



CENTENNIAL AIRPORT COMMUNITY NOISE ROUNDTABLE
MINUTES

May 6, 2026

Approved 06 03 2026

Chair: Chis Eubanks Vice Chair: Pam Thompson 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 6:3 p.m. by Vice Chair Pam Tjhompson. The following were in attendance, and a quorum was present:

- Douglas County: DJ Beckwith
Douglas County: Alison Biggs
Elbert County: Brenda Dyche online
Aurora: Brad Pierce
Castle Pines: Ron Cole online
Centennial: Ryan Dwiggin online
Cherry Hills Village: Dave Heller online
Foxfield: Pam Thompson
Greenwood Village: Donna Johnston
Highlands Ranch Metro: Andy Jones
Lone Tree: Mike Anderson
Parker: Cynthia Liston Thyme
ACPAA: Michael Fronapfel
AOPA: Joe Patton
CABA: Don Kuskie
Wings Over the Rockies: Bill Wasmund

Also present: ACPAA Alternate Representative Zach Gabehart; AOPA Alternate Representative Mike Koscielniak online; City of Centennial Staff Michael Gradis; and ACPAA Staff Matt Frenette, Aliyah Then, and Lauren Wiarda. Jennifer Redding, FAA Senior Program Analyst, Northwest Mountain Region, was also in attendance online.

Additional attendees or online/guests: Ryk Dunkelberg, Mead & Hunt; Brady Flowers; Kimberly Fullmer, citizen online; Kim Hellweg, citizen online; FAA online; Randy Johnson, citizen online; Jennifer Kovalski, citizen online; Vincent Ma, HMMH; Joe Panem, citizen online; Lauren Rasmussen, Mead & Hunt; Eugene Reindel, HMMH; and Pilot Bill Ward.

- Absent: Arapahoe County: Rhonda Fields/Leroy Evans
Arapahoe County: Sreenivasan Alakappan/Vacant
Elbert County: Mike Buck/Shawn Fletcher
Castle Rock: Laura Cavey/Sandy Vossler
CDOT Aeronautics Div: Todd Green/Vacant

2. CONSENT AGENDA: The Consent Agenda included the draft CACNR Minutes from April 1, 2026; and the Treasurer's Report from April 30, 2026, showing a balance of \$27,587.53. 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 - Ryk Dunkelberg, Mean & Hunt and Eugene Reindel, HMMH
There was a handout on the tables, and Ryk Dunkelberg reported CACNR had seen much of it before, which he would recap. The remainder of the meeting would be spent by them presenting the alternatives being looked at for implementation.

As the handout had not been available for inclusion in the meeting's mailing, it would be attached to these minutes for those who had not attended the meeting, and for reference. Some discussion points or questions are included here.

- Page 5 (if the pages were numbered), fifth bullet, were the electronic flight bags referenced the ones the pilots carry and where would pilots know to get that information? It was currently published by the Colorado Pilots Association. Suggestion was made that additional distribution methods might be explored to help assure pilots from even locations outside of Colorado would know that information existed and how to access it; even the creation of a QR code might be explored. The Pilots Association had recently added noise abatement information as well.
Page 5, 7th bullet, question was asked what the FAA Study Group was. Apparently, the reference was to the CACNR Study Group Committee and it had been given the wrong name in this presentation.
Discussion related to what might change with an air space redesign including how different approach and departure procedures might affect noise for those on the ground. A redesign would involve more than just Centennial, however, so the airport would want to be sure to be involved. Phoenix and Hawaii were ahead in the FAA redesign process, so it would probably be at least three or four years before redesign took place here.

Eugene Reindel then presented some of the operational alternatives being explored. Even though the FAA noise contour guidelines use only the 65 DNL, development pressures here had resulted in the study looking beyond that restriction, and some modeling had

been done at the 60 DNL level as well. Examples of changes in noise levels on the ground were looked at depending on the operational measures put in place. Further analysis would be done in some instances to determine feasibility of implementation. For example, the FAA Air Traffic Control Tower's manager had attended the Study Advisory Committee meeting earlier in the day and had expressed concern about the involvement of helicopter traffic, so that would be further explored. The airport would then need to determine what changes it wished to recommend to the FAA in the final result of the study.

