



CENTENNIAL AIRPORT COMMUNITY NOISE ROUNDTABLE MINUTES

Approved May 7, 2025

April 2, 2025

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.

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

1. **CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL, and QUORUM:** The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chair Chris Eubanks. The following were in attendance, and a quorum was present:

Douglas County:	Dan Avery	Highlands Ranch:	Andy Jones
Douglas County:	Alison Biggs	Lone Tree:	Mike Anderson
Aurora:	Brad Pierce	ACPAA:	Mike Fronapfel
Castle Pines:	Chris Eubanks	AOPA:	John Hirshman
Centennial:	Don Sheehan	CABA:	Don Kuskie
Foxfield:	Pam Thompson	Wings Over the Rockies:	Bill Wasmund
Greenwood Village:	Donna Johnston		

Also present: Castle Pines Alternate Ron Cole; ACPAA Alternate Zach Gabehart; and ACPAA Staff Matt Frenette and Lauren Wiarda.

Absent:	Arapahoe County:	Rhonda Fields/Leroy Evans	Cherry Hills Village:	Dave Heller/Doug Robinson
	Arapahoe County:	Sreenivasan Alakappan/Vacant	Parker:	Vacant/Bryce Matthews
	Castle Rock:	Laura Cavey/Sandy Vossler	CDOT Aeronautics Div:	Todd Green/Vacant

2. **CONSENT AGENDA:** The Consent Agenda included the Draft CACNR Minutes from March 5, 2025; a Treasurer's Report from March 28, 2025, showing a balance of \$34,317.13; and a Noise Report from February 2025. On the motion of Andy Jones, duly seconded, the Consent Agenda was approved.

The February 2025 Noise Report included the following information:

Noise Monitor #9 – Castle Pines- data was missing due to equipment outages; repair was in progress

February Local Operations:	11,277	February Total Operations:	23,186
Year to Date Local Operations:	22,476	Year to Date Total Operations:	46,716

23,186 Total Operations in February resulted in 656 complaints from 43 households.

February Noise Events:

February Total:		February 60 – 69 db:		February 70 – 79 db:		February 80 – 89 db:	
Golf Course	9,650	Meridian	5,889	Golf Course	4,470	Golf Course	516
Meridian	7,504	Golf Course	4,660	Meridian	1,562	Airport East	424
Airport East	2,749	Parker	2,204	Airport East	835	Meridian	52
Parker	2,440	Airport East	1,433	State Park	488	Lone Tree	30
State Park	1,815	Portable Station	1,344	Portable Station	273	Portable Station	15
Portable Station	1,632	State Park	1,321	Lone Tree	258	State Park	6
Lone Tree	1,556	Lone Tree	1,267	Parker	232	Greenwood Village	4
Grandview Estates	1,332	Grandview Estates	1,165	Grandview Estates	166	Parker	4
Castle Rock	1,082	Castle Rock	1,027	Greenwood Village	117	Grandview Estates	1
Greenwood Village	882	Greenwood Village	761	Castle Rock	55	Hunters Hill	1
Hunters Hill	510	Hunters Hill	471	Hunters Hill	38	Castle Pines	0
Sagebrush Park	107	Sagebrush Park	100	Sagebrush Park	7	Castle Rock	0
Castle Pines	62	Castle Pines	57	Castle Pines	5	Sagebrush Park	0

February Noise events in the 90+ decibel range: Airport East – 57 Golf Course – 4 Lone Tree – 1 Meridian – 1

February Noise Complaints and	Numbers of Households:	YTD Complaints and	Number of Households:
Unincorporated Arapahoe County	389 (59%)	UAC	651 (56%)
Unincorporated Douglas County	75 (11%)	UDC	166 (14%)
Centennial	63 (10%)	Centennial	116 (10%)
Other	60 (9%)	Other	99 (8%)
Greenwood Village	37 (6%)	GV	72 (6%)
Highlands Ranch	19	HR	39
		UAC	20 (30%)
		UDC	10 (15%)
		Centennial	10 (15%)
		Other	7 (11%)
		Centennial	5 (8%)
		Denver	3

