



CENTENNIAL AIRPORT COMMUNITY NOISE ROUNDTABLE MINUTES

Approved 08 05 26

June 3, 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 6:31 p.m. by Vice Chair Pam Thompson. The following were in attendance, and a quorum was present:

Arapahoe County:	Rhonda Fields online	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:	Cynthia Liston Thyme
Aurora:	Brad Pierce	ACPAA:	Michael Fronapfel
Castle Pines:	Chris Eubanks	AOPA:	Joe Patton
Castle Rock:	Sandy Vossler online	CABA:	Don Kuskie
Centennial:	Don Sheehan	Wings Over the Rockies:	Bill Wasmund
Cherry Hills Village:	Dave Heller online		

Also present: Castle Pines Alternate Representative Ron Cole online; ACPAA Alternate Representative Zach Gabehart; AOPA Alternate Representative Mike Koscielniak; Jennifer Redding, FAA Senior Program Analyst, Northwest Mountain Region; online; and ACPAA Staff Matt Frenette, Aliyah Then, and Lauren Wiarda.

Additional attendees or online guests: Michael Gradis, City of Centennial Staff, online; Randy Johnson, citizen online; Nathan Moran, Mead & Hunt, online; Joe Panem, citizen; Brad Rolf, Mead & Hunt, online; and pilot/instructor Bill Ward, online.

Absent: Arapahoe County:	Sreenivasan Alakappan/Vacant	Lone Tree:	Vacant/Chuck Darnell
Elbert County:	Mike Buck/Shawn Fletcher	CDOT Aeronautics Div:	Todd Green/Vacant

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT: Before the beginning of the meeting, Chris Eubanks announced he would be resigning the Chair position for CACNR at the end of this meeting. Various work and personal commitments had made it very difficult for him to give that position the attention and time he felt it deserved. Per the bylaws, the Vice Chair automatically assumes the Chair, until the next election, and the Chair would then appoint someone to the Vice Chair position, subject to approval of a majority of the Regular Member Representatives present at the meeting when any appointment was made.

Eubanks was thanked for his work on behalf of CACNR, both as Chair and as a member of the CACNR Study Group Committee. He indicated he would remain as the Castle Pines Representative to CACNR, and on that Committee. Interest in the Vice Chair position was solicited so that an appointment could be made at the August CACNR meeting.

2. **CONSENT AGENDA:** The Consent Agenda included the draft CACNR Minutes from May 6, 2026; the Treasurer's Report from May 29, 2026, showing a balance of \$27,587.53; and the CACNR Attendance Record through May, 2026. On the motion of Alison Biggs, duly seconded, the Consent Agenda was approved.

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

4. **PART 150 STUDY UPDATE:**

A. **UPDATE** - Zach Gabehart reported continuation of the refinement and finalized modeling of noise alternatives. The consultant team was scheduled to attend the August CACNR meeting to bring a finalized version of the draft noise compatibility plan. The Part 150 Noise Compatibility Study Advisory Committee would meet to receive the information on the same day as CACNR. Comments received at those meetings might be used to make changes. The public hearing on the plan could be scheduled for September. The plan would then be taken to ACPAA which would decide on the final version as the official recommendation from the airport to the FAA, possibly by mid-October.

Requests were made for the consultants to date their reports and to number the pages. More importantly, request was again made for the reports to be provided in a timelier fashion so they could be included in the pre-meeting e-mailing instead of just being made available at the meeting. Without receiving the reports before the meetings, those Representatives who could only attend online had no

opportunity to review the material and provide comments or questions. Not receiving the reports until after the meetings was considered unfortunate for them at the least. It did not seem as though the content of reports received had been so time sensitive that they could not have been prepared in time for inclusion in the CACNR e-mailings, and it was asked that this not occur for the August CACNR meeting.

B. REPONSES TO PAST CACNR QUESTIONS - Questions pulled from past CACNR meetings had been submitted to the consultants; some had been answered by them, and some had been referred back to the airport. Responses were provided. It was noted many of the inquiries which had been indicated would/could be considered during the upcoming Part 150 had been deemed not within the scope of that study.

Clarification was sought about the status of the portable noise monitor currently labeled P1 becoming permanent in the Greenwood Village area. The FAA will no longer install or recommend installation of anything outside the 65 DNL noise contour as it did when the current noise monitors were installed following the last Centennial Airport Part 150. From the airport's perspective, the current Part 150 would look at areas that potentially need a permanent noise monitor, and if they were not eligible for federal funding, then different funding avenues could be explored by the airport, possibly in conjunction with the jurisdictions involved. Such monitors would be integrated into the airport's current system for data collection and reporting and maintenance. Since the FAA would not assist with funding, there would be no reason to wait on the FAA any longer to begin the process of making the P1 monitor permanent. The exact required expenditure was unclear, and Greenwood Village had not budgeted for it this year, pending an FAA ruling. There would also need to be some agreement on what the monitor would be called, to assure recognition of its location as well as continuity with the data already collected from the portable location.