Pattern changes already somewhat in operation because of the CACNR Study Group Committee's (SGC's) work with the flight schools were looked at and would also be documented through this study. Throughout, care would need to be given to not just shift noise from one neighborhood to another. Anything not considered as a standard type of pattern throughout the rest of the country would need to be carefully evaluated before being recommended to the FAA here, and safety would also need to be factored in.

Concern was expressed that any of the changes investigated might undo any of the good work resulting from the effort of the SGC. Things had changed in the Greenwood Village area since this study began, for example, so what would determine if which alternative might be included in the study's next steps. The ultimate authority for deciding what recommendations would be made to the FAA would be the airport. Something which had been modeled during the study would not necessarily be recommended due to the results of the modeling.

Another factor which had been explored was the use of electric aircraft by the flight schools. A manufacturer of electric aircraft which had come to Centennial recently had allowed some noise measurements to be made as it flew the pattern here. Actually, it had been so silent that its noise was not detected. However, battery life would relegate its use to local pattern work rather than going to the training boxes. Perhaps that might change in the time it would take for current flight school aircraft to be replaced by electric – anticipated to be five to ten years – although some local flight schools had reportedly already placed orders. Having done some exploration, however, would allow Centennial to indicate its interest in replacing gas powered aircraft with electric aircraft. This could also be linked to the airport's efforts in relation to lead pollution and the use of unleaded fuel.

It was noted that training aircraft operations don't actually change the noise contours much, as they actually are not as noisy as jet aircraft. But the jets go over once while the training aircraft may circle or be repetitive, all of which affect the public underneath but don't change the noise contours. The phasing out of the very loud Stage 1 and Stage 2 jets after the last Part 150 here caused a significant reduction in the noise contours.

Although the FAA may not accept some of the alternatives which could be recommended, some may be included with the thought of asking for future consideration if the FAA reconsiders its position about reliance only on the 65 DNL contour. Showing benefits might eventually lead to access to federal funding for related projects.

The consultants would continue to take input, consider all ideas, and address them through modeling or other evaluation for the likelihood of being able to implement them. Draft recommendations will be refined and shared with the Study Advisory Committee and CACNR in late Summer. That would be followed by an open house and meetings with the Study Advisory Committee and CACNR in the Fall, and an official public comment period and public hearing. Information from all of that would be utilized to create the final submission for the airport's approval, and then submission to the FAA. The FAA has no timeframe for approval or disapproval. When it is eventually placed on the Federal Register however, the FAA has 180 days to indicate its position of record.

Dunkelberg and Reidel were thanked sincerely for their presentations.

B. RESPONSES TO PAST CACNR QUESTIONS ABOUT OR REFERRED TO THE PART 150 – This list had been provided to Kate Andrus and had been then provided to CACNR Representatives since many individuals had not been on CACNR during the questioning time frame. The consultant team had responded but felt some information needed to come from the airport, so that was in process and the responses would be provided in June.

C. PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE – The Committee had met this morning and heard exactly what CACNR had just heard.

5. NOISE REPORTS: A. **The March 2026 Noise Report** included the following information:

March Local Operations:	11,306	March Total Operations:	24,275
Year to Date Local Operations:	36,565	Year to Date Total Operations:	75,223

24,275 Total Operations in February resulted in 601 complaints from 51 households.