Denver	6	Highlands Ranch	3	Denver	11	HR	3
Castle Rock	5	Aurora	1	Castle Rock	8	Lone Tree	3
Aurora	1	Castle Rock	1	Lone Tree	6	Aurora	2
Parker	1	Other	1	Aurora	2	Castle Rock	2
Castle Pines	0	Castle Pines	0	Parker	2	Parker	1
Cherry Hills Village	0	Cherry Hills Village	0	Castle Pines	0	Castle Pines	0
Lone Tree	0	Lone Tree	0	CHV	0	CHV	0

Year to Date, the top five households complaining were:

Household #1 283 (24%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County
Household #2 266 (23%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County
Household #3 108 (9%) Centennial

Household #4 92 (8%) Other

Household #5 52 (4%) Unincorporated Douglas County

In February, 159 responses were requested from 656 noise complaints, with 151 of those requests made by email and 4 made by telephone.

In February, of 1,172 complaints 1,107 complaints were made about **daytime flights** (7:00 a.m. – 9:59 p.m.) – 95%.
65 complaints were made about **nighttime flights** (10:00 p.m. – 6:59 a.m.) – 5%.

In February, props accounted for **88% of the complaints by aircraft type**; **jets** accounted for **10% of the complaints**, and **helicopters** caused **2%**.

In February, training was responsible for **43% of the complaints**, **departures** were responsible for **35% of the complaints**, and **arrivals** were responsible for **22% of the complaints**.

A graph was provided showing the **number of complaints by the hour** in which they were made, with a peak around 3:30 p.m., followed by a rather dramatic decrease by 6:00 p.m.

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

3. **SPECIAL EDUCATION SESSION:**

Bill Wasmund presented an educational session on the various categories of airspace surrounding Centennial Airport. His slides were included in the mailing for this meeting; the narrative is provided here with some of his additional comments noted in italics:

AIRSPACE

The National Airspace System (NAS) is the network of United States airspace: air navigation facilities, equipment, services, airports, aeronautical charts, information/services, rules, regulations, and procedures. Divided into 2categories

- **Regulatory airspace** - Regulatory airspace includes Class A, B, C, D and E airspace areas, restricted and prohibited areas
- **Non-regulatory airspace** - includes military operations areas (MOA), warning areas, alert areas, controlled firing areas (CFA), and national security areas (NSA) *Civilian pilots do not interact with this airspace.*

Airspace Types

- **Controlled Airspace**
 - Class A
 - Class B
 - Class C
 - Class D
 - Class E
- **Uncontrolled Airspace**
 - Class G
- **Special Use** - Warning areas, MOAs, alert areas,
- **Other** – TFRs, ADIZ

Class A Airspace *must have an instrument certificate to fly here*

- 18,000'MSL up to and including 60,000'MSL
- All operation in class A is conducted under IFR
- Altimeter set to 29.92

Class B Airspace *this is the airspace of Denver International Airport; called Bravo*

- Surface up to 10,000' MSL • Surrounds nations busiest airports
- Surface layer and two or more outer layers
- Two -way radio communications and ATC clearance required
- 4096 Transponder with mode C
- Student pilots require an endorsement from CFI

Class C Airspace *this is the airspace of Colorado Springs Airport, called Charlie*

- Surface up to 4000' AGL
- RADAR approach control
- Surface area with 5 nm radius
- Shelf area with 10 nm radius
- Two-way radio communications and ATC clearance required

- 4096 Transponder with mode C

Class D Airspace *this is the airspace of Centennial Airport, called Delta; this airspace is underneath DIA's Bravo airspace so pilots must take care not to encroach on Bravo*

- Surface up to 2,500' AGL
- Control tower
- Surface area with 5-8 nm radius
- Two-way radio communications and ATC clearance required
- Depicted on a sectional chart by a blue segmented circle

KAPA/KBKF Class D Airspace Redesign

- Configurations for both the KAPA and KBKF Class D airspaces have been expanded and reshaped
- The corridor between KBKF and KAPA airspaces has been eliminated. Pilots must now be in contact with ATC when transiting the airspace
- Aircraft must communicate with ATC over a wider area

Discussion and questions followed Wasmund's presentation. It was pointed out that the designations for "base level" and "ceiling level" altitudes within the airspace can sometimes be misinterpreted causing confusion about the amount of airspace available for training. It was noted again that the slides had been in the mailing for this meeting and the illustrations were available there.