Discussion noted if the FAA will not pay for any noise monitors outside the 65 DNL noise contour on a nationwide basis, how would airports without current noise monitoring systems know where their noise contours were, and what was outside the 65 DNL? If airports cannot access that information, they cannot truly identify or measure the noise in their surrounding communities. It did leave the impression that the FAA did not really want to know about noise issues facing the public, perhaps not a good message for the FAA to be sending.

Frustration was again noted that when questions and concerns had come up in prior meetings, it had been easy to say they could be looked at during the Part 150, and then it turned out they were replied to with generalities or weren't considered within the purview of the Part 150 study after all. A listing of meetings the consultants indicated they had attended, either in person or virtually, with various groups, including CACNR was provided. It was noted the group the consultants called the FAA Study Group was actually CACNR's Study Group Committee.

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

5. NOISE REPORTS:

A. APRIL 2026 - The April 2026 Noise Report included the following information:

April Local Operations:	11,757	April Total Operations:	23,814
Year to Date Local Operations:	48,322	Year to Date Total Operations:	99,037

23,814 Total Operations in April resulted in 755 complaints from 53 households.

April Noise Events:

<u>April Total:</u>		<u>April 60 – 69 db:</u>		<u>April 70 – 79 db:</u>		<u>April 80 – 89 db:</u>	
Golf Course	7,907	Meridian	6,702	Golf Course	3,427	Airport East	380
Meridian	7,876	Golf Course	4,278	Meridian	1,142	Golf Course	197
Airport East	2,651	Parker	2,032	Airport East	792	Lone Tree	42
Parker	2,243	State Park	1,435	State Park	498	Meridian	30
State Park	1,944	Airport East	1,434	Port. Station 31	264	Port. Station 31	18
Port. Station 31	1,523	Port. Station 31	1,241	Parker	210	State Park	11
Grandview Estates	1,288	Grandview Estates	1,140	Grandview Estates	142	Grandview Estates	5
Castle Rock	951	Castle Rock	894	Greenwood Village	70	Castle Rock	2
Greenwood Village	781	Greenwood Village	710	Castle Rock	55	Castle Pines	2
Lone Tree	624	Lone Tree	506	Castle Pines	48	Parker	1
Hunters Hill	399	Hunters Hill	379	Lone Tree	36	Greenwood Village	1
Castle Pines	241	Castle Pines	191	Hunters Hill	19	Hunters Hill	1
Sagebrush Park	78	Sagebrush Park	72	Sagebrush Park	6	Sagebrush Park	0

April Noise Events in the 90+ decibel range: Airport East – 45 Lone Tree – 40 Golf Course – 5 Meridian – 2 Grandview Estates - 1

<u>April Noise Complaints per Municipality</u>		<u>Numbers of Households:</u>		<u>YTD Complaints and</u>		<u>Number of Households:</u>	
Unincorporated Douglas County	277 (37%)	UAC	15 (28%)	UDC	673 (29%)	UAC	24 (23%)
Unincorporated Arapahoe County	148 (22%)	UDC	14 (26%)	UAC	494 (22%)	GV	23 (22%)
Centennial	142 (19%)	Greenwood Village	12 (23%)	Centennial	397 (17%)	UDC	23 (22%)
Unincorporated Elbert County	73 (10%)	Centennial	2 (4%)	UEC	354 (16%)	Other	8 (8%)
Greenwood Village	60 (8%)	Lone Tree	2 (4%)	GV	266 (12%)	Lone Tree	6 (6%)
Lone Tree	44 (6%)	Highlands Ranch	2 (4%)	Lone Tree	57 (2.5%)	Centennial	5
Highlands Ranch	4	Other	2 (4%)	Other	21	HR	5
Denver	3	Castle Rock	1	Denver	10	Parker	3
Other	2	Denver	1	Highlands Ranch	8	Denver	2
Castle Rock	1	UCE	1	Castle Rock	6	UEC	2
Parker	1	Parker	1	Parker	4	Castle Pines	1
Aurora	0	Aurora	0	Castle Pines	2	Castle Rock	1
Castle Pines	0	Castle Pines	0	Aurora	0	Aurora	0
Cherry Hills Village	0	Cherry Hills Village	0	Cherry Hills Village	0	CHV	0

Year to Date, the top five households complaining were:

Household #1 358 (16%) Centennial
Household #2 353 (15%) Unincorporated Elbert County
Household #3 289 (13%) Unincorporated Douglas County

Household #4 212 (9%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County
Household #5 166 (7%) Unincorporated Douglas County
Remaining Households 914 (40%)

In April, 78 noise complaint responses were completed from 755 noise complaints, with 72 of those by email and 6 by telephone.

In April 675 complaints were received from 7:00 a.m. – 9:59 p.m. (89.5%)
80 complaints were received from 10:00 p.m. – 6:59 a.m. (10.5%)

In April props accounted for **91% of the complaints by aircraft type**; **jets** accounted for **6% of the complaints**, and **helicopters** caused **3%**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed propellers had caused 91% of the complaints; jets caused 7%, and helicopters caused 2%.

In April departures were responsible for **22% of the complaints**, **training** was responsible for **69% of the complaints**, and **arrivals** were responsible for **9% of the complaints**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed training had caused 66% of the complaints, departures had caused 24%, and arrivals had caused 10%.

A graph was provided showing the **April number of complaints by the hour** in which they were made, with a peak at 7 a.m. hour; followed by a secondary peak at 10 a.m. An early evening bump in complaints is observed at 8 p.m.

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

- Looking at noise complaints month to month, they seemed to be going up even though operations have been trending down: 421 complaints from 25,866 operations in January 2026 to 755 complaints from 23,814 operations in April.
- Could there be a relationship between the higher number of complaints and the decibel levels noted in some neighborhoods? For example, Lone Tree's noise monitor recorded 40 flights in the 90+ dB range, almost as many as Airport East on the airport's grounds. Last month Lone Tree had only eight in that range. Staff reported having noticed the seeming discrepancy and was examining the situation. Flight tracks had not appeared to correlate to the number of events recorded, so all related aspects of these numbers were being explored.
- It was noted complaints from Unincorporated Douglas County were up rather significantly, as were those from Centennial. Greenwood Village complaints had stayed steady. The Unincorporated Douglas County complaints were heavily attributed to one or two households in the northwestern part of the county. For Greenwood Village, comment was made that jet traffic there had moved toward Cherry Creek High School, and fewer of the flight schools were circling by the fire station. The number one Centennial house was located west of the airport, west of I-25. Nighttime complaints had also increased from 47 to 80 although that might be attributed to the effect of daylight savings time's longer daylight hours encroaching on clock hours.
- Representatives were asked to self-monitor their areas to see what was happening regarding fluctuations in noise and complaint data over both the short and long terms, and to bring that information to future CACNR meetings.

B. PORTABLE MONITOR, The Canyons, Castle Pines – The location of this portable monitor was in the Canyons subdivision of Castle Pines, about five miles directly south of the airport, right in the ILS approach corridor for the airport's main runway. This approach has a ground based precision approach which is used in any sort of inclement weather because it can get aircraft closest to the ground in bad weather. That approach is critical, very precise, and cannot be deviated from.

- The portable monitor was in place during the month of April before the prevailing winds had switched into summer mode out of the south. Jets were the aircraft most using the approach related to the location of the portable monitor; 916jts, 558 propellers, and 10 helicopters. There were 907 arrivals, 440 departures, and 130 training flights.
- Question was asked about the altitude, which had been between 1,500 and 2,000 feet, going below that about five miles out where the pilots are also powering back to slow down, deploying flaps, etc., all of which increases the noise footprint. That was not really any different than any other north flow April.
- It was noted the residence where the portable monitor was located was directly under the approach path, so every aircraft using the path is right over that residence. The topography also might be contributing to the problem, as the sound down in the canyon there seemed different than other locations. The majority of noise events at the portable monitor were in the 60-69 decibel range, with a smaller number in the 70-79 decibel range.
- There had been a noticeable increase in the number of complaints coming from the area, which had not even been completely built out yet. The Outer Marker Road within the community had been there for a very long time, as the outer marker to the instrument approach to the runway.
- Because of these factors, the airport had opposed this development and had requested navigation easements and notifications to perspective buyers, but the home builder had declined to do that. If prospective residents do not do their due diligence, they are met with unanticipated noise.
- It was reported that the main developer in the area does provide one paragraph in its contracts saying you are moving into an area where there is slight activity, and they ask the buyer to sign the statement. It was unknown how many actually looked at flight activity in the area before signing. Apparently other builders are doing something similar. It was noted being given something within the myriad of papers needing to be signed at closing was too late to be meaningful in relation to the airport and aircraft noise.

Developers do not want to disclose anything which might affect their sales. It would be positive if there was differing notification being done by any developers.

- There was discussion of what to do with results from the portable noise monitors, or any of the monitors for that matter. Given the constraints in place from the FAA, the need to use a precision approach flight path which cannot be changed, and the complaints CACNR receives from a variety of locations, it was obviously a challenging situation. It was noted the frequency of overhead flights seemed to be of particular concern, and that was something CACNR was attempting to address with the flight schools at least.

- Question was asked what the response of the homeowner who had asked for the portable monitor had been about the results. Some questions had been asked and information provided to help with understanding, such as why the ILS could not be moved, and some discussion of the frequency annoyance issue. There had been no further communication from the resident.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

A. MEETING OR VIRTUAL ATTENDEES – There was no one attending in person who wished to speak.

- Online, Randy Johnson of Louviers reported noting 352 planes over his area, mostly training flights; 215 had come from Centennial and 175 from Rocky Mountain Metropolitan, with occasional ones from Spaceport. On their highest days, 15 had come from Centennial and 17 had come from Rocky Mountain. His overall highest days included one day of 38 planes, two days of 36 and one of 33. He had submitted 116 complaints to Centennial, the highest he had ever done, and 13 to Rocky Mountain, which was a little low because he was so busy with Centennial's.

Once again, Johnson felt multiple planes had been purposely flying directly towards Louviers and then doing a similar turning pattern which included flying over Louviers area residences. He had been able to identify which flight schools had been involved, including Aspen, Independence, and Epic. It had appeared to him that Epic had added planes, and they did not normally fly close. He had also noted some new plane numbers but did not provide specifics about those.

- Online, Bill Ward, flight instructor and pilot at Centennial commented on the home closing disclosure documents mentioned earlier. He had previously felt and continued to feel that a paragraph in a closing document comprised of countless pages was not enough. He felt Shea Homes and Richmond America Homes were two of the most difficult for giving notice. He had toured the Summit at Meridian, Cityscape at Dove Valley, and the Canyons in Castle Pines and had asked about the airport at each. Responses had included such comments as "Oh, the airport is subject to restrictions," or "the airport's not that busy," or "they don't even use that runway," or "you don't really get any noise."

He felt it should be made clear to people moving right next to the airport or in the path of the ILS that they are going to be subjected to 24-7-365 noise from the airport. The results from the portable noise monitor provided an honest picture of what being under a precision approach is like. Centennial Airport objects to developments being built in that location as did many other people, because the ILS cannot be moved or curved or otherwise fixed.

He suggested one thing CACNR might do was to look at some way to strengthen disclosures about the noise sensitive areas around the airport, whether it was through CACNR itself or Representatives working with their jurisdictions' governing bodies. Prospective buyers need to be helped to look at a map, and a heat map, and understand the development's relationship to the airport, and understand what a navigation easement means before they sign one. It had been observed that the housing market or the housing developers and the aviation industry were eventually going to come head to head. It did not seem appropriate or safe to keep allowing building and selling single family, not as well insulated homes in areas where they are being placed right now. He noted he had recently flown over a development to the unacceptably Immediate south of the airport that was being unfortunately heavily populated and wondered how many of those residents were really aware of the implications of their decisions.

B. RECEIVED BY CACNR –

1. Randy Johnson was commended for the work he did and does to keep airport staff and CACNR apprised of the flight activity in his area. He had spoken about his results for the month as noted above.

2. Brenda Dyche from Elbert County also had provided explicit records of flight activity in her area, including for today showing four planes which were recorded as being between six to eight hundred feet over the top of her house. Factors which might have affected the accuracy of the measurements could have been cloud cover, barometric pressure, etc. There may also have been aerial surveying going on, or some kind of photography. Knowing that did not necessarily make the accompanying noise any less annoying.

3. Laurie Boshart from Douglas County, a new development east of Hilltop and Singing Hills Road, basically had requested flights going to the training boxes observe the voluntary fly quiet hours. Although there were both late-night and morning violations, the very numerous 5:30 a.m. wake-up flights were the most prevalent and annoying.

4. Joe Panem was in attendance and also regularly communicated with CACNR and airport staff. His emails agreed strongly with Boshart, as he had been expressing for several months. Planes seemed to be using an older, retired training box even though there was one only five minutes away. And unfortunately, planes had to go over Randy Johnson's location to reach that location. For Panem, it frequently started around 4:00a.m., and he shared some personal information about the impact such noise had on his family. He was thanked for putting such a real life perspective on the situation. All agreed there had to be a better way to get the flight schools to respect those on the ground more than had been evidenced so far.

5. Lisa Esquivel was in the area involved by the Study Group Committee, and it was the first communication from someone in that area for a long time. Her point was she was getting a lot of training flights, some seeming as low as 450 feet over her house, from 5:00 a.m. to 11:00 p.m.

It was noted that concerns as noted above are brought to CACNR's attention, and responses are provided to the questions asked.

7. EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:

A. ACPAA MEETING - Pam Thompson had provided the written report given to the May meeting, and reported the members of the ACPAA Board were very concerned about noise. Two on that Board were Douglas County Commissioners, and all would have these minutes to read, plus having heard Thompson's report on June 18th. She noted there were now areas from Elizabeth to Louviers, with Chatfield, Ridgeway, Castle Pines and Meridian coming for more anticipated noise complaints. It would be a challenge to determine what to do with all of them, since it would be difficult to form a targeted Study Group to address each of them. Those who had been complaining for some time would not want to take a back seat to the newer developments, even if those were actually closer to the airport.

The ACPAA Board was very sympathetic to the noise problems, but there was little it could do since so many of the affected areas were not within its jurisdiction. FAA regulations also limit actions airports can take regarding noise abatement and aircraft. Voluntary noise abatement guidelines were perhaps its best offense for working with the flight schools. One of the pilots connected to CACNR had commented that when he was in a training box and noticed he was over houses, he made the conscious effort to relocate his training. That kind of thinking would be nice to instill in all pilots and pilot instructors. The concept was being discussed at the pilots' association, and at the Colorado Aviation Business Association (CABA), but was taking a very long time to trickle down,

B. WEBSITE RFP – Andy Jones was excited to bring information about updating the website, which had not occurred for a very long time. The goal was to have a website which was simple but sophisticated, visually appealing, user friendly, and which would effectively inform and educate CACNR Members and Representatives and the public about airport noise issues, noise mitigation efforts, noise abatement procedures, and the roles of CACNR, ACPAA, and other related or involved organizations.

Jones noted CACNR was not a governmental agency and therefore was not required to obtain multiple bids to do the update and maintenance of its website. He had created a draft RFP which the Executive Committee had seen and he had shared it with Altitude Design Agency (ADA), run by an individual he knew and had worked with for a long time who was currently based in Bentonville, Arkansas. He had received ADA's proposal the day before this CACNR meeting. He had spoken with his friend extensively and believed he had already started working on the website even without a contract. He was suggesting changing the content management system to one which would be very easy to use and to regularly update. He understood the website should be a repository for information to be accessed and used by CACNR Representatives and by the general public

The cost of the ADA proposal to update the website would be the full \$5,000 included in CACNR's budget for both the update and maintenance of the website. ADA requested \$2,500 at the start of the project, and \$2,500 when the update was completed to CACNR's satisfaction. Details and timelines were included in the proposal, beginning with this meeting, with the update completed by the August CACNR meeting. There would be another month for training on the use of the site, and completion of any necessary adjustments.

Question was asked if there would be any kind of service agreement for perhaps at least a year. There did not want to be any reliance on airport staff to do maintenance or updating of the site on a regular basis. ADA would do so but would require a separate agreement at a special rate to CACNR of \$200 an hour. The cost of ongoing maintenance would certainly need to be under consideration, unless CACNR Representatives would take on the task. There would also be a cost factor related to the new content management system, and how that would compare with the cost of the Go Daddy current platform, domain registration fee, etc. was unclear. Although ADA's proposal did not include these types of additional costs, it was noted CACNR did have budgeted reserve funds, as well as unexpended funds in other categories. Such costs should be clarified before the 2027 budget needed to be created.

Question was asked if ADA had its own hosting site or would host on its own mainframe, or would it be taking over the current CACNR Go Daddy account, and what kind of refreshing would go along with either. Security of the site was also brought up. The proposal did address some of these more technical topics, which were included in the proposal's cost.

Jones encouraged proceeding with the ADA proposal in order to have something operable by the August CACNR meeting. Observation was made that would preclude any interest which might be expressed by any other vendors, with perhaps a different cost factor. Request was made for next steps which needed to be accomplished. Per Jones, it appeared CACNR should approve the draft RFP, with a price point not to exceed \$5,000; the timeline written into the RFP splitting the cost into \$2,500 initially and \$2,500 when CACNR was satisfied with the update. CACNR would supply the content, although Jones would ask the airport for the use of any archived photos or videos not currently in use and for which CACNR would not have to include attribution. He next wished for approval of the proposal from ADA to be signed no later than July 10th, provided no one had major modifications between now and then.

Question was asked about the different dates in the version of the RFP which had been shown on the screen, and what was correct. It was noted the majority of CACNR Representatives had not seen the RFP or the ADA proposal before getting it tonight, and was there a definitive reason for taking action now? It did not seem appropriate to approve something in that fashion. It was noted the website had needed to be updated for a very long time, so waiting another couple months would probably not make a lot of difference, but would allow everyone to know what they were voting on.

Considerable additional time was spent clarifying deadlines and deciding how to handle the RFP and the vendor (s) proposal(s). Finally, on the motion of Brad Pierce, duly seconded, it was agreed to approve the RFP with the issuance date changed to June 10th, and to postpone any decision on a vendor proposal until the August meeting. (Secretary's note – other dates in the RFP also needed to be changed to accommodate final action on a proposal not taking place until August.)

C. WORK PROGRAM – Alison Biggs reported Bill Wasmund (see #13), Mike Koscielniak and Andy Jones were the three who had so far volunteered and were working on aspects of the Work Program. Volunteers were still needed.

8. **CACNR STUDY GROUP COMMITTEE:** Chair Brad Pierce reported the committee greatly appreciated the active participation of two representatives from the air traffic control tower at its last meeting and looked forward to their continued attendance. He also thanked Jennifer Redding from the FAA Regional Office for approving their return to the committee.

He next reported that, as requested, the committee had looked into possible mitigation strategies to reduce the number of overflights and low-flying aircraft within the 3 Towers and Elizabeth practice areas. It had also been asked to include the practice areas in the group's scope of work by providing data analysis and developing operational mitigations. Its findings and recommendations had been included in the email for this meeting.

The report provided background on the development of the practice areas, the growth of the Elizabeth, Elbert County, and Kiowa areas, and the FAA's mention of minimum safe altitudes for aircraft flying over "congested areas," leaving the application and definition of "congested area" to individual assessments.

The current study area was located within the Centennial Airport Class D airspace, which enabled collaboration between the airport, the local FAA control tower, based flight schools, and CACNR. The 3 Towers and Elizabeth practice areas were in uncontrolled airspace approximately two miles southeast of Centennial's airspace boundary or approximately nine miles from the center of the airport. The airport and local FAA tower do not have jurisdiction in that area.

Consideration had been given to the challenges presented for pilot training in areas surrounding Centennial Airport, including the existence of nearby Denver International Airport, Buckley Space Force Base, and Colorado Air and Space Port. The vertical cap provided by the overlying Denver Class B airspace allowed separation of larger and faster jets from the smaller propeller aircraft used for training, but did increase congestion and limit flexibility for use of certain other areas. Population density differences were also a factor.

The committee acknowledged the seriousness of the issue with aircraft noise and repetitive flights in the requested study area, but after considerable consideration, it had been determined the committee's current scope of work did not include developing operational mitigations or providing continuous data analysis of the 3 Towers and Elizabeth practice areas. However, the committee made three recommendations for CACNR to

1. Request flight schools to avoid ground reference maneuvers in the 3 Towers and Elizabeth practice areas. Such maneuvers require aircraft to be lower to the ground, generally a thousand feet above ground level. These would be requested to be conducted in the more easterly practice areas. For reference, some based flight schools have already adopted this practice as mandatory in their standard operating procedures.
2. Request flight schools to adopt a standard altitude entering and exiting the 3 Towers and Elizabeth practice areas to allow for maximum vertical separation between the aircraft and communities. This practice would help flight schools be good neighbors while transversing through the practice areas.
3. Continue working with the Colorado Pilots Association to address and relay concerns about flight training activities in the practice areas.

It had been noted that any concern about low flying or erratic maneuvered aircraft should be directed to the FAA through the Denver Flight Standard District Office (FSDO), the regulatory body which would determine any possible violation of FAA regulations.

Discussions, clarifications and observations:

- The three training boxes to the west of the airport were considered unacceptable or of concern to flight instructors due to the rising terrain, more frequent turbulence and wind shear, traffic congestion and airspace constraints.
- The 2020 population figures used did not reflect the current populations of the areas involved. This had made the comparisons cited by the committee in that paragraph of its report inaccurate and the paragraph should be stricken.
- Although pilots were already asked to voluntarily refrain from doing ground reference maneuvers in these training boxes, there had never been an official CACNR recommendation to that effect, thus recommendation #1.
- Question was asked what the standard altitude was or would be as referenced in recommendation #2? Response was it would not be for 'us' to determine but would be up to the flight schools; it was anticipated it would be close to two thousand feet. The topic was on the agenda for the next flight school meeting.
- It was noted CACNR had never worked formally with the Colorado Pilots Association or attended any of its meetings. Having one

of CACNR's Alternate Representatives also be an active board member of the pilots' group had been very helpful, as he had served as an informal conduit, taking what CACNR had heard from the communities to the broader flying community along the Front Range and the State. Recommendation #3 seemed to make a communication channel between CACNR and the Colorado Pilots' Association more recognizable, official, and useful for the future. Mike Koscielniak was thanked for his role in all of this!

- It was also noted when information had not seemed to be getting to the pilots, the pilots' association had published several templates, map overlays, the Noise Abatement Guidelines, and other items for the use of pilots, and this had been much appreciated. That type of information sharing and the resulting related conversations could result in broader communication channels throughout the state and to other flight schools as well. Mike Koscielniak was again recognized for his actions.
- Question was asked how to get in touch with the Denver FSDO with safety concerns, reports of low-flying aircraft, etc. That part of the FAA can be reached through the airport's website, noise.centennialairport.com, or it could be accessed through the FAA website, FAA.com.
- Noise reports, data, and complaint information from the communities continued to be shared during the mandatory flight school meetings, and some individual schools had also been informed of specific problems involving their school's flights. Some schools were responding by giving instructions to their members about the issues. Others, perhaps not so much.

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

- Question, was asked if CACNR should communicate with the Denver FSDO, providing the kind of information available from members of our communities who had tracked planes. It would seem appropriate for CACNR to be on record as having identified safety problems, and would appreciate the FSDO's attention to them. Or should it be on the CACNR agenda so there could be more specific information gathering to create a compelling communication to send to the FSDO? It would need to focus on safety rather than noise for the FSDO to even consider it. Getting any kind of response from the FSDO could be useful in the future.
- There was considerable discussion of the FAA's lack of a specific definition of a congested v. non-congested area, and the frustrations that caused. Leaving the decision up to individual inspectors would result in an incalculable number of different standards. It was again as though the FAA had found another way to prevent careful consideration of the problems aircraft cause for the public.
- Suggestion was made for informational letters about the issues under consideration to be sent to the actual owners or financiers of each flight school. They could be asked to look into the situations with their chief financial officers and their membership, and perhaps others. Mike K. volunteered to bring a draft of such a letter to the August CACNR meeting. It would need to be sent personally to each company owner. Airport staff indicated that information was available for CACNR's use.
- Frustration and disappointment was expressed that with all the work done by the committee to help Greenwood Village, similar assistance was not being provided to those in the 3 Towers and Elizabeth areas. Would there ever be any way to help someplace other than Greenwood Village if the committee was given a different charge? The committee had discussed the problem at length, and the decision had been made as given in the report.

On the motion of Brad Pierce, duly seconded, CACNR adopted the 3 recommendations from the CACNR Study Group Committee.

9. **AIRPORT DIRECTOR:** Mike Fronapfel indicated he would be brief, but did want to note that operations through the end of April were almost identical to that time last year. Fuel sales were 5.8% higher than last year, surprising since operations were flat and fuel costs were higher.

As noted, the FAA had participated with the last Study Group Committee and had been welcomed with open arms. Time had been spent reviewing the activity, mediations, and progress over the last year, as well as the dashboards, which they had not seen.

Work on the Signature hangar was progressing, with completion expected in Spring 2027. Work on the air traffic control tower was also continuing, with completion anticipated late Summer 2026. He reminded that the tower would be closed from 10:00 p.m. until 5:00 a.m., Monday through Thursday through June 12th. There would also be some additional nighttime closures toward the end of July and the exact dates would be provided to CACNR. The Hot Dogs and Airplanes Runway 5K event was the next weekend, with about 2,000 people participating as well as others attending, vendors, sponsors and spectators. Due to an industry conference in Pueblo on a conflicting date, the ACPAA meeting would be on June 18th instead of June 11th.

Question was asked if Centennial expected any differences in operations with the airport in Aspen closing. Most aircraft go to Eagle or Rifle if they don't use Aspen, so only a small difference would probably be noted. In the Winter, some now go to Aspen, drop their passengers and come to Centennial because there is more space to park and fuel prices are lower. If Aspen is closed, more might come here and their passengers would either drive or helicopter to Aspen, but both Rifle and Eagle have more ramp pace, which might or might not fill up. It will likely be a 'remains to be seen' situation.

Zach Gabehart reported the FAA had just notified the airport of a proposed updated arrival procedure into the airport. The change affected a star or standard terminal arrival meant to bring aircraft from high flight levels down into the terminal area and set them up to approach into the airport. It would be used by jet aircraft approaching from the northwest, only when under instrument flight rules, so a fairly small segment of aircraft would be using it; single engine planes would not be. Gabehart provided slides comparing current routes and the proposed revised routes, which had been requested by the air traffic controllers and would require fewer directional changes to aircraft by them since the routes would be in the GPS.

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

Although this would affect aircraft approaching from the northwest, that westward shift would make a change for those outside that airspace, so those in the foothills could notice an increase in traffic because of the FAA's action. Questions were asked if the FAA was telling anybody about this, or if an environmental study had been done on the shift. The FAA is apparently only required to do an environmental assessment if it is 3,000 or less feet above ground, and there is only one segment of this approach that met that criteria. It seemed that one change segment had been evaluated as part of the 2020 Denver Metroplex project and had been included as an approval in that overall assessment. Anything above the 3,000 foot buffer does not require any sort of environmental action.

As far as advance notice is concerned, apparently the FAA has some sort of an internal comment process about which Centennial Airport staff had no knowledge and which comment time had closed; Centennial was now signed up to receive such notices. Comments which could have been made would have included that people in the foothills would be impacted negatively by the change; The shift of traffic from a more populous to a less populous area might be considered a positive by the FAA, but it likely would be noticed more because of that, as well as because the different terrain reflects noise more dramatically. It would also be harder to find a landing spot in the foothills in the case of an emergency. Observation could also have been made that operators would likely experience more turbulence and more discomfort over the foothills, as well as the safety concerns mentioned. It was noted this change had been sent out to corporate pilots as soon as it was available and would likely be discussed at that group's monthly meeting and their observations shared with CACNR in August.

10. **OLD BUSINESS:** Dave Heller had provided a report from the UC Davis Noise and Emissions Symposium which he had attended along with Chris Eubanks and Pam Thompson. The cover page of the report had been in the mailing, but the referenced attachments had been missed and were provided on site. There had been some discussion during previous CACNR meetings, but to recap, the symposium was a great networking and learning environment, and particularly helpful for those new to CACNR and aviation noise. There had not been much specific to general aviation airports, but there was still a lot of relevant noise and related topics.

Thought was expressed that it might be time to become more aggressive about getting some general aviation topics on the agenda, or to have general aviation represented on some of the panels. That had been mentioned by the CACNR representatives when they completed the post-conference evaluations.

11. **NEW BUSINESS:** None

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

13. **REPRESENTATIVES COMMENTS:** Nothing from members of the Colorado Municipal League.

- Bill Wasmund reported Wings Over the Rockies was having a breakfast fly-in on June 13th. About 1,000 people were expected at the event, from 7:30 a.m.- 11:30 a.m. If they could arrive on time, two F-16 Vipers would take part in the fly-in, and would be there until about 9:00 p.m. This was all in support of a Dos Gringos (an American fighter pilot band) concert that evening, from 5:00 p.m. - 8:30 p.m.

The June 2026 issue of *Flying* magazine contained an article about Wings Over the Rockies, about 6-7 pages long and well done. A copy had been provided so it could be shared with CACNR, and it would be attached to the minutes.

For part of his volunteer work with the CACNR Work Program, Wasmund had created two 30-minute presentations that could be used for new CACNR Representative and Alternate Representative orientation and also for airport tour participants. The first was an introduction to Denver airspace and the flight school practice areas. The second one was called Sound, Noise and Human Perception and was an abbreviated version of the Noise 101 course that many have taken. It condensed much of that information into about 30 minutes; if viewers required additional information, Wasmund volunteered to help them individually.

It was anticipated these would be put on the updated website, and Wasmund had also shared them for CACNR distribution before the website was operational.

- Brenda Dyche first wanted to formally request a data comparison to be done for one of the flight training areas in Douglas County compared to 3 Towers.

Second, she had found an article stating "*A congested area in the eyes of the FAA is defined by the number of complaints that come from a given area or individual. A single phone call to the local FSDO turns one person's house into a congested area. An enforcement action has in the past been taken against pilots who operated aircraft below 1,000 feet in what the pilot considered a sparsely populated area. The following is an FAA chief council opinion taken from the federal aviation regulations explained (Jeppesen, 2005). 'Congested area' is determined on a case-by-case basis. Examples of what was determined by the [NTSB to be congested areas] are 1. an area consisting of 10 houses and a school, 2. a university campus; 3. a beach area along a highway; 4. over a camp where there are numerous people on the dock and children playing on the shore.*" Dyche noted some of these criteria fit the 3 Towers area and the Elizabeth area as being congested.

Third, in response to the concern about the additional cost to training flights for going further east, she observed if they can pay for flying lessons, they can probably afford the gas to take a straight line from the airport east over less congested areas instead of flying down south, directly into 3 Towers, buzzing the houses there, and then making a beeline north and east to the less congested areas. Numerous violations of aircraft flying below 1,000 feet out there had been reported but nothing was being done about them. She had heard nothing from the FAA, nothing.

She recommended the 3 Towers training box and the Elizabeth training box both be closed entirely due to the large amount of development in those sites. Less congested space is available further east. Listening to recordings of what the neighborhood sounds

like when the planes are not there and when they are gives some idea of what the neighborhood deals with on a far too regular basis from before 7:00 a.m. until after 10:00 p.m.

- Brad Pierce thanked Chris Eubanks for chairing CACNR during the past couple years. He noted appreciation that Ebanks was staying on CACNR representing Castle Pines.
- Alison Biggs issued a "ditto" to Pierce's comments to Eubanks, followed by further commendations by the other Representatives around the table.
- Reminder was given that the Vice Chair position would need to be filled at the August meeting, so volunteers were being sought or no one would leave the room on August 5th!
- Mike Koscielniak indicated as he was working on the Work Program on noise study issues, looking at GA airports with roundtables and noise monitors and had found that Aspen and Jackson Hole Wyoming had dashboards and noise monitors. Surprise! In addition, there were 20 airports in Colorado that had some sort of noise abatement in effect.

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

None

15. **NEXT MEETINGS:**

- A. **CACNR** –
- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 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** –
- | | |
|---------------|---|
| 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** – August 5, 2026

16. **ADJOURN:** Before adjourning the meeting, Eubanks asked for a warm welcome for Pam Thompson as the next Chair of CACNR. Such was given. The meeting was adjourned at 9:18 p.m.

Alison Biggs, Secretary