		March Noise Events:					
March Total:		March 60 – 69 db:	March 70 – 79 db:	March 80 – 89 db:			
Meridian	8,374	Meridian	7,094	Golf Course	3,077	Airport East	445
Golf Course	8,105	Golf Course	4,857	Meridian	1,253	Golf Course	168
Airport East	3,215	Parker	2,076	Airport East	1,001	Meridian	26
Parker	2,953	Airport East	1,729	State Park	595	Lone Tree	7
State Park	2,182	State Park	1,580	Parker	246	Port. Station 31	7
Port. Station 31	1,433	Grandview Estates	1,256	Port. Station 31	230	State Park	6
Grandview Estates	1,396	Port. Station 31	1,196	Grandview Estates	136	Grandview Estates	4
Castle Rock	962	Castle Rock	901	Greenwood Village	90	Castle Rock	3
Greenwood Village	761	Greenwood Village	669	Castle Rock	58	Greenwood Village	2
Lone Tree	560	Lone Tree	507	Castle Pines	45	Hunters Hill	1
Hunters Hill	324	Hunters Hill	303	Lone Tree	38	Parker	1
Castle Pines	275	Castle Pines	230	Hunters Hill	20	Castle Rock	0
Sagebrush Park	107	Sagebrush Park	99	Sagebrush Park	8	Sagebrush Park	0

March Noise Events in the 90+ decibel range: Airport East – 40 Lone Tree – 8 Golf Course – 3 Meridian – 1 State Park – 1

March Noise Complaints per Municipality		Numbers of Households:		YTD Complaints and		Number of Households:	
Unincorporated Douglas County	171 (28%)	UDC	11 (22%)	UDC	396 (26%)	GV	19 (24%)
Unincorporated Arapahoe County	146 (24%)	UAC	10 (20%)	UAC	346 (23%)	UDC	18 (23%)
Greenwood Village	107 (18%)	Greenwood Village	9 (18%)	UEC	281 (18%)	UAC	15 (19%)
Centennial	78 (13%)	Other	6 (12%)	Centennial	255 (17%)	Other	7 (9%)
Unincorporated Elbert County	68 (11%)	Lone Tree	5 (10%)	GV	206 (13%)	Centennial	5 (6%)
Lone Tree	10 (2%)	Highlands Ranch	2 (4%)	Other	19 (1%)	Lone Tree	5
Other	9	Castle Pines	1	Lone Tree	13	HR	3
Castle Rock	3	Castle Rock	1	Denver	7	Denver	2
Highlands Ranch	3	Denver	1	Castle Rock	5	UEC	2
Castle Pines	2	Parker	1	Highlands Ranch	4	Parker	2
Denver	2	UEC	1	Parker	3	Castle Pines	1
Parker	2	Cherry Hills Village	0	Castle Pines	2	Castle Rock	1
Aurora	0	Highlands Ranch	0	Aurora	0	Aurora	0
Cherry Hills Village	0	Parker	0	Cherry Hills Village	0	CHV	0

Year to Date, the top five households complaining were:

Household #1 280 (18%) Other Elbert County	Household #4 159 (10%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County
Household #2 219 (14%) Centennial	Household #5 103 (7%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County
Household #3 205 (13%) Unincorporated Douglas County	Remaining Households 571 (37%)

In March, 87 noise complaint responses were completed from 601 noise complaints, with 81 of those by email and 6 by telephone.

In March 554 complaints were received from 7:00 a.m. – 9:59 p.m. (92%)
47 complaints were received from 10:00 p.m. – 6:59 a.m. (8%)

In March props accounted for **90% of the complaints by aircraft type; jets** accounted for **8% 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 March, departures were responsible for **32% of the complaints**, **training** was responsible for **53% of the complaints**, and **arrivals** were responsible for **15% of the complaints**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed training had caused 50% of the complaints, departures had caused 35%, and arrivals had caused 15%.

A graph was provided showing the **March number of complaints by the hour** in which they were made, with a peak at 11 a.m. hour; followed by secondary peaks at 7 a.m. as well as the hours 3 to 4 p.m. Early evening bumps in complaints are observed at 7 and 9 p.m.

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

It was noted both operations and complaints had been down in March. Comparatively, complaints and operations were both down from March 2025 and the number of households had increased by one this year. Other categories were largely consistent and down from the previous year. Some clarifications were made about the radar track density map's tracks in relation to downwind landings when aircraft are being controlled by Denver Approach Control rather than the Centennial air traffic control tower.

Comment was made that complaint numbers were climbing since December, as was the number of complaining homes represented, and the noise monitors were picking up more noise events in some instances – for example, Lone Tree had eight events over 90 decibels when it usually had none or only one.

B. CENTENNIAL ANAD 3 TOWERS AREAS DATA – Those areas were looked at for trending in relation to usage and altitudes when entering the boxes. At 3 Towers, the number of training operations had increased by 731 from 2024 to 2025, even though the total airport operations were down 35,000. This stressed the importance of encouraging the flight schools to be aware of what they were doing in relation to practice box usage. The data could also prove useful if the flight schools would look at redesigning or reshaping or moving the training boxes.

Comment was made that at the quarterly meeting with the flight schools, Gabehart had done a great job of bringing this up to all the schools, showing actual patterns of some planes in the area. It was further commented that all airport personnel had really advocated for the people living under the boxes, showing slides and pictures about how things actually were there and asking for recognition of that by doing something about it. It was noted one of the schools had sent the information to all the pilots in that school, reminding them of the 3 Towers and Elizabeth training boxes and advising them to avoid ground reference maneuvers and generally avoid flying below 1,000 feet there, so the word had been spread at least to that school's personnel.

At present there was no way to determine repetitions over a specific location, only the number of times an aircraft went into or left a box. The noise monitor could determine each "circle" as a separate noise event however. It was noted that encouraging words were coming from different pilot groups and individual pilots whose awareness had been raised, and who were looking at what the tower asked them to do as well as how what they were doing was affecting those on the ground.

In relation to Centennial, where some citizens had questioned how the changes in relation to the study area were effecting their neighborhoods. As there were fewer flights going north and south, more seemed to be moving to the west over Centennial. Arrivals and departures affected that area as well as training flights. Those three factors had been compared from 2024 – 2025 and the data showed a decrease in all three; operations in that time frame as well, so it appeared there had not been a shift in traffic to the west.

Question was asked if the Study Group Committee would be taking the 3 Towers problem area into consideration. There would need to be discussion of how that group might do that, and what factors might be included since it was not airspace covered by the

airport. One suggestion was to put it in the dashboard, with points for going further east. Discussion further addressed the complexity of this situation, the density of the area, and whether a new study group might need to be formed. The current study group would need to discuss the matter, but it seemed CACNR was addressing the situation logically by gathering data and presenting it to optimistically influence the flight schools. While pausing to see the effect of the effort to date, discussions could use that information for planning next steps. The FAA did not provide guidance about what kind of density would preclude training due to safety, and each situation was addressed individually.

Suggestion was made to bring the topic to the next meeting of the flight schools to see what ideas they might have about modifying or moving the training boxes, or not. They could become partners in seeking solutions to the difficulty. The Study Group Committee already has a good record of collaboration in this regard, and that might help clarify the scope of future work. Pilots and flight schools were commended for being willing to collaborate with us about matters of mutual concern.

6. PUBLIC COMMENT:

A. MEETING ATTENDEES/VIRTUAL ATTENDEES –

- Bill Ward commented he thought the transit-oriented development buffer zone proposed earlier was a bad idea. In order to be publicly transit-oriented, such areas have to be walkable, such as those in Washington, DC and Tokyo. The area proposed here west of the airport is not really walkable. Traffic pattern concerns were a reason for the initiation of the Part 150 study, so with cities developing there, there would need to be some sort of navigation easement, or some sort of early public disclosure to any residential building that says there are airplanes here, showing with a heat map what the traffic around the airport looks like. Just moving the traffic pattern further west would do little to solve problems. He wondered if the blue line west of the airport was related to an RNAV procedure.

He further noted it would probably be five to ten years before electric aircraft became frequently used. The availability of the rare earth metals needed to produce the batteries, and the cost of them would affect the use of electric aircraft for the foreseeable future.

- Joe Panem of the Solstice community near Sterling Ranch and south of Chatfield Reservoir commented that area used to be open space but was now a densely populated growing community. He asked if the area was brought up during the meetings with the flight schools, as there had been little to no improvement, still dramatically affecting his family. He had been communicating with Zach Gabehart, who indicated flight tracks from that area had specifically been shown to the flight schools, with a request that they minimize activity in those areas, particularly since that area's training box no longer existed. Solstice, Louviers, and the old training box had all been pointed out for discussion. Question was asked what the response from the flight schools had been to that information, and there had apparently been no particular response. It was noted the area is unfortunately also affected by traffic from Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport, over which there is no local influence.

- Randy Johnson from Louviers, near to Solstice and Sedalia on US 85 noted he submits numbers of planes over his area and how many complaints he registers. In April, he had noted 424 planes, and he could identify 186 from Centennial and 150 from Rocky Mountain Metropolitan. Of those, he had submitted 84 complaints to Centennial and 21 to Rocky Mountain. It still seemed many planes were purposely turning and flying closer over Louviers. He understood why the public is encouraged to submit complaints so CACNR can know where there are problems, and that was why he continued to do this. Mornings seemed to be the worse time, but the turning and flying over his area still seemed obvious.

Johnson had noted there were actually 13 airports whose planes fly over that area: Centennial, Rocky Mountain, Air Force Academy, Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado Springs, Vance Brand, Erie, Space Port, Northern Colorado, Boulder, Colorado Springs, Greeley, Meadowlark, and Pueblo. And on a closing note, he wanted to thank Bill Ward for attending the CACNR meetings to bring his unique perspective to the group.

- Brenda Dyché from Elbert County indicated she felt like no one thought anything could be done for her area because it was out of Centennial's airspace. So the issue got dumped on her community and that's it. But if flight schools could be asked to stop doing something over one or more areas, and a training box could be closed in another area, why couldn't something be done to help her area? So perhaps the training boxes should be put back into Centennial's airspace, away from the area that is not in Centennial's airspace where nothing can be done about them. There had been ample demonstration of the number of planes, the planes seemingly targeting her home, and planes flying under 500 feet and under 1,000 feet. Something had to be figured out.

B. RECEIVED BY CACNR – emails had been received from Joe Panem, Randy Johnson, Brenda Dyché, and to Andy Jones from Highlands Ranch. All had been basically the types of comments heard from them individually tonight, with documentation of flight paths, etc. demonstrating the severity of the problem. Zach Gabehart was included as a recipient of many of the emails and had been helpful to Andy Jones in responding to the Highlands Ranch resident who had been impressed with the amount of information provided. It was noted that informing the public would be a good service provided by the updated website.

7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

A. SUGGESTED PROPOSAL RE TRAFFIC TO AND FROM 3 TOWERS AND ELIZABETH FLIGHT TRAINING BOXES – The suggestion provided by Bill Ward had been included in the mailing. He explained the idea was to follow Parker Road southbound at the allowed altitude, then enter the south side of the box from the west, exiting to the eastern part of the box, following that north to the box boundary and then turning back toward Centennial. This allowed entering and leaving the box at higher altitudes, and was basically a system that had once been in use in this area. There was considerable discussion of how pilots currently going to the Fairgrounds or Kiowas boxes go straight through the Three Towers box and have to stay at lower altitudes because of DIA airspace. Using the old approach, higher altitudes would be possible which could help alleviate noise. The whole concept seemed to make good sense for helping to alleviate some of the noise problems in that area. It was noted that one suggestion had been made to close the Three Towers box, but that would not guarantee pilots would not still use that airspace even if the box did not exist.

Further discussion of the finer points of the suggestion followed. Ward indicated various fine points for using the system could be used by flight instructors, and he had power point presentations which also provided how other facets of needed training could be included along with this approach to the training boxes. It was noted that it might be best if the concept came voluntarily from the pilot group, rather than being pushed by the airport or CACNR. Suggestion was made that Ward could do a presentation at a meeting of the flight schools, so there could be an in-depth discussion among the pilots and instructors attending; he was willing to do so.

It was mentioned the increased development to the east might have training flights going to the east of Limon in the not too distant future. There already are complaints that planes are bothering livestock on the eastern plains.

MOTION TO EXTEND THE MEETING TIME: A motion to extend the meeting by 30 minutes was made by Andy Jones and duly seconded. The motion carried.

B. **ACPAA MEETING** – Pam Thompson’s report of the April 1, 2026 CACNR meeting to the April 9, 2026 ACPAA meeting, with her notes from that meeting, had been included in the email packet. She had nothing further and there were no questions.

C. **WEBSITE RFP** – The EC had had a brief discussion of this and agreed it should be a stand-alone website which would not add to the workload of the airport but which might have links to issues of mutual interest. There was also agreement this did not necessarily have to go out for multiple bids CACNR Representatives had been asked for input about known web designers, but none had been forthcoming. Andy Jones indicated he had a possible source and would contact that individual for some exploratory work. He could also at least begin to define the scope of what we might want – clean, compelling, easy to navigate, informative, etc. Maintenance of the site would need to be included. It was also hoped the site would have enough space to handle the CACNR Orientation documents, and archival materials from the formation of CACNR. Again, other ideas for anything related to the website were solicited.

D. **WORK PROGRAM** – Bill Wasmund and Mike Kosciuelniak had each volunteered to work on a part of the Work Program and were thanked greatly. The remaining Representatives were sincerely asked to consider taking some responsibility for handling any part of the work program of interest to them. There would be help available if needed to get started, by contacting Aison Biggs or another member of the Executive Committee. A list of materials for possible inclusion in the Orientation Manual was being developed, and the new webmaster would be consulted for the best way to include and/or present that material on the website, for the education of both CACNR personnel and the general public.

8. **CACNR STUDY GROUP COMMITTEE (SGC):** Chair Brad Pierce reported the Committee’s 1st Quarter 2026 Report was in the meeting material packet, along with the 1st quarter dashboard report.

A. **1ST QUARTER 2026 REPORT** – Pierce provided an overall summary and Matt Frenette provided detailed comments on the data reported. The number of aircraft entering the study area had declined from a similar period in 2025, as had the touch and go. Frenette noted there are many factors involved, such as weather, wind direction, the flow of traffic, and the staffing of the air traffic control tower. Improved staffing in the tower would result in the pattern being run at a fuller capacity, which could result in more aircraft being involved in the study area. Runway closures for any reason also affect numbers.

Mitigation updates were noted in blue in the report and included such things as the meeting with the flight schools which covered safety, best practices, the Noise Abatement Guidelines, the use of the practice boxes, and the new dashboard scoring methodology. The dashboard went live on January 1, 2026, giving the flight schools regular objective feedback to use in improving their performance. Individual flight schools were not identified, as the purpose was to focus on trends and best practices instead of singling out any one school’s performance. The schools would of course be able to access their individual scores. On page 15, request was made to include a brief description of the eight metrics used to create the scores.

Another mitigation method was having airport staff reach out to those using an extended training pattern during night-time hours when there were no other aircraft in the pattern, reminding them about following the Noise Abatement Guidelines. Other material in the report substantiated the finding of few aircraft entering the study area, and the occurrence of fewer touch and goes. Warm weather had contributed to a greater portion of the airport’s overall operations being related to training. It was noted that the Study Group Committee does focus on trends and will be looking at such things as the first quarter of the year or times of day.

Given the complexity of factors which influence flight, it was hoped access to such data would help the airport, with CACNR, to control what it could control through such things as collection of the data, the meetings with the flight schools, distribution of the Noise Abatement Guidelines, counseling nighttime outliers, and the new existence of the dashboard.

B. **1ST QUARTER DASHBOARD** – Zach Gabehart reported on the creation of the metrics used in the dashboard, done with considerable discussion and involvement of the flight schools. It was anticipated those would be used for the first year, with an evaluation of the need for changes for the next year. The ‘de-identification’ of the schools came about at the suggestion of some schools and was utilized to help assure continued collaboration with all schools. Gabehart discussed how the dashboard was structured for identification of how the various schools rank against each other and where there was room for improvement.

It was noted the dashboard encouraged many questions by the schools as they saw the results for the first time, and any one from CACNR with questions was encouraged to contact Zach Gabehart.

MOTION TO EXTEND THE MEETING TIME: A second motion to extend the meeting by 30 minutes was made by Brad Pierce and duly seconded. The motion carried.

Question was asked how the schools got credit for meeting the various metrics. If anyone connected with a school did something, credit would be given. It would be up to the schools to make sure there was reporting to the airport so that could be reflected in the school's score. Pierce, Frenette and Gabehart were thanked for their information and presentations.

9. **AIRPORT DIRECTOR:** Mike Fronapfel reported the Centennial Airport Tower Manager would be joining the Study Group Committee (SGC) again. This was particularly welcomed, as air traffic control's perspective would be valuable in relation to the dashboard, noise mitigation approaches, and the flight school training boxes. All of those involved in getting the FAA back to the table with the SGC were recognized for their efforts.

Work on a new Signature Hanger to the west of the administration building was progressing, to be completed Spring 2027. Fronapfel particularly noted work continued on the air traffic control tower rehabilitation, which was expected to be completed in late summer. The tower would be closed from June 1st – June 19th, Monday – Friday, between 10:00 p.m. – 5:00 a.m.

The Runway 5k coming up on June 6th was sold out, although sponsorships were still available. The ACPAA meeting date for June had been rescheduled for June 18th because of scheduling conflicts.

Fronapfel noted Lone Tree Representative Mike Anderson's term as a city council member was coming to an end, so this might be his last CACNR meeting, unless Lone Tree decided to appoint him to CACNR as a citizen representative. He was thanked for the time he had spent with CACNR and wished him the best in case this actually was his last meeting.

Fronapfel was thanked for providing the written report of the flight school meetings, both now and for the future. Question was asked about the F-18 which had come in to the airport when one of the runways was closed for scheduled maintenance; is it known how much runway closures affect noise in the surrounding communities? Will the airport be able to send some sort of email "blast" when things will occur which might affect or shift noise? Response was that if runway closures or other situations were of a relatively short duration, they would probably not be given such notice. Events such as the arrival of an F-18 are not known in advance so the public cannot be alerted.

10. **1ST QUARTER 2026 LAND USE REVIEW:** There were 24 land use referrals January through March, with 9 approved, 14 subjected to comment, and 1 not recommended. A map was provided which showed those subject to comment. The one referral not recommended was a change to a Douglas County zoning resolution that involved some changes to the site improvement plan process, which the airport opposed.

Question was asked if the Douglas County School District was talking with the airport at all about perhaps at least doing extra sound mitigation in the elementary school it is building right underneath the flight path? Response was there had been no conversations, but the airport had provided comments about that situation in its land use referral response to the County which should get back to the school district.

Question was asked if there were still jurisdictions the airport needed to meet with regarding their land use codes; all that the code would apply to had been met with. Comments from the Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Advisory Committee meeting earlier today would be used for further refinement and then taken back to the jurisdictions for final adoption into their land use codes, or not.

Question was asked if CACNR Representatives were ever to be informed of what the airport was speaking with their jurisdictions about, land use code recommendations and jurisdiction responses, what kind of noise complaints jurisdiction personnel reported to the airport they were getting, etc. Such information and knowledge would be useful to CACNR. Response was noise complaint information was felt to be adequately shared already by the jurisdictions' Representatives. Meetings with city and county staff were seldom, mostly with regard to the Part 150 study. Regarding noise complaints, it was difficult to determine if those who complained to a county commissioner, for example, had also complained through the airport's systems. Otherwise, some interactions had involved recommendations related to the Part 150 study, and the remainder were related to land use referral processes which are publicly available.

Zach Gabehart indicated airport staff could keep the respective Representatives in the know as the Part 150 study progressed and as that and land use were discussed with their jurisdiction. A few CACNR Representatives or Alternate Representatives were also on the staff of their jurisdictions, so might have been aware of the conversations that had been held.

It was noted some of the land use referrals were in the application preparation process and had not yet been presented to the jurisdictions' governing bodies. They might also be being presented to other referral agencies as their applications were being finalized.

11. **OLD BUSINESS:**

A. UC DAVIS NOISE AND EMISSIONS SYMPOSIUM: A report would be forthcoming.

12. **NEW BUSINESS:** None

13. **EXTENDED PUBLIC COMMENT:** None

14. **REPRESENTATIVES' COMMENTS:**

- Cynthia Liston Thye from Parker was welcomed to her first CACNR meeting. She indicated she was a planner, doing development review. She noted that about 90% of Parker's land use applications were administrative, so they did not go to public hearing. Accordingly, she felt the land use referral process would be important as things were tracked through a program that is transparent to the public, and through which any member of the public with comments was directed to contact the planner assigned to the case. She indicated she had not had any airport issues to date. She was again welcomed.

- Bill Wasmund noted Wings Over the Rockies would have a fly-in the weekend of May 9th. That event generally had aircraft owners and operators flying in to show and tell about their aircraft. Time would be between 9:30 and 12:30, and a food truck would be

available. On Sunday, May 10th, there would be a Wings Over the Rocky Space Race 5K, from 8:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon. Information was available on the website. The final event he noted would be a concert on June 13th supporting the restoration and unveiling of an F-16 fighter which had been donated to Wings Over the Rockies. The concert would feature Dos Gringos, a band formed by some fighter pilots – Maverick types – who apparently have a good time with their music. Information about this event would also be on the Wings Over the Rockies website.

- Mike Anderon thanked Mike Fronapfel for the kind words earlier and noted two new city council members had been elected for Lone Tree. He did not know how or when the mayor would proceed regarding appointees. He indicated Lone Tree continued to grow and had just broken ground on High Note Regional Park, an 80 – 100 acre site along I-25 and Happy Canyon Creek. That open space area has a lot of overflight traffic. He felt that Lone Tree continued to build a balance of open space, recreational amenities, schools, public works facilities and administrative facilities, not just all residential as some might think.

- Brenda Dyche indicated she did not feel her county – Elbert County – was being treated fairly and wanted to work collaboratively to figure something out. The flight schools and the FAA needed to be involved. She wanted to know the result of any FAA meeting which discussed the safety concerns of her county about the low-flying planes which had been reported. She wanted specific discussion results, because the two flight schools which had been reported had been flying low over her home ever since they had been reported. What had been said and what had been the schools' reaction to that reporting and discussion?

Dyche further noted it was not just one or two houses complaining, so they should not be shoved in a corner and ignored. If a rancher complained that planes were spooking the cattle, were the planes buzzing over the cattle at 500 feet as they did over Elbert County homes and towns and schools and businesses?

15. **RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACPAA & OTHERS TO POTENTIALL REDUCE NOISE OVER AFFECTED COMMUNITIES:** None

16. **NEXT MEETINGS:**

A. **CACNR** – June 3, 2026 6:30 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
July 1, 2026 NO CACNR MEETING
Aug 5, 2026 6:30 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
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** – May 14, 2026 3:00 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
June 18, 2026 3:00 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
July 9, 2026 NO ACPAA MEETING
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. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:20 p.m.

Alison Biggs, Secretary