There was discussion of how the designations for "base level" and "ceiling level" altitudes of the DIA Class Bravo airspace affect aircraft using the local training boxes. It was noted that each individual training box has a ceiling limitation based on the lower level of the Class Bravo airspace above it.

Wasmund was thanked very much for the information and his presentation.

4. **ITEM REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA:** None

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT:**

- A. RECEIVED BY CACNR – None
- B. MEETING ATTENDEES /VIRTUAL ATTENDEES –

1. Mike Koscieiniak commented on the recent flight school meeting which had been attended by everyone desired except the FAA representatives, who had not been allowed to attend and were missed. Other than that, the room was packed, there was good discussion, the airport staff had done a fantastic job, and he deemed it the best meeting he had attended!

2. Randy Johnson from Louviers had recorded 364 planes, mostly training planes, and submitted 39 complaints. Some are still doing their turns and flying directly over his home; he has communicated with Gabehart about those. He had also submitted eight complaints to Rocky Mountain Airport. He did note one plane circling overhead today. As noted previously, there have been noticeable periods of quiet, which have been appreciated.

3. On-line, Brenda Dyche noted she was glad to hear that others were getting some peace and quiet from the planes flying over their homes, as she felt all of those planes were flying over her home. She asked if there was any movement for closing the Three Towers training box and the Elizabeth training because people in those areas were getting hammered with flights. She again asked if planes could be sent east where the elevation is lower and there is more space without population. She was also concerned about multiple times when there were two planes in the Three Towers training box, and at least once two were observed seeming to be chasing each other in circles. She further discussed the elevation of the homes in the area in relation to their designation as high density and the available airspace as presented earlier.

Dyche then expressed the feeling that those on CACNR had gotten noise away from their homes by sending it to places which do not have representation on the group, and the majority of CACNR does not care about those who do not have a seat at its table. She was waiting to see if the Elbert County Commissioners would agree to request membership on CACNR and would appoint her as their representative. In the meantime, she asked what CACNR was going to do about the Three Towers training box and all the noise that is going on in that area. She also felt someone needed to shake up the FAA to get something done as well.

There were no further individuals waiting to speak, so the public comment portion of the agenda was closed at 7:08 p.m.

6. **CACNR STUDY GROUP COMMITTEE:** Brad Pierce, Chris Eubanks, Mike Fronapfel

Brad Pierce indicated the group was discussing the dashboard being created, so there can be recognition of the good and bad actors. The needed equipment will be on top of the control tower (Matt and Zach get kudos for working on/with it). The parameters/framework of what the dashboard will contain and look like is a main focus of the study group, and that information will be provided for the contract with the company so all are working together.

Question was asked when the next quarterly report would be available. Response was probably May or June.

7. **REPORT OF UC DAVIS NOISE SYMPOSIUM:** Bil Wasmund and Chris Eubanks

The following report was presented by Bill Wasmund and entered into the minutes at the request of Chris Eubanks - **2025 UC Davis Aviation Noise and Emissions Symposium Report March 11-12 Las Vegas Bill Wasmund**

Key Note – R. John Hansman, MIT

- Generation of noise irritation due to volume increase

- Airport Noise and Capacity Act 1990 (ANCA) and Part 161 In many cases, FAA reporting Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Aviation Emissions and Health

- Low Frequency Noise LFN (20-50 Hz) transmission
- Noise Monitors do not capture LFN? This is false.
- Discussion of Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) 65dB vs 55dB
- Sustainable Aviation Fuels (SAF) – Ultra-Fine Particle Emission improvement over Jet-A
- The Absence of Runway Protection Zones? and nearby land development

FAA Noise Policy Review and FAA Aircraft Noise Advisory Committee (ANAC)

- FAA not present
- ANAC – 24 FAA members appointed for a 2 year term
- Deployment of aircraft flaps/speed break/landing gear, and noise generation
- Airport Council International North America ACI-NA - ensure that legislation and regulations are enacted in Washington, D.C.
- Delta airlines and possibly others, employ aeronautical engineers that evaluate fleet for noise
- Number Above vs DNL discussion (Yaplee) The number of aircraft noise events that exceed a certain decibel level, like 60dB(A), 65dB(A), or 70dB(A), within a 24-hour period as opposed to the total accumulation of **all** sound energy, but spread out uniformly over a 24-hour period.. Same presentation as last year

Assessing Noise Impacts

- Education/Income and aircraft noise exposure study. Study does not apply to KAPA
- Use of Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT)
- Metroplex Overflight Noise Analysis (MONA) System
- Same presentation and presenter as last year. Alonso - Stanford

21st Century Noise Report and Noise Office

- California only
- NA – Noise or Number Above
- NA-A Noise or Number Above plus surrounding ambient noise
- L-90 - 65dB exceeded 90% of time
- TNI – Total Noise Index
- Uses CNEL Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) used only in California is similar to DNL but adds two off hour penalties to aircraft operations: a 5dB between 7 – 10PM and a 10dB penalty between 10PM and 7AM for increased noise sensitivity at night.
- Aircraft Noise Event Extraction Methodology (ANEEM) Envirosuite's proprietary algorithm that accurately measures aircraft noise exposure in the community and determines the contribution made by your airport
- Study of the deployment of aircraft flaps/speed break/landing gear and noise generation

Unleaded Fuel

- Swift UL-94 to be discontinued at UND Experienced exhaust valve seating issues
- Swift UL-100R (restricted fuel) I being tested by American Society for Testing Materials (ASTM) Distribution in progress
- Supplemental Type Certificate (STL) to allow aircraft to use UL-94/100R
- UL-94/100R is subsidized
- Improvement to environment studies under way

NASA Quesst and Advanced Air Mobility AAM Missions

- Speed limit vs Noise limit – Test the effects of supersonic flight over land
- Psycho-Acoustic Testing – human noise response
- Sonic Boom mitigation and alternate sound using X-59 aircraft
- No mention of Boom XB-1 aircraft design, research, and recent successful supersonic testing over continental US (FAR 91.817)

Flight Schools Challenges and Opportunities

- Zach
- Emery Riddle: Flight training presents very little hazard
- ANOMS and 1200.Aero applications
- Noise Roundtable creation, purpose and input
- Flight training - night and day, practice area development
- Compatible land management and Grant Assurances
- Zoning and Planning authorities
- Master plans and Part 150 noise compatibility studies NEM and NCP

Other:

- FAA was scheduled to present but was absent
- The UC Davis Aviation Noise and Emissions Symposium has signed a 5- year contract with the Las Vegas Renaissance Hotel.
- All questions submitted electronically (SLIDO) to facilitate order.

Matt Frenette and Zach Gabehart had also attended the symposium, and there had been a separate meeting for airport noise officers. They discussed some of the challenges and solutions being seen and done. Las Vegas was troubled by people using artificial intelligence bots to jam noise lines with enough noise complaints to overload the system so it could not be used by legitimate callers. Matt and Zach had discussed some of the data collection done here and showed how it could be applied elsewhere. They indicated they had learned some things which they could find beneficial here, and hoped they had shared some things of benefit to others.

During discussion, it was noted the FAA could not appear at the event, but notes from the FAA were read. Other areas of particular attention included:

- The keynoter focused most on the generation of noise irritation due to volume increase; the common FAA response to his studies and reporting would be FONSI (standing for Finding of No Significant Impact).
- Low frequency noise tends to penetrate more than high frequency; there was mention the noise monitors do not capture low-frequency noise, but that was disputed.
- There was exploration of the pilot shortage that has occurred, and how flight training has affected noise, specifically close to airports.
- There had been discussion of lowering the FAA's 65 DNL to 55; this had been a constant topic for several years.
- Sustainable aviation fuels were mentioned - fuels that are being produced which contain fewer ultrafine particles than those generated from jet fuel. There had been improvement in that production.
- There was some discussion about the presence or absence of runway protection zones, and residential land development close to an airport which was becoming more prevalent.
- The FAA has an Aircraft Noise Advisory Committee, composed of 24 FAA members, appointed for a two-year term. The purpose is to study noise and its effects on the general public.
- Delta Airlines reported its evaluation of its fleet for noise generation, on an ongoing basis.
- There was discussion about recording the number of aircraft noise events that exceeded a named decibel level in a 24-hour period above a particular site, as opposed to DNL which is the total number of aircraft noise events spread out over a 24-hour period. The former was considered a more accurate measurement of sound impact.
- Assessing noise impacts related to education and income; residences closer to airports were considered less expensive because of noise, and the education level was lower accordingly; this did not seem to apply to Centennial Airport.
- The FAA has developed an Aviation Environmental Design Tool (AEDT) which measures noise as it compares to the aircraft type, speed, weather, etc. There is also a Metroplex Overflight Noise Analysis which is similar to AEDT; Stanford had been using this tool for a number of years.
- It was noted that there has been much data collection about noise, but as yet there have been no reports of the findings from all of that data collection.
- There was discussion of the development and use of the various unleaded fuels being developed.
- NASA has a project called Quest, it also has Advanced Air Mobility. It has a test aircraft the X-59. There is testing of supersonic and subsonic flight over the continental United States, doing psychoanalysis/psychoacoustic testing for human noise response based on supersonic flight.
- There was no mention of the Boom aircraft XB-1 and all of the testing involved with it. It seemed like an information gap.
- Zach Gabehart had participated on a panel discussing flight school challenges and opportunities, and his presentation had later been marked by multiple attendees as being the best of the conference. Congratulations Zach!
- Gabehart had noted the emphasis here on being a good neighbor. A representative from Emory Riddle, a national flight school, stated that flight training presented very little hazard, but did not discuss hazard to what or whom.
- There had been a whole session on the creation of a model on noise
- There had also been a session on the effects of noise and emissions based on ethnicity. It had seemed an odd perspective that perhaps needed to be defined differently, as there were so many other factors which would effect its focus.

Question was asked about the FAA Aircraft Noise Advisory Committee. It apparently had not been formed yet. It came out of the FAA noise policy review and the reauthorization legislation but had been put on hold because of the current administration. There have been no members appointed, but the charter for the group is being developed for whenever (if ever) it will be allowed to proceed.

It was noted this year's symposium had fewer presentations which had seemed to be "commercials" to buy software or some other product, and although the lack of presentations of findings had been noted, it was a good symposium. There would always be room for more focus on general aviation airports.

8. **PART 150 STUDY UPDATE/PROGRESS:** The meeting of the Part 150 Study Group Advisory Committee would be held here on April 9th, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon. That would be followed by the Public Meeting from 4:30 – 6:30 p.m. at the Greenwood Village Maintenance Facility. The draft noise contours would be available, and the operations forecast that had been approved by the FAA should also be available. With this information, staff anticipated being able to look at potential alternatives that could be explored during the Part 150 study, looking at different solutions to be included in the study.

Question was asked if there would be any kind of handouts at the poster session. Assumption was it would just be posters with someone standing there talking. Response was it would be a similar format, with things subsequently posted on the study website; staff would get hard copies for CACNR. The approved operations forecast had already been posted on the study website.

Agenda item 7.C. could not be considered, as CACNR had no knowledge of what information was going to be available on April 9th. It was noted that at one time in the past, at least the members of the advisory committee received the materials in advance, and there was question of why even have an advisory committee if it is not given the information in enough time to study it and formulate questions or comments or provide advice. Something may be posted on the website but not everyone has time to constantly check the website to see if anything is or is not available there. The consulting group would be asked if materials could be available in advance for the future.

It was noted there would also be additional meetings and opportunity for comments. There was observation that the poster sessions were not the most useful for some, as there was no opportunity to hear what others were thinking or questioning. A different format might occasionally be more useful. The consultants would be on the May CACNR agenda with a summary of the April 9th poster sessions.

9. **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:**

A. ACPAA MEETINGS – Pam Thompson continued to represent CACNR at these meetings. She had attended the Elbert County Commissioner's meeting where a resident requested the commissioners consider joining CACNR. She had provided information about CACNR, and had then informed the ACPAA as to what had transpired at the Elbert meeting.

B. CACNR ATTENDANCE THROUGH MARCH 2025 – The full year's attendance had been provided. Thompson indicated those whose attendance was highlighted in yellow had not met the attendance standard called for in the CACNR Bylaws. Their Member jurisdictions would be contacted to see if they wished to appoint different Representatives/Alternate Representatives who might be better able to meet the called for standard.

C. CACNR FEES – Andy Jones indicated there were still four jurisdictions which had not submitted their fees: Castle Rock, Cherry Hills Village, Foxfield and Parker. He continued to try to contact those Representatives to get the situations resolved. There was discussion of getting an up-to-date roster sent to everyone; Representatives continued to prefer it be sent to just Representatives and Alternate Representatives, rather than the larger mailing list.

D. WEBMASTER - Chris Eubanks had met with Trish Coberly to learn how to keep the web site up to date. The Executive Committee had agreed a new webmaster would be sought to redesign the site as well as maintain it.

E. WORK PROGRAM- Chris Eubanks noted the need for volunteers to serve on this group. Alison Biggs indicated, per the wishes of the few who had attended an initial meeting, she would be asking specific members to address particular portions of the project so that work could begin. It had appeared a basic design might be most acceptable at this time. Even those who could not be part of the work were invited to share any ideas they might have for consideration.

10. **REPRESENTATIVES' COMMENTS:**

Zach Gabehart and Matt Frenette were thanked for everything they do to assist CACNR and its efforts.

Bill Wasmund was thanked for all the work he had done to present twice during this meeting,

Brad Pierce noted the Aurora City Luncheon would be on June 24. It is a Rotary Club sponsored event featuring Mayor Coffman, at the Hyatt Regency Conference Center on Colfax and 225.

Mike Anderson noted he felt the redesigned Noise Report was more easily used. He noted the Lone Tree website did publish information about the Part 150 meeting next week, and hoped others had done similarly in their jurisdictions. The Lone Tree Director of Economic Development on the Part 150 Advisory Committee would be participating earlier in the day as well. Anderson further noted Lone Tree is at the end of the runway and there had been concern from time to time about the frequency of flights over that area. It was having its State of the City address coming up on the 22nd of April at the Lone Tree Arts Center, 7:30 a.m. and free to the public. The new mayor, Marissa Harmon, would speak about the happenings in Lone Tree, including the expansion in Ridgeway.

Dan Avery expressed similar gratitude to airport staff for helping him understand some of the limitations and height limits that may affect certain land in Meridian as Douglas County reviews any economic development proposal in that area.

Don Kuskie expressed concern about his attendance record, thinking he had been present more than reflected. The lack of a meeting in November was noted as well.

11. **AIRPORT DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** The following information was provided by Mike Fronapfel:

A. Recognition was given to staff members Zach Gabehart, Matt Frenette and Lauren Wiarda. It was Gabehart's first anniversary in his position and of being introduced to CACNR, so that anniversary was noted with appreciation. Frenette had been on board for about 13 months, and Wiarda had been with ACPAA for roughly 15 years, more recently working as director of planning development and overseeing the noise environmental office. One of the new interns, Ethan Nason was introduced.

B. The flight school meeting held on March 26th was the first mandatory meeting following the change in the airport's Minimum Standards. There were 28 in attendance, including Commissioners Campbell from Arapahoe County and Laydon from Douglas County.

With the new administration, they've really pulled back on the FAA being at public meetings in regards to noise and environmental matters, so the FAA had not been allowed to attend this meeting to provide its usual safety briefing up front. However, the meeting had included robust discussions on both sides, and one participant said it was like a town hall meeting and was the best meeting in a long time.

Some time had been spent reviewing the latest report of the Study Group Committee, which did show some improvements. Year over year, there were about 5,000 less overflights over the study area than prior. Progress has been shown so far, but there was still much to be done. Work was continuing on the dashboard, which was hoped to be available by the end of summer.

The FAA's participation with the Study Group had been curtailed by the current administration in Washington, D.C. and it was hoped that blockage would not last long.

Question was asked if there had been any discussion about the Three Towers training area. The airport had requested the flight schools adopt policies and practices that avoid any sort of ground reference maneuver or any low level maneuver in the Three Towers and the Elizabeth Box. The flight schools seemed receptive to the idea of limiting that activity as much as possible in those two boxes. It was something that would continue to be looked at. The schools had been presented with a heat map showing the intensity of how frequently the two boxes closest to the airport were being used versus the other six that are further north and east of those two. So that topic was considered pretty extensively.

Question was asked if there was any flexibility with the 25-mile requirement that seemed to prevent more extensive use of the other training boxes. It was unclear how the 25 mile distance was measured, and the FAA's guidance was very vague.

Question was asked if changing the airport's airspace shape or form would allow any flexibility with the 25 mile limitation. In theory yes, but it's a standard that had been in place for a long time and is widely used, so doubtful if the FAA would carve out our traffic specifically.

It was noted that pilots now use an electronic mapping system called ForeFlight, rather than paper such as the Noise Abatement Guidelines we used to provide with holes punched for the lap boards which used to be in use. ForeFlight allows layers to be created which can show a variety of whatever pilots desire, such as showing our noise sensitive areas or the training boxes which have been designated. It was further noted neither the airport nor the Colorado Pilots Association created the training boxes, or have any direct control of them. While there is no direct control, the tenants at this airport want to be good neighbors and so there can be a kind of influence. One thing might be to include a related criteria in the dashboard which could be a very useful tool to have, working with the pilots' association to create a layer for the flight schools to utilize. It was further noted there were lots of things that came out of meeting last week but now that pilot mapping is done electronically, ForeFlight is one of the tools which can be very useful.

C. ACPAA, along with Greenwood Village and Arapahoe County, had contracted with the Normandy Group to help lobby both at the national and the state levels on noise and environmental issues. Mike Fronapfel had been in Washington DC and the Normandy Group had set up five different meetings for him. He met with the staffs for Hickenlooper, Bennett Crowe, Negus, and the new Representative to the south, Bobert. Several different talking points were presented; one asking that the FAA get back to the table, both at the Part 150 study and the Study Group as it is important for them to be at the table as part of the process. The FAA has been a great partner over the last 18 to 24 months. The staffs were receptive to that and wanted to be updated if there continued to be issues with the FA not being able to engage. Also, they were provided a copy of the Q4 2024 Study Group report and Fronapfel briefly went over some of the updates and trend lines. They were pleased to see there has been some improvement in that regard.

D. In addition, the legislative staffs had received an update on unleaded fuel and the airport waiting for a national 100R or 100 octane unleaded fuel to come out that would be more broadly usable than the UL-94 which can only be used by about 65% of the fleet. FAA and ASTM certification are needed before that is starting to be produced and rolled out. There was another product on the market as well, G100UL, however, the makers of G100UL were not going through the ASTM process, and as a result, it may not be welcomed or used by the industry because of liability concerns. (The ASTM certification verifies the product's compatibility with seals, gaskets, hoses, all kinds of different transport trucks, fuel farms, all the different things that the fuel touches through the process before it even gets to the aircraft.)

E. In California, there are a few jurisdictions where they say as soon as there is a market or a fuel on the market that is viable and available, they are mandating that the airports must transition immediately to that new fuel. Some are arguing and have been successful in resisting that. There have been some lawsuits and judges have cited that it's not considered a viable replacement yet. It is obviously something ACPAA will be watching. So far, none of the Centennial Airport's FBOs would be willing to use it because of the liability issues. Of the 850 or so tenants at the airport, only one has requested that the airport gets that fuel, but no one else is willing to put it in their aircraft either. ACPAA hopes to be in the forefront of the transition to the 100R.

3. There are a couple airports in California that only sell unleaded, one of which is Reed Hillview as the main one. It was interesting now with the new administration, the FAA may be going after those airports because of them breaking their grant assurances. However, Reed Hillview has stopped taking grants, so that's not a weakness in a sense for them, but some of the other airports that are considering that could be in jeopardy of losing their funding if they ban 100 low lead altogether.

4. Many airports across the country are concerned about staffing of their towers, and Centennial Airport is short-staffed as well. Many of the controllers are working longer hours and reducing services and not being able to do pattern work. When there is not enough staffing to do pattern work, it can be a better and quieter outcome for the community, but from a safety standpoint, the towers do need to be fully staffed.

5. Centennial received an \$8 million grant, and work will begin on the existing tower this summer. Conversations are starting with elected officials now to try to find a way to get the FAA to build and fund a new tower here.

6. The hotel was getting closer to opening, with an anticipated date of April 24th. All county permits have been granted and all inspections have been done. There is a refurbished meeting space which CACNR may wish to consider using in order to be more of a true roundtable.

7. The Runway 54K would be held of June 7th and all were invited to come. Last year there were 1,000 participants and raised \$65K for the Centennial Airport Foundation. So far this year there are over 1,100 registrations and it is being capped at 1,500, hoping to raise \$70,000. Donations are made to the Tuskegee Airmen, and local aviation programs and the high school and college levels. We've set up three scholarships, one for airport management in memory of former airport director Robert Olislagers, a scholarship for pilots and another for aircraft mechanics. The scholarships are for \$10K each.

8. Finally, recognition was given to Bob Doubek who had been on the ACPAA Board for 20 years and at 97 was leaving that position. He still maintained a plane at Centennial and occasionally still flew it with a safety pilot on board. His petroleum engineering background had been utilized by the board over the years, and he had also served as the AOPA representative on CACNR for many years. ACPAA had had a celebration for him the week prior.

12. **OLD BUSINESS** – None

13. **NEW BUSINESS** – None

14. **PUBLIC COMMENT**: Completed.

15. **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIVES' COMMENTS**: Pam Thompson asked Mike Fronapfel if he could share the destinations of Centennial flights with CACNR. Response was yes, that could be done in May. The Division of Aeronautics did an economic impact study, and as part of that, they looked at the IFR flights in and out of all the airports in Colorado. For Centennial Airport, it showed that all 50 states had been reached by about mid-January with flights to and from. Internationally, there were over 1,600 different destinations in 41 different countries, double the destinations going through Denver.

16. **RECOMMENDATIONS TO ACPAA & OTHERS TO POTENTIALLY REDUCE NOISE OVER AFFECTED COMMUNITIES**: Alison Biggs noted this was one of the things in the work program that never got talked about so was on the agenda to remind us that one of the charges that we have is to make recommendations to the airport board or anybody else to potentially reduce noise. The Study Group does, and we talk about what that group does, but are there other thoughts that anyone has that might develop into recommendations?

17. **NEXT MEETINGS**:

A, CACNR –	May 7, 2025	6:30 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
	June 4, 2025	6:30 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
	July 2, 2025	NO JULY CACNR MEETING	
	August 6, 2025	6:30 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112
B. ACPAA –	April 10, 2025	3:00 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
	May 8, 2025	3:00 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
	June 12, 2025	3:00 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR
	July 10, 2025	NO JULY ACPAA MEETING	
	August 14, 2025	3:00 p.m.	7565 South Peoria Street, Englewood, CO 80112, Pam Thompson for CACNR

C. PART 150 MEETING – April 9, 2025 4:30 – 6:30, Greenwood Village Maintenance Facility, Mr. Elbert Room, 10001 E. Costilla Avenue, Greenwood Village, CO 80112

18. **ADJOURNMENT**: The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 p.m.

Alison Biggs, Secretary