



CENTENNIAL AIRPORT COMMUNITY NOISE ROUNDTABLE MINUTES

May 7, 2025

Approved June 4, 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 Vice Chair Pam Thompson. The following were in attendance, and a quorum was present:

Douglas County:	Dan Avery	Greenwood Village:	Donna Johnston
Douglas County:	Alison Biggs	Lone Tree:	Mike Anderson
Aurora:	Brad Pierce	ACPAA:	Mike Fronapfel
Castle Pines:	Ron Cole (virtual)	AOPA:	John Hirshman
Cherry Hills Village:	Dave Heller (virtual)	CABA:	Don Kuskie
Foxfield:	Pam Thompson	Wings Over the Rockies:	Bill Wasmund

Also present: ACPAA Alternate Zach Gabehart; and ACPAA Staff Matt Frenette and Lauren Wiarda.

Absent:	Arapahoe County:	Rhonda Fields/Leroy Evans	Centennial:	Don Sheehan/Amy Tharp
	Arapahoe County:	Sreenivasan Alakappan/Vacant	Highlands Ranch MD:	Andy Jones/Renee Anderson
	Castle Rock:	Laura Cavey/Sandy Vossler	Parker:	Vacant/Bryce Matthews
			CDOT Aeronautics Div:	Todd Green/Vacant

RECOGNITION OF BOB DOUBEK AND MOMENT OF SILENCE: The passing of Bob Doubek, long time AOPA Representative on CACNR, and ACPAA Board Member was noted. Several CACNR Representatives shared fond memories of him from that time. A donation of \$500 had been made by CACNR to Wings Over the Rockies per the family's request for donations rather than flowers. His celebration of life would be held on Thursday, June 5, 2025, 1:00 p.m. Horan & McConaty, 5303 E. Cuntly Line Road, Centennial CO. There was a moment of silence in his memory.

2. **CONSENT AGENDA:** The Consent Agenda included the Draft CACNR Minutes from April 2, 2025; a Treasurer's Report from May 2, 2025 showing a balance of \$34,817.13; a Noise Report from March 2025; and a Portable Noise Monitor Report. On the request of Pam Thompson, the Noise Report and the report of the Highlands Ranch Portable Noise Monitor were removed from the consent agenda. On the motion of Bill Wasmund, duly seconded, the remainder of the Consent Agenda was approved.

The March 2025 Noise Report included the following information:

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

March Local Operations:	13,135	March Total Operations:	26,647
Year to Date Local Operations:	35,611	Year to Date Total Operations:	73,363

26,647 Total Operations in March resulted in 707 complaints from 50 households.

March Noise Events:

<u>March Total:</u>		<u>March 60 – 69 db:</u>		<u>March 70 – 79 db:</u>		<u>March 80 – 89 db:</u>	
Golf Course	14,399	Golf Course	9,118	Golf Course	5,022	Airport East	463
Meridian	8,066	Meridian	6,112	Meridian	1,737	Golf Course	252
Lone Tree	3,391	Parker	2,265	Lone Tree	1,130	Lone Tree	214
Airport East	2,761	Lone Tree	2,040	Airport East	899	Meridian	212
Parker	2,502	State Park	1,485	State Park	560	Portable Station	12
State Park	2,050	Portable Station	1,359	Portable Station	299	Grandview Estates	9
Portable Station	1,672	Airport East	1,338	Parker	233	Parker	4
Grandview Estates	1,481	Grandview Estates	1,296	Grandview Estates	176	State Park	4
Greenwood Village	854	Castle Rock	799	Greenwood Village	91	Greenwood Village	3
Castle Rock	852	Greenwood Village	760	Castle Rock	50	Castle Rock	2
Hunters Hill	502	Hunters Hill	469	Hunters Hill	33	Castle Pines	0
Sagebrush Park	87	Sagebrush Park	84	Castle Pines	3	Hunters Hill	0
Castle Pines	39	Castle Pines	36	Sagebrush Park	3	Sagebrush Park	0

March Noise Events in the 90+ decibel range: Airport East – 61 Golf Course – 7 Lone Tree – 7 Meridian – 5 Portable Station – 2
Castle Rock – 1 State Park – 1

March Noise Complaints and		Numbers of Households:		YTD Complaints and		Number of Households:	
Unincorporated Arapahoe County	293 (42%)	UAC	15 (30%)	UAC	944 (50%)	UAC	24 (29%)
Other	112 (16%)	UDC	10 (20%)	UDC	244 (13%)	UDC	15 (18%)
Centennial	79 (11%)	Greenwood Village	7 (14%)	Other	211 (11%)	GV	12 (14%)
Unincorporated Douglas County	78 (11%)	Centennial	5 (10%)	Centennial	195 (10%)	Other	9 (10%)
Greenwood Village	71 (10%)	Other	5 (10%)	GV	143 (08%)	Centennial	7 (08%)
Parker	49	Highlands Ranch	3	Parker	51	Lone Tree	5
Highlands Ranch	10	Lone Tree	2	HR	49	HR	4
Denver	8	Aurora	1	Denver	19	Denver	3
Aurora	5	Denver	1	Castle Rock	8	Aurora	2
Lone Tree	2	Parker	1	Lone Tree	8	Castle Rock	2
Castle Pines	0	Castle Rock	0	Aurora	7	Parker	1
Castle Rock	0	Castle Pines	0	Castle Pines	0	Castle Pines	0
Cherry Hills Village	0	Cherry Hills Village	0	CHV	0	CHV	0

Year to Date, the top five households complaining were:

Household #1 458 (35%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County
Household #2 305 (16%) Unincorporated Arapahoe County
Household #3 195 (10%) Other

Household #4 163 (9%) Centennial
Household #5 104 (6%) Greenwood Village

In March, 98 responses were requested from 707 noise complaints, with 96 of those requests made by email and 2 made by telephone.

In March 659 complaints were made about **daytime flights** (7:00 a.m. – 9:59 p.m.) – 93%.

48 complaints were made about **nighttime flights** (10:00 p.m. – 6:59 a.m.) – 7%.

In March, props accounted for **93% of the complaints by aircraft type**; **jets** accounted for **6% of the complaints**, and **helicopters** caused **1%**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed propellers had caused 90% of the complaints; jets caused 8%, and helicopters caused 2%

In March, training was responsible for **53% of the complaints**, **departures** were responsible for **26% of the complaints**, and **arrivals** were responsible for **21% of the complaints**. Comparatively, **Year to Date** figures showed training had caused 47% of the complaints, departures had caused 32%, and arrivals had caused 21%.

A graph was provided showing the **March number of complaints by the hour** in which they were made, with a peak around 1:00 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 the March Radar Track Density Map.

3. ITEM REMOVED FROM THE CONSENT AGENDA:

A. **MARCH 2025 NOISE REPORT** – Zach Gabehart noted the number of complaints had