



CENTENNIAL AIRPORT COMMUNITY NOISE ROUNDTABLE
MINUTES

December 3, 2025

Approved 02 04 26

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 6:34 p.m. by Chair Chris Eubanks. The meeting was conducted virtually due to a snowstorm. 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:	Andy Jones
Elbert County:	Brenda Dyche	Parker:	Michael Lawson
Aurora:	Brad Pierce	ACPAA:	Michael Fronapfel
Castle Pines:	Chris Eubanks	AOPA:	Joe Patton
Centennial:	Don Sheehan	CABA:	Don Kuskie
Cherry Hills Village:	Dave Heller		

Also present: Castle Pines Alternate Representative Ron Cole; Centennial Alternate Representative Amy Tharp; ACPAA Alternate Representative Zach Gabehart; AOPA Alternate Representative Mike Koscielniak; and ACPAA Staff Matt Frenette.

Absent: Arapahoe County:	Sreenivasan Alakappan/Vacant	Lone Tree:	Mike Anderson/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

2. **CONSENT AGENDA:** The Consent Agenda included the draft CACNR Minutes from November 5, 2025; and the Treasurer's Report from November 26, 2025, showing a balance of \$34,673.10. Also included were the CACNR Attendance Record through November 2025, and a revised version of the 2026 budget.

Rather than move items to Agenda #3., Alison Biggs was asked to comment on typographical amendments needed in the minutes and in the 2026 budget. She noted on page 6 of the minutes, item #10, Zach Gabehart's name was misspelled. The 2026 budget needed to reflect there are now 13 Regular Members instead of 12.

It was noted CACNR had not sent letters to those whose attendance was below 75%, as noted on the bottom of the attendance form, but the form had been provided so everyone could see where their attendance fit. The year for attendance ends with the March 2026 meeting. On the motion of Don Sheehan, the consent agenda was approved with the amendments as noted.

3. **ITEMS REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA:** See above.

4. **PART 150 STUDY UPDATE/PROGRESS:**

A. REPORT OF PUBLIC MEETING OF NOVEMBER 20, 2025 – none requested

B. UPDATE FROM MEAD AND HUNT – Kate Andrus from HMMH was present to present an update on the Part 150 Study. She noted last month had been an update about the noise exposure maps that would be submitted to the FAA in December, with the draft noise contours for the existing and future noise exposure maps. Today she brought more on the items which had been requested by CACNR, including the 55 DNL contour and a comparison of the previous 65 noise exposure map and the one being used as part of this study. There would also be an update of some alternative concepts for CACNR feedback. The list might be narrowed for selection for modeling. Starting in 2026, some of the modeling would be done and the results shared. Refined alternatives and land use would be included for the next set of meetings as well.

Comparison with the last noise exposure map update in 2021 showed the NEM was smaller this time, likely because jets had gotten quieter. Question was asked why some of the work had been redone due to JSX, since there were apparently others doing the same thing JSX was doing; why had JSX been singled out specifically? There is a mechanism if the forecasts are off by a certain percentage point, it can trigger an update to the NEM. Regarding JSX, the response was mainly timing, and to take a look at the effect of JSX operations in response to community concerns. The % change due to JSX appeared to be minimal by FAA standards.

A slide showing noise contours for 55 DNL, 60-65 DNL, 65-70 DNL, 70-75 DNL, and >75DNL was shown. The 55 DNL was larger, but 65 DNL was still considered the threshold used by the FAA for compatible land uses. Again, a reminder that DNL is a cumulative

24 hour average measurement, so it may take several noisy flights to make a difference in that overall measurement. The number of types of operations in the fleet mix is important as well as the time of day. Other comments or questions included:

- When comparing the 65 DNL from 2021 – 2030, the area had shrunk. Properties once in the 65 DNL would no longer be, but there were no residences in the 65 DNL in 2021; development had changed that since then.
- The DNL does present a challenge, because it is an average, so no one actually hears DNL – it is 55 or 65 decibels on the decibel scale that are heard, but they do not equate to a DNL – there is a difference between perception versus a cumulative metric.
- Of the three main conceptual areas in the noise compatibility study, the NEM will be submitted to the FAA. Once approved, the study moves to three areas – 1.) conceptual land use alternatives, to assure as much as possible that non-compatible land uses are not built around the airport creating problems in the future; 2.) operationally, explore what can be done with aircraft in-flight procedures; 3.) administratively whatever else does not fit in the other two categories but which also needs to be considered.
- For #1.) updating the airport influence area might be useful, as it currently shows the involved jurisdictions have a wide variety of development plans and pressures from developers, but there are areas where there really should not be residential in them; identify where development can happen with the least noise effect. (The AIA provided was not the most up to date – that would be provided when work on it was completed.)
- Early in 2026, there is a goal for the Part 150 personnel to meet with the jurisdiction’s planning departments regarding the possibility of them using the draft concepts to achieve development with the least noise effect;
- Many jurisdictions have gotten away from utilizing the land use maps in their zoning, so there needs to be a happy medium to protect the airport in critical areas and from incompatible development while allowing for development where ambient noise is already at a level where aircraft noise would not be a factor.
- The goal would also be for the jurisdictions to adopt the updated set of noise contours and use the same land use and restricted development area and buffer zones.
- Utilizing consistent construction standards might also be helpful.
- CACNR Representatives were encouraged to be involved in the above discussions if possible, to bring the knowledge and expertise their CACNR involvement had provided.
- Airport staff would reach out to Representatives to let them know when the meeting with their jurisdiction’s personnel was scheduled.
- A tool to be developed would be to have the land use maps and the noise contours available on KML and GIS formats.
- For #2.), operational concepts and operational alternative concepts were provided on slides; some would be modeled. There was discussion about what had transpired about each to date. Not all might be considered worth modeling after further investigation.
- For #3.), Administrative Alternatives Concepts were also provided. These ideas too were discussed with any progress to date. Not all might be considered worth modeling after further investigation.
- Some experimental flights with an electric plane had been conducted at Centennial Airport, with impressive results in relation to noise reduction; some assumptions would be created using data collected from the noise monitors, to determine the effect electric planes would have on the fleet mix of the flight schools, for example. The FAA does not have this kind of data.
- A summary of the comments from the last public meeting was provided. They primarily focused on alternatives and what to look at in the next stage, rather than the NEM package. Some of the alternatives previously mentioned were discussed and refining those and others would be worked with in the future. Refining and modeling would come next.
- All were encouraged to get comments and thoughts about noise compatibility, non-compatible land uses, safety, etc. from their jurisdictions to Andrus. Even if not completely explored or modeled, all comments will be considered.

Request was made for the information on the slides to be made larger, and to better identify the boundaries/roads used, as they were impossible to read or otherwise access. Effort would be made to provide the information so everyone could usefully have it. Anyone wishing an actual copy of the slides was also encouraged to make that request of staff.

Andrus was thanked for her presentation and CACNR looked forward to her next update.

C. PART 150 NOISE COMPATIBILITY STUDY ADVISORY COMMITTEE – None

5. NOISE REPORTS:

A. The October 2025 Noise Report included the following information:

October Local Operations:	12,554	October Total Operations:	27,238
Year to Date Local Operations:	123,393	Year to Date Total Operations:	262,152

27,238 Total Operations October resulted in 873 complaints from 56 households.

October Noise Events:

<u>October Total:</u>	<u>October 60 – 69 db:</u>	<u>October 70 – 79 db:</u>	<u>October 80 – 89 db:</u>
Meridian 9,684	Meridian 8,072	Golf Course 3,563	Airport East 650
Golf Course 9,071	Golf Course 5,317	Meridian 1,549	Golf Course 186
Airport East 3,592	Parker 2,414	Airport East 1,036	Meridian 59
Parker 2,667	Airport East 1,850	State Park 589	State Park 21
State Park 2,199	Port. Station 31 1,674	Port. Station 31 294	Port. Station 31 16
Port. Station 31 1,985	State Park 1,587	Parker 251	Grandview Estates 7
Grandview Estates 1,542	Grandview Estates 1,372	Grandview Estates 162	Greenwood Village 5
Castle Rock 1,029	Castle Rock 987	Greenwood Village 77	Hunters Hill 5
Greenwood Village 912	Greenwood Village 765	Castle Rock 42	Sagebrush Park 5
Lone Tree 643	Lone Tree 765	Lone Tree 39	Castle Pines 3
Hunters Hill 512	Hunters Hill 577	Hunters Hill 35	Parker 2
Castle Pines 256	Castle Pines 364	Castle Pines 23	Castle Rock 0
Sagebrush Park 130	Sagebrush Park 104	Sagebrush Park 9	Lone Tree 0

October Noise Events in the 90+ decibel range: Airport East – 56 Golf Course – 5 Meridian – 4 State Park – 2 Grandview Estates – 1
 Lone Tree – 1 Portable Station 31 – 1

<u>October Noise Complaints per Municipality</u>	<u>Numbers of Households:</u>	<u>YTD Complaints and</u>	<u>Number of Households:</u>
Unincorporated Arapahoe County 255 (29%)	UAC 18 (32%)	UAC 2,524 (30%)	UAC 66 (27%)
Centennial 161 (18%)	Greenwood Village 12 (22%)	GV 1,408 (17%)	GV 53 (21.5%)
Unincorporated Douglas County 151 (17%)	UDC 10 (18%)	UDC 1,269 (15%)	UDC 41 (17%)
Greenwood Village 139 (16%)	Centennial 4 (7%)	UDC 1,266 (15%)	Other 19 (8%)
Unincorporated Elbert County 134 (15%)	Other 4 (7%)	Centennial 1,096 (13%)	Centennial 17 (7%)
Parker 15 (2%)	Lone Tree 2	Parker 516 (6%)	Lone Tree 15 (6%)
Denver 5	Aurora 1	Other 108	HR 7 (3%)
Lone Tree 5	Castle Pines 1	HR 81	Parker 7 (3%)
Other 5	Castle Rock 1	Denver 60	Denver 6
Aurora 1	Denver 1	Castle Rock 35	Aurora 5
Castle Pines 1	UEC 1	Lone Tree 28	Castle Rock 4
Castle Rock 1	Parker 1	CHV 7	Castle Pines 2
Cherry Hills Village 0	Cherry Hills Village 0	Aurora 5	CHV 2
Highlands Ranch 0	Highlands Ranch 0	Castle Pines 2	UEC 2

Year to Date, the top five households complaining were:

Household #1 1,131 (15%) Other Elbert County	Household #4 495 (7%) Parker
Household #2 1,027 (14%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County	Household #5 461 (6%) Greenwood Village
Household #3 808 (11%) Centennial	Remaining Households 3,610 (48%)

In October, 71 noise complaint responses were completed from 873 noise complaints, with 70 of those by email and 1 by telephone.

In October 812 complaints were received from 7:00 a.m. – 9:59 p.m. (93%)
61 complaints were received from 10:00 p.m. – 6:59 a.m. (7%)

In October props accounted for **89% of the complaints by aircraft type**; **jets** accounted for **9% of the complaints**, and **helicopters caused 2%**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed propellers had caused 89% of the complaints; jets caused 9%, and helicopters caused 2%

In October, departures were responsible for **30% of the complaints**, **training** was responsible for **54% of the complaints**, and **arrivals** were responsible for **16% of the complaints**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed training had caused 43% of the complaints, departures had caused 37%, and arrivals had caused 20%.

A graph was provided showing the **October number of complaints by the hour** in which they were made, with a climb at the 7:00 8:00 a.m. hours; a peak at 8:00 a.m., followed by a rather dramatic decrease after 1:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.; with blips at 1:00 p.m., 5:00 p.m. and 8:00 p.m. and relatively flat from 11:00 p.m.- 4:00 a.m.

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

Comments made regarding the October Noise Reports were as follows: YTD Operations remained down as compared to 2024.

Complaints increased slightly in October as compared to September as the weather remained well suited for flying. Complaints by time of day were still peaking in the a.m. hours in October.

B. PORTABLE MONITOR REPORT – submitted as follows:

Portable Noise Monitor Location - Kiowa, CO
Under Fairgrounds Practice Box
22.5 Miles Southeast of Centennial Airport
Report Date Range - 10/21 – 11/18/2025

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

Propeller 365	Jet 12	Helicopter 1	Total 378
---------------	--------	--------------	-----------

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

Arrival 93	Departure 52	Training 233	Total 378
------------	--------------	--------------	-----------

Airport	Arrival	Departure	Training	Total
Centennial (KAPA)	93	52	233	378
Denver Intl (KDEN)	693	77	0	770
Colorado Air & Space Port (KCFO)	7	7	13	27
Rocky Mountain Metro (KBJC)	4	1	0	5
Northern CO Regional (KFNL)	0	0	0	0
Colorado Springs (KCOS)	0	0	0	0
Pueblo (KPUB)	1	2	0	3

Noise Data

Aircraft DNL (The 24-hour average sound level of aircraft with a 10dB penalty for nighttime noise events.)	33.9
Community DNL (The 24-hour average sound level of the community with a 10dB penalty for nighttime noise events)	47.1
Total DNL (The 24-hour average sound level with a 10dB penalty for nighttime noise events)	47.3
Average Aircraft LMax (dB) (The peak noise level for a single aircraft noise event)	64.6

Noise Events

Centennial Airport Aircraft Noise Events at Noise Monitor	105
Non-Centennial Airport Aircraft Noise Events at Noise Monitor	47
Total Aircraft Noise Events at Noise Monitor	152
Total Community Noise Events at Noise Monitor	392

Noise Events at Noise Monitor

Decibel Range (dB)	Centennial Airport Aircraft	Non-Centennial Airport	Community
60-69	93	37	296
70-79	2	2	79
80-89	0	0	1
90+	0	0	0

Comments made regarding the Fairgrounds Portable Noise Reports were as follows: Fairgrounds Portable Monitor Report as compared to 3 Towers Noise Reports - Operations passing within 1 mile radius of the portable noise monitor = 152 in the Fairgrounds v.s. 1,302 in the 3 Towers; a measurable difference in activity and usage. The average aircraft LMax at the 3 Towers location is 59db v.s. Fairgrounds at 64.4db. This could be due to lower ambient noise levels – a remote location.

Comments Regarding Use of the Three Towers Practice Box – Brenda Dyche: Dyche had provided a screen shot from Thanksgiving morning and noted what she described as an inconsiderate unneighborly act from one of the flight schools housed at Centennial Airport. **The** individual choose to fly circles over homes in Elbert County in a high density area instead of doing it out east over nothing, disturbing no one. The flight pattern showed hard banking turns over homes for a while before the aircraft headed east to do way fewer maneuvers out there. It then came straight back to Three Towers to annoy people again and then flew back to the airport. This was considered a perfect example of this flight training box being abused, of how unneighborly the flight schools, Centennial Airport, and the FAA were being to the citizens of Elbert County.

Although past discussions had included a concern about the cost for aircraft to use other training boxes, it seemed if they could do as shown in the screen shot, they could afford to fly a straight line east from the airport to flight training boxes over nothing that were still in their 25-mile radius. She noted there were no planes in the training boxes further east and most certainly none in the Douglas County training boxes. She also wondered why the majority of the flight training boxes were over Elbert County and not in the two counties that benefited most from the revenue of the airport. Elbert County is furthest from the airport but was outpacing people closer to the airport with complaints. The solution of closing the training boxes over the schools, businesses, churches and homes in Elbert County did not seem to be heard or considered. The county is now the 10th fastest growing county in Colorado, so the complaints will only increase if the situation is not addressed now.

Dyche issued a challenge for CACNR to work together to make this situation fair for everybody. Would it take a new Part 150, or a new Study Group Committee? She issued an invitation to anyone who wished to come to her house for a day to find out just how unbearable this can be. It totally ruined the Thanksgiving weekend.

There was discussion and agreement this topic would be added as a discussion item to the agenda of the Study Group Committee on December 18, beginning a consideration of what might be done about the problem. Dyche’s screenshot would be provided for that

meeting. The topic would also be included on the agenda for the February CACNR meeting. Question was asked if the flight school involved had been notified of the problem. Response was no, as the establishment and use of the training boxes was not within the airport's purview.

6. **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

A. **MEETING ATTENDEES/VIRTUAL ATTENDEES –**

Reporting virtually, Randy Johnson of Louviers indicated that even though he had said in the past that it had been quieter in his area, he still had daily noise as reflected by Dyche, and it was worse in the morning. Last month he had recorded 460 planes, an average of 15 per day. Of those, 194 were from Centennial; 145 from Rocky Mountain Metropolitan; 33 from Colorado Springs. (Sometimes the flights going north-south or vice versa are hard to figure out where they came from.)

This month, he recorded 203 flights for Centennial and 154 for Rocky Mountain. He had submitted 57 complaints. He did submit his complaints on web track and asks for an email, so airport staff does have that information which shows planes turning and flying directly over his area. Some planes do seem to avoid flying directly overhead but still contribute to the rather constant noise. He did report noticing a considerable amount of JSX flights, and wondered if anyone was monitoring them because there were so many on a regular basis. The other thing he noted was the low frequency of propeller planes which penetrated everything over other background noise.

Pam Thompson reported Anthea Gerardo had contacted CACNR after last month's meeting and she had responded to her twice but had never heard back. She does try to help individuals learn how to submit noise complaints

B. **RECEIVED BY CACNR –** One email had been received, from Ryan Sarny who indicated he would try to attend tonight's meeting. He further stated *"I appreciate the work you're doing to minimize train flights over residential areas, including the Part 150 effort and following up regularly with the flight schools. I know it's a major undertaking.*

"In Cherry Creek Vista South, just north of the airport, I've noticed an improvement over the last year. Still, we have training props circling over our homes regularly, including a few days per week before 7 am. Beyond the noise pollution this exposes our families to, many of these props are still using leaded fuel, and as you know tragically these planes do occasionally crash.

"There is zero justification for the flight schools to expose local residents to these risks. I maintain that the flight schools should use a queuing system that requires these flights to be spread throughout the day, having training pilots just wait for a little bit before starting touch and go's so the pattern does not need to be expanded over residential areas. This seems like an extremely reasonable compromise. We should not have to suffer noise pollution, lead exposure, and the risk of a crash so that training schools aren't slightly inconvenienced occasionally."

7. **CACNR STUDY GROUP COMMITTEE:** Brad Pierce indicated the committee had met recently and had received a presentation from the vendor for the dashboard who unofficially presented some data that they had been collecting. The committee gave them feedback; there were three different general categories to be measured on the dashboard which would be broken down to more detailed metrics for measurement. The percentage weight for each detailed category had been discussed, with the vendor taking that back for further work before the flight school meeting in December when it would be presented. However the committee did want to meet one more time before the flight school meeting, and was trying to get that meeting scheduled soon. The vendor was finishing inserting some of the scoring feedback fed into the dashboard. It had been hoped to have something to show to this meeting tonight, but details had not been finalized yet.

8. **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:**

A. ACPAA – Pam Thompson had submitted a report from the November ACPAA meeting. She noted one of the ACPAA board members had asked Zach if it was possible to quantify unique exposures of noise from aircraft, so if a particular aircraft made a higher pitch or a lower thrust or something like that, could they pull the algorithms on it and put it through the criteria of the dashboard. This could be used to create awareness by the flight schools so they know about any aircraft that tend to be a problem to the citizens below. They might be asked to consider if they could possibly fly higher or such, but to at least make them aware of the potential hazards that they may be exposing people below to. For the ACPAA to think about this seemed a very heartfelt and reasonable thing that might possibly be moved forward with possibly.

She noted Centennial Flyers had purchased some electric aircraft, with two to be delivered in 2027 and four more to be delivered in 2028. There were no questions about her report.

B. WEBMASTER – Chris Eubanks had no update, other than to note the intention to redesign the CACNR website in 2026. An RFP needed to be prepared and issued, and there were funds in the 2026 for the update to occur

C. WORK PROGRAM – A draft work program had been included in the emailing, and the committee which had worked on it was thanked for its diligence. Committee members (Donna Johnston, Amy Tharp, Pam Thompson, Chuck Darnell, Bill Wasmund) were invited to add comments during the discussion. There was agreement from the committee that feedback from the larger group of CACNR Representatives was needed and encouraged. The draft and discussion points included:

1. Categories and tasks undone from past work programs, and some new additions, ranked high, medium or low priority in each category.
2. A column provided for the Responsible Party who would work on each task (currently empty and could include one person up to and including the entire CACNR).
3. It was noted those who would be responsible for a task could do so singly or with a self-designated group; once the task was completed – as short or as long a time as needed - the task group would dissolve.
4. The committee wanted feedback on this idea, or suggestions for any other way to accomplish the work program's tasks.

5. Were there too many high priorities, or could a different metric be utilized? Everything could be a high priority, but how much weight or effort would CACNR have to put toward a task's accomplishment?
6. Further work could be done for final adoption in February.

Following further discussion about the content and focus of the draft, and various approaches for how to deal with changes which might be suggested, it was agreed Zach Gabehart would send the current draft document to everyone in Word format for their consideration. Comments were to be sent via email to Chris Eubanks by December 19, 2025. He would compile those and provide them to the Executive Committee (Alison would also send this to the WP Committee for its final input) in January. The EC would then develop a final draft to bring to the February CACNR meeting. It was felt it was in the purview of the Executive Committee to rank priorities for consideration of the larger group with the input of everyone.

MEETING TIME EXTENSION – On the motion of Donna Johnsoton, duly seconded, action was taken to extend the meeting time to consider the remainder of the agenda.

D. UC DAVIS NOISE AND EMISSION SYMPOSIUM – The 2026 budget had funds for two to attend, March 9-11. Chris Eubanks was planning on attending, and Pam Thompson expressed interest. It was noted that there were funds in the budget for attendance at N.O.I.S.E. educational sessions which were probably not going to be held in 2026. CACNR could take action to use those funds to send more than two to UC Davis, which had been very interesting and useful previously. Anyone else interested should contact Zach Gabehardt to be included in the early bird advance registration time frame.

E. 2026 CACNR/ACPAA MEETING DATES – The schedule had been provided in the email. It was noted there would be no January 2026 meeting, and no July 2026 meeting. The schedule could be adjusted if desired during the year.

F. LOGO CONSIDERATION – Without discussion, the Chair called for a phone vote on the samples that had been included in the email packet. Samantha Blymyer was thanked for preparing the samples. Comment was made that the name of CACNR was in two different size fonts in the samples, which did not seem appropriate. The different sizes did not seem to bother some Representatives. Blymyer indicated she could make the full name of CACNR all in the same size font. Motion was made by Andy Jones, duly seconded, to approve Sample #2 as presented; motion carried.

9. **AIRPORT DIRECTOR:** Mike Fronapfel provided the following information. Year to date through October, airport operations were down 10.2%; total fuel sales were down 0.4%. The numbers indicated there hadn't been a decline in jet traffic, but there had been a noticeable decline in training traffic, particularly pattern traffic and local traffic to the airport. Less training traffic is anticipated throughout the winter. 10,278 gallons of Avgas were used; one of the flight schools had resumed using it in its training aircraft.

Rehabilitation of the air traffic control tower continues, including replacing the elevator and HVAC systems. This work is being done over the winter and is anticipated to be finished by the end of Summer 2026.

Matt and Zach had been scheduled to attend an AAAE (American Association of Airport Executive) noise conference in Florida, but Zach was ill so Matt filled in for him moderating a panel about noise complaints outside the noise contours. It and he were well received and Matt was thanked for doing a good job.

Snow crews were out at 5:00 a.m. dealing with this first snow of the season. Everything had been cleared when another band came through around 4:30 p.m. so they had to start all over again. The airport was able to be open, operational and safe all day.

There had been a public hearing at the November ACPAA meeting for an amendment to the minimum standards for Part 135/380 operators, to include a \$1 per available seat on departing aircraft in 2026, raising to \$2 per available seat on departing aircraft. There had been no public comment, and the amendment had been approved by ACPAA.

Promotions for both Matt and Zach were announced. Matt was now the Senior Planner/Noise analyst and IT Assistant, and Zach was now the Senior Planner/Noise & Environmental. Both were congratulated.

10. **OLD BUSINESS:** None

11. **NEW BUSINESS:** None

12. **PUBLIC COMMENT EXTENSION IF NEEDED:** (3 minutes per person time limit) None

13. **REPRESENTATIVES' COMMENTS:**

Andy Jones indicated he would be working on the invoices for all the Regular Members. No funds would be requested for 2026, in accordance with CACNR's adopted budget, but the invoices would provide Members with a reminder of who we are and what we are. Members' Representatives to CACNR would receive the invoices, for them to pass on to their appropriate staff and decision-making bodies.

Braad Pierce noted the emailing contained a Noise Alert from the National Organization to Insure a Sound Controlled Environment (N.O.I.S.E.), which he Chairs. That alert came out right after the November CACNR meeting, and another alert had just come to Pierce today. There was considerable discussion of how to get that information to CACNR Representatives in a timely fashion, considering there would be no mailing for January. Matt Frenette indicated he had just placed the new alert in the handout section of the goto webinar dashboard for this meeting, where it would be accessible to everyone.

Pam Thompson noted the last two paragraphs in an Hometown Weekly article stated an FAA spokesperson indicated the agency continuously worked to help reduce the number of people exposed to aviation noise, and with communities around airports addressing this concern, etc. She wondered if the FAA was back at the table about any of our concerns or attending any of the study group committee meetings. The FAA representatives were very helpful when they were allowed to attend, and efforts to get them back were being addressed. The lobbying group consisting of Greenwood Village, Centennial Airport, and Arapahoe County and its lobbying firm had had this as a topic of discussion both internally and with the staffs of Senators Bennett and Hickenlooper and Congressman Crowe. Hopefully there would be a joint letter to the FAA administrator pressing this issue. Thompson indicated CACNR would be happy to help with this or other efforts in the future.

14. **RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACPAA & OTHERS TO POTENTIALLY REDUCE NOISE OVER AFFECTED COMMUNITIES:** None

15. **NEXT MEETINGS:**

- A. **CACNR** – Feb 4, 2026 6:30 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
March 4, 2026 6:30 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
April 1, 2026 6:30 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
May 6, 2026 6:30 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
June 3, 2026 6:30 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
July 1, 2026 NO CACNR MEETING
- B. **ACPAA** – Dec 11, 2025 3:00 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
Feb. 12, 2026 3:00 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
March 12, 2026 3:00 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
April 9, 2026 3:00 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
May 14, 2026 3:00 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
June 11, 2026 3:00 p.m. 7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
July 9, 2026 NO ACPAA MEETING

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

16. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 p.m.

Alison Biggs, Secretary