattern has to exist for the airport to function, and it cannot be moved or changed. So the only fix to the noise problem is to object in the strongest way possible to any incompatible land uses in areas that knowingly have or will have a noise problem. When government personnel ask that a noise problem be fixed, but then subsequently approve more incompatible land uses up against the airport fence, it is hard for the pilot community to take them seriously. He provided some examples of such developments which have occurred around Centennial

He noted that even in a buffer zone close to the airport, underneath the downwind leg there was no amount of triple pane windows or insulation that would block the noise out. He felt strongly that the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) was a bad idea. Denver is an urban sprawl town which is not really walkable, so that was a misleading approach and endorsing and putting housing in areas that knowingly have a noise problem was not a good idea. He suggested getting rid of the TOD entirely.

- Randy Johnson from Louviers, south of Chatfield and west of I25, noted the several types of planes which had flown over his home. He had recorded 234 from Centennial and 142 from Rocky Mountain, although he might have missed some from Rocky Mountain because of the volume of flights from Centennial. He had submitted 118 complaints about Centennial flights, and only eight about Rocky Mountain, again some were missed due to the volume related to Centennial. In July, he recorded 609 overall flights, with 272 from Centennial, 148 from Rocky Mountain, and 77 from the Air Force Academy. He had submitted 160 complaints, which is about five per day to Centennial, 16 to Rocky Mountain, and he had also called the Air Force Academy a few times.

Of those 160 complaints, he had been able to identify how many were from each of the various flight schools and that information was available. On the Saturday prior to this meeting, by 9:45 a.m. there had been 17 flights over his home; by 10:45 there were 28 and by noon there had been 33. Again, he was able to identify the identity of most of the planes, and had submitted nine complaints with that specific information. He did wish to thank CACNR for its efforts, as it did seem more pilots might be avoiding flying directly overhead

B. RECEIVED BY CACNR –

- Emails had been received from Randy Johnson related to flights directly over Louviers.
- Emails had been received from Joe Panem regarding financial and health impacts, unbearable stress and disruption throughout the days. It was noted that some kudos were due because after the last flight school meeting, Pam Thompson had gotten an email from Panem indicating they had had one quiet day. One day was not much, but it must have been a relief nonetheless. Panem had contacted Zach Gabehart with questions about such things as how noise complaints are reviewed and handled when they are received, and if the airport takes follow-up actions based on complaint data. The dot map does show areas needing attention with operators. Noise data has been used in formulating noise abatement initiatives, and has also been provided to the FAA. CACNR does recognize the problems and tries to work with the resources available. Information from the public is invaluable to that process.

- Brenda Dyché spoke briefly to the emails she had submitted about the situations in her area from low flying aircraft, aircraft doing ground maneuvers, and repetitive flights over homes. She had provided graphic evidence of the many flights in the 3 Towers practice box over her home, and indicated she would speak more to the problems later in the meeting.

- Emails from Lisa Esquivel who is in the Study Group Committee study area close to Arapahoe Road, had inquired about the need for observation of the fly quiet hours. She had been encouraged to report flights not observing the fly quiet hours because that information would be used as data in the dashboard and show up in the offenders' rankings. She had been under the impression that the airport would lose funding because of complaints, and it was clarified that was an erroneous assumption – the airport does not lose funding if there are complaints.

- Lastly, another email had been received just today from Joe Panem, expressing concern about flights beginning as early as 5:40 a.m. and continuing late into the evening. There was almost a non-stop pattern where one propeller aircraft would leave and another would immediately arrive. Apparently, the one nice day they had experienced had been an anomaly. His home, in the Chatfield general area is not in one of the established training boxes but there is one about five miles south and he did not understand why the planes could not go there instead of continuing to circle his home. Propeller aircraft noise continued to be unbearable, directly affecting his family's health as well as financial situation due to an exponential increase in needed medical care caused by the trauma, and chronic stress, and making it impossible to even enjoy the outdoors of the nearby state park. Panem regretfully indicated the persistent noise felt like harassment from above and the cumulative impact was severe. He asked for immediate attention and relief.

It was noted these kinds of problems were brought to the flight school meetings, but question was asked if there had been specific discussion about this area and what did the flight schools say? The last two meetings had featured examples of flight tracks which were directly over Panem's area as examples of things the airport does not want to see. While the schools seemed receptive, it remained to be seen if there would be any long lasting relief. Nighttime outliers receive a visit from airport staff – question was asked if daytime offenders such as these ever were visited as well? The nighttime outliers visited were those who flew into the study group area. These daytime fliers were doing so outside of the airport's airspace and jurisdiction, so there was not the same kind of influence. The area's problems would continue to be brought to the attention of the flight schools however.

Question was asked if making the 'dot map' available to the flight schools would be helpful, perhaps as a big poster. It could be hand delivered to them by a volunteer CACNR Representative just wanting to share information with them about our most bothered areas and asking if they could find a way to not fly over those areas as had been occurring. The dot map was publicly available and would be included in the presentations at the flight school meetings, although there could be no guarantee it might end up on the wall behind a door at their headquarters. There seem to be three levels at the schools – the 'management' which comes to the flight school meetings, the instructor level, and the student level. Some of the information shared at the flight school meetings may not trickle down to those doing the actual flying over the neighborhoods.

Again, there were volunteers to hand deliver a quarterly map showing where the problem areas were. CACNR might have more leeway than the airport in asking for help for those areas which were outside of the airport's limitations. The dot maps would need enough underlying information to be relevant to pilots from the air without providing the specific addresses of those who had lodged complaints. We could encourage them to fly further out, and not do ground reference maneuvers in the close in boxes

7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

A. ACPAA MEETING - Pam Thompson had provided the written report given to the June meeting (there had been no July ACPAA meeting). She reported there is a good relationship with that group, which was working on the future of electric aircraft at Centennial Airport. She noted that some CACNR Representatives had received a survey from Mike Fronapfel and encouraged them to fill it out.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: To clarify, Jeremy Gunn, ACPAA Director of Operations was present and provided an overview of a project that had been under consideration for about a year, to create an airport observation tower. It would allow the public to experience the airport, have a good view and allow them to possibly become immersed in aviation. As envisioned, there would also be a landscaped ground area with an aviation themed playground and appropriate landscaping.

The idea had come up during an airport strategic plan update when it had been noted people were coming to the airport and trying to find a hole in the fence where they and their children could watch the planes. Few airports have any sort of community welcoming place, so creating one could be a gateway for inspiring someone other than a pilot, passenger or medevac patient to experience the airport and perhaps develop a lasting affinity for the world of aviation.

An RFP had been issued, and a landscape architect selected, and work had begun to determine what such a project would actually look like. A presentation would be made to the next ACPAA meeting. Several categories of persons had been selected to provide feedback about the project, and those from CACNR who got the survey were asked to be sure to respond by Sunday evening. The project would be directly west of the current administration building, providing community space and an observation tower. Anticipated line of site would include downtown Denver, all the main runways, and the mountains to Pikes Peak.

Some specifics of the survey which not all CACNR Representatives had seen were discussed with those who had. The actual cost of the project was unknown, but there was a thought about having a fund raising campaign. The State Division of Aeronautics had been excited about the idea and had already given a \$50,000 grant towards the conceptual design phase. It was recognized this was not a usual project for an airport to finance, with no financial return on investment, but considerable return in good public relations.

RETURN TO 6.A. PUBLIC COMMENT: Online, Mark Horton of Grandview Estates continued to have connection problems, but eventually sent a message: "Early AM flight school take offs east bound are really irritating, especially frequency pre 6 am." Grandview Estates is just southeast of the airport. It is one of the few developments which predated the airport. It was noted in the summer months, flight school activity does start earlier because of the earlier sunrise, and that the heat later in the day affects performance of the aircraft. Horton was invited to contact the Chair directly with any further comments related to the Grandview Estates area.

7. **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE: (continued)**

B. WEBSITE – Andy Jones reviewed some of the ideas he had discussed with the one respondent to the RFP. Clarity about CACNR's mission, how residents and communities could voice concerns, and have a place to obtain information about a variety of noise and airport related subjects were main goals to be met through the website which would provide some information and provide links to the location of other information. Archives would provide historic information about CACNR and other organizations and the actions taken in the past which still affect what CACNR can accomplish now. Ease of access to information would be one of the major foci of the website, and ease of keeping the website current would be another.

Question had been asked if it was realistic for CACNR volunteers to provide all of the information desired by the vendor in one month. Vendor was amenable to extending the time projection to two months. It was reiterated this should be an easily sustainable website. Question was asked about what entity would host, how long a contract would be compared to the current system and be most advantageous, and the additional costs involved. The current Go Daddy system would likely need to be canceled. The additional costs did not seem to be clear, and various other specific items were discussed that would be dealt with as the site was updated. Such costs should be clarified before the 2027 budget needed to be created. Information on the current website would be used wherever possible. The vendor was willing to be flexible with CACNR as the work progressed.

It was proposed a small group might be formed to work with the vendor while Jones was away. Request was made for the vendor to bring a kind of draft to the September meeting so it could be 'road tested' before getting to the October CACNR meeting for final approval. There would be homework for all to assure any questions or concerns would be brought up to be addressed in that final month's time frame. Airport staff would also be involved. The agency's flexibility was appreciated.

On the motion of Brad Pierce, duly seconded, the proposal from Altitude Design Agency was accepted. Jones was concerned the agency's first check would be processed quickly. The formation of the website group was referred to the end of the meeting.

C. WORK PROGRAM –

1. Alison Biggs noted that over some time, work had been done to identify the kind of things that CACNR felt should be available for the orientation of new members, and for the public to also have access to. Past CACNR Representatives had been asked what had been useful to them when they came to CACNR, and what they wished they had known about. The list of that resulting content had been in the meeting's mailing. It was envisioned to be fluid so things could be added or updated as

developments occurred. As this work had begun on the orientation list before the website update had begun, it was unclear how that process would accommodate the orientation items.

To frame a discussion, Alison Biggs then made a motion for the Orientation content list to be accepted by CACNR. Motion was seconded. Biggs then spoke to her motion, noting the document would be an important starting point for use with the updated website. Question was asked about the mentioned airport tours, suggesting the roundtable should take a group tour before a future meeting. It would take about an hour, and there was general interest in doing so.

It was clarified one of the maps would show where the noise monitors were located, as well as the jurisdictions represented by membership in CACNR. Representatives would be identified with their Member jurisdictions, but individual email addresses would not be provided. Question was asked if there was still an FAA Next Gen Advisory Committee, and it was thought it might have been disbanded but was coming back in a different form. That would need to be clarified for future reference. There being no further questions, the vote on the motion was called and the motion carried.

2. Consider Schedule Showing of 3 New Orientation Presentations – would be referred to the Executive Committee.

3. Consider Including Compilation of Health Effects of Noise in CACNR Work Program – referred to a future meeting.

8. **CACNR STUDY GROUP COMMITTEE:**

A. 2nd QUARTER 2026 REPORT - Chair Brad Pierce presented the committee's 2nd Quarter report, its 12th such report. For the benefit of the guests, he explained CACNR's formation of the Study Group Committee about three years ago, its composition of CACNR representatives, elected officials, airport staff, flight school representatives, community members, consultants, and FAA representatives.

Pierce indicated that in the second quarter, touch and go activity in the study area had risen from Q2 2025 to Q2 2026. There had been 7,579 in 2025, rising to 8,392 in 2026. He then called on Matt Frenette, ACPAA staff, to provide additional highlights from the report. He focused on changes from the previous year, what mitigation efforts were underway, how the data was changing, and where the study group felt there was room for improvement. Many outside factors enter in to such numbers, including wind, pattern traffic flow, air traffic control tower staffing, controller training, demand, runway availability/closures, and safety, which is always a top priority.

Mitigation updates included proactive outreach to the flight schools; 20 representatives had attended the April quarterly flight school meeting. There was one flight school which had no representative attending. The most recent meeting had been in mid-July. The dashboard results had been discussed, and quarterly reports had been shared. The 4th quarter meeting is scheduled for October 14. Another mitigation item was proactive checking of the extended traffic during nighttime hours. The Noise and Environmental Specialist had reached out to nine with negatively recorded flights and reminded them of the voluntary noise abatement hours. This direct follow up occurs with the flight schools involved.

Data analysis of Q2, 2026 unfortunately did show an increase in touch and go activity from the data of last year, although it was still down from the 2024 level. Year to date did show a decrease from the first two quarters of 2024 compared to 21026. There was a downward trend from when the Committee began in 2023. Changes in activity at the airport affects how the touch and goes occur, and Frenette continued to review the relationships with other things such as heat and storm patterns and daylight hours. In this last quarter, there were more saturated flight time hours in the morning to beat the afternoon storms, pushing the entry rate up into the study area

In Q2 of this year, 56% or 10,700 did not enter the study area, with 44% or about 8,400 which did enter the study area. Details were provided which showed that even though there was an increase in flights into the study area, flights were not extending as far north as previously. Frenette noted overall, weather and ATC staffing and instructional variances continued to affect the outcomes, and the practical approach was to control what could be controlled, which included the FAA airport and flight school meetings as the minimum standard, continuing to distribute the voluntary noise abatement guidelines, reaching out to flight schools or operators whenever nighttime outliers occur in the study area, and the dashboard. There had been good feedback at the last flight school meeting, as several flight schools found the dashboard useful by just looking at individual trends within their organizations.

Question was asked if more touch and goes could be anticipated as the air traffic controller staffing improved. The air traffic manager indicated when the numbers in the tower allowed, there would be a dedicated controller for that runway, and that would be monitored during the rest of the summer. August and September are usually the busiest months at the airport. Request was made for some of the maps used during the creation of the Committee to be revisited to see if there had been changes, and Frenette indicated that could be done. There had been safety data concerns as well which should be revisited to see what had happened since. That too could be accomplished, particularly since the FAA had returned to the Committee meetings and its main concern is safety,

Question was asked how many repeat offenders were in the nighttime outliers group? Most of the nighttime outliers were from two operators, but staff does not have access to information about the specific pilots involved. However, the two operators involved are two of the largest operators on the airport, so proportionally out of the number of flights they do, it could be expected that they would have more nighttime outliers than others. Staff does talk to those involved on a regular basis. They are generally receptive, but some put a little more effort into it than others, indicating they have reached out to the pilots involved with the information and this was what was learned. Others just indicated they would take care of the problem and staff never hears anything further

It was noted that after the last quarterly pilot meeting, it was clear that some of the lower scoring flight schools were really paying attention to their scores and wanted to know how they could improve, so one of the things suggested was to have fewer nighttime outliers. It can be difficult for some flight schools because sometimes they are dealing with their training flights, sometimes someone rents the plane, and it's tougher to reach those people that aren't specific students of the school.

115:09

MOTION TO EXTEND THE MEETING TIME: A motion to extend the meeting time by 15 minutes was made by Andy Jones and duly seconded. The motion carried.

B. **2nd QUARTER DASHBOARD** – New items added since the last meeting included a report showing both the previous and the current quarters, and an appendix describing the specifics of all the metrics. The current contents of the dashboard were reviewed, and how the schools compare to each other and why were highlighted. It was again noted that some of the operators whose scores were low had come to staff to inquire how they could improve, a positive sign the dashboard was being used as envisioned. It was anticipated that some scores would slip after the summer busy season. The report also included a dashboard showing the year as a whole. Again, it was noted the schools were purposefully de-identified to avoid losing participation and cooperation in the program. The positive result of that approach was seen as the schools were engaged in the project and asking questions on how they could improve. Kudos and a thank you for nice start were given to all involved.

9. **AIRPORT DIRECTOR:** Mike Fronapfel noted that Lorie Zarlengo, Assistant Airport Director, would be retiring on August 15th after 36 years at Centennial Airport. She had originally hired Fronapfel as an intern at the airport, and he had essentially worked for her his entire career at Centennial. There had been several hundred interns who had gone through the program and she had started the career of many in the aviation and airport worlds; she had been a great mentor and a great leader. She had just received a Distinguished Service Award from the Colorado Division of Aeronautics at the Colorado Airport Operators Association meeting in June.

Recent position changes at the airport included: Zach Gabehart as the new Assistant Airport Director/COO; and Luis Gonzales as the next Noise and Environmental Specialist. He would be reporting to Gabehart who would be overseeing the airport's noise program. Fronapfel indicated he might no longer attend every CACNR meeting. Bryson Hoover had been appointed to fill the Operations Specialist position and the airport was interviewing for two Airport Management Interns and a Maintenance Tech 1 position.

Fronapfel reported Centennial Flyers had purchased Heliplex,, a helicopter FBO, and planned to rebrand it to an electric aircraft and vertical takeoff and landing aircraft FBO while retaining the helicopter segment. The airport had anticipated electric aircraft, particularly electric training aircraft, were coming soon, but none of the other FBOs at Centennial were willing to make the capital investment to bring in the electrical infrastructure to service such aircraft. It had been reported Centennial Flyers had previously made a commitment to buy six electric training aircraft, with two coming next year, pending FAA certification, and four the following year.

In addition, nearby Cosmic Aerospace was developing a four seat multi engine electric aircraft that could be used for multi-engine training but also would have a range of 250 nautical miles, and a capability of doing cross-country flights. Fronapfel reported a new FAA certification process called MOSAIC which they think will streamline the certification of electric aircraft. Cosmic was applying and developing its aircraft under the MOSAIC guidelines with the hope they will be able to start making deliveries of it in 2029. Although some of the timelines might be optimistic, Fronapfel believed within the next five years, some electric aircraft trainer would be at Centennial. From a noise and environmental impact, that would be a very positive development. And the airport was grateful at least one company was willing to invest in the airport, invest in the infrastructure, and invest in the charging abilities, and then was willing to carry those expenses until it all started to come to fruition.

The Signature hangar construction continued, scheduled to house one of the base charter companies as well as transient primarily jet aircraft. Work on the air traffic control tower was to be completed by the end of August, as was the elevator. The HVAC had been updated as well as all the tower cab areas, the break areas and the bathrooms. It would be good to finally have that work completed.

The Runway 5K held in June raised almost \$110,000 for scholarships granted by the Centennial Airport Foundation, with over 2,00 people attending the overall event. Phil Washington, the airport director at Denver International Airport, was retiring in mid-August.

The FAA was creating an Aircraft Noise Advisory Committee and wanted nominations for membership on that committee. Fronapfel had filled out an application and had a draft letter of recommendation for CACNR's consideration. Only one letter of recommendation was allowed, and he felt CACNR with its knowledge of the challenges presented by noise from a busy general aviation airport, and of his involvement with the issues, was best positioned to speak on his behalf. He asked for CACNR's endorsement and recommendation to be a part of the new FAA committee. On the motion of Donna Johnston, duly seconded, CACNR agreed to submit a letter of recommendation for Mike Fronapfel's application to be a member of the FAA Aircraft Noise Advisory Committee.

10. **2nd QUARTER LAND USE REVIEW:** Zach Gabehart presented the 2nd quarter land use review, which had considered 19 referrals from April through June. Seven were approved as submitted, 10 were subject to comments, and two were not recommended. A map was provided to show where those subject to comments and those not recommended were located.

Question was asked if the airport ever knows what the jurisdictions involved with the questionable locations had done about them. The airport did not necessarily receive follow-up reports but could see what their planning commissions or city councils or county

commissioners had done. It seemed this would be good information to have, to track trends and see if other actions might be taken. The Chair indicated CACNR personnel could attend hearings or provide other assistance if the airport felt it would be helpful, particularly in addressing developments which would be greatly affected by noise.

11. OLD BUSINESS:

A. DRAFT LETTER TO FSDO and FLIGHT SCHOOL OWNERS – A draft letter to these two groups had been provided, but AOPA had determined having a representative sign the letter might be a conflict of interest, not wanting to appear to oppose legal flights, so CACNR would be the sole signatory. On the motion of Alison Biggs, duly seconded, CACNR approved sending the letter to the designated recipients.

MOTION TO EXTEND THE MEETING TIME: A motion to extend the meeting time by 15 minutes was made by Brad Pierce, and duly seconded. The motion carried.

B. PILOT REACTION TO FAA UPDATED ARRIVAL PROCEDURE FROM NORTHWEST – There had not seemed to be much effect of the procedure on the flight schools in the area, but some local corporate pilot groups had concerns. Those had been relayed to the FAA and the FAA had since released a revised version of the procedure. The EPA concerns had been discussed at the last CACNR meeting and nothing further could be done in that area.

12. NEW BUSINESS:

A. & B. FAA PROPOSED SUPERSONIC OVERLAND FLIGHT REGULATION CHANGE – In July, the FAA had released a notice of proposed rulemaking to repeal the ban on all supersonic flights over the continental US which had been in place since 1973. The proposed new rule would repeal that ban with a few stipulations. Apparently this action stemmed from an Executive Order issued last year which ordered the FAA to remove the ban.

There were requirements which did not seem to be clearly stated, the rule only addressed high up route noise but did not address landing and takeoff noise or airport operation noise around an airport. This rulemaking did say that that would be addressed in future rulemaking. Various other seeming shortcomings of the proposed rule had been identified and were included in the airport's draft response, along with a recommendation for additional research on community response. There was apparently a NASA study going on right now that would involve flying a supersonic aircraft over communities and measuring community response, and it would seem appropriate to have the results of that study before doing specific, premature rulemaking.

Other areas which lacked clarity had been identified and were noted in the airport's response, a copy of which was provided in this meeting's emailing. The airport requested CACNR to be a co-signer of its letter, and Pam Thompson and others had drafted a response letter from CACNR which had also been provided in tonight's mailing. The CACNR letter had more of a community based approach, including concern for people on the ground, what would happen when there was a violation and how would future violations be prevented, etc. There was also encouragement for communities to submit their own letters as well.

A motion was made by Brad Pierce, duly seconded, that CACNR submit its own letter, drafted by Pam Thompson, and co-sign the airport's letter regarding the regulation change related to supersonic flight. It was clarified the regulation change did not apply to military aircraft. Question was asked why CACNR was even getting involved with this issue, why do we care? The various future implications related to supersonic flight, development of smaller supersonic aircraft which would operate out of Centennial, have different noise profiles and standard and certification standards all had indicated there should be responses from the very start of this movement.

The FAA had said this was preemptive rulemaking toward establishing landing and takeoff noise standards for supersonic aircraft. Seemingly, a Colorado-based operator was instrumental in getting this rulemaking started, so recognizing that, the technological advances being made in supersonic flight, and the fact that even if such aircraft did not actually operate out of Centennial, they would be flying overhead causing related noise impacts, it seem important to speak out now instead of when it might be too late.

Question was asked if this might lead to raising the 'acceptable' noise level from 65dB to 75dB? That could be a possibility. Observation was made that CACNR already gets noise complaints that are considered outside its purview, and this would perhaps be more appropriately looked at in 2032 rather than now. It was noted this was being proactive, identifying concerns we care about now and asking for more information to understand how this will play out in relation to the noise which would affect our communities. The motion made by Brad Pierce, for CACNR to submit its own letter, drafted by Pam Thompson, and to co-sign the airport's letter regarding the regulation change related to supersonic flight was approved with one abstention by Andy Jones.

C. REQUEST FOR DATA COMPARISON BETWEEN FLIGHT TRAINING AREA IN DOUGLAS COUNTY AND 3 TOWERS - A request had been made for such a data comparison. There was considerable discussion of how to select a Douglas County area which would be comparable to 3 Towers, in terms of terrain, congestion, proximity to mountainous terrain, thunderstorm development, turbulence, etc. In addition, the flight schools had specified that those Douglas County boxes were primarily for multi engine use and there was no such stipulation on the boxes in Elbert County; that area to the south and west was more suitable for multi engine training.

Question was asked weren't student pilots being trained to handle such thing as turbulence. Instructors did not like risking their aircraft in very bad weather, so they do try to avoid the kind of terrain which leads to such concerns. Question was asked of the individual making this request what kinds of comparisons were desired – to compare numbers of flights or altitude training or what? A method was devised by which staff felt it could collect usable comparative data to meet this request. Results could be shared at the next CACNR meeting.

13. **PUBLIC COMMENT EXTENSION:** Not needed

14. **REPRESENTATIVES COMMENTS:** Nothing from Representatives from Members of the Colorado Municipal League.

- Don Sheehan volunteered to assist with the website.
- Brenda Dyché inquired who at the Denver FSDO was supposed to be replying to complaints about low flying aircraft. She had been told that the FAA had been checking into this behind the scenes, but nothing had ever been relayed to her or anyone else in Elbert County. She inquired if perhaps Jennifer Redding might relay any related information so they would know if something was being done.

Early morning flights continued to plague her. She continued to question why trainees could not go east away from the congested areas for their training at 5:30 a.m. This was about noise and violations affecting citizens, and why would those who supposedly answer such questions not communicating?

- Rhonda, Fields commented she already found the website to be user-friendly, so was excited to see what this new refresh was going to look like.
- Donna Johnston has already agreed to assist with the website.
- Brad Pierce followed up the earlier mention about the NextGen Advisory Committee having been disbanded, but it was coming back in a different form. It would be called the National Airspace Advisory Committee. The Executive Director of N.O.I.S.E. (of which he is President) had nominated him to be a member and was waiting to about his possible appointment to it. CACNR would support his appointment if there was a way to do so, but the nomination period had passed.

He reported he and the N.O.I.S.E. Executive Director working to reconstitute that organization because it had been somewhat dormant for a while. Goals are to increase membership and do more active advocacy. They were talking to Jason Swartz who did CACNR's retreat a few years ago about helping do that.

- Andy Jones reported the website vendor had been on line, and had indicated WIX does do the hosting and it costs about \$185/year, outside of the contract with him. He had also indicated he would have something for CACNR to see in September.
- Don Kuskie noted a youngster he had been monitoring had just soloed and when asked how many were in the pattern, he said just one other, and that one was also soloing. That does not happen every day.
- Mike Koscielniak reported that Amazon Prime Air, a commercial drone package delivery service for Amazon, was planning to expand operations in the Denver, Colorado area. They were having a question and answer session at Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport on Wednesday, August 26th. Centennial was given notice of the meeting, and planed to attend. No additional meetings were planned at this time. Centennial would be happy to host if any are ever scheduled.

Koscielniak indicated he had asked the flight schools to look at their practice areas. He questioned do they want to keep them? Do they want to modify or move them? What do they want to do? He wanted them to tell us what they think, as their input is needed since the conversation cannot be all one way. They were to go home and think about it and give us their ideas because something needs to be done for us to be good neighbors the way development is going. He remembered when the airport was first here, there was very little around it, and now it is heavily populated with people who expect to fly and their pilots attend a flight school to train. So the flight schools grow with the development the local governments allow to happen around the airport. Everyone needs to work together to find solutions to the resulting noise and safety issues.

15. **RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACPAA AND OTHERS TO POTENTIALLY REDUCE NOISE OVER AFFECTED COMMUNITIES:**

None

16. **NEXT MEETINGS:**

A. CACNR –	Sept 2, 2026	6:30 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
	Oct 7, 2026	6:30 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
	Nov 4, 2026	6:30 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
	Dec 2, 2026	6:30 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112

B. ACPAA –	Aug 13, 2026	3:00 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
	Sept 10, 2026	3:00 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
	Oct 8, 2026	3:00 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
	Nov 12, 2026	3:00 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
	Dec 10, 2026	3:00 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR

C. **PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE –**

17. **ADJOURN:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:06 p.m.

Alison Biggs, Secretary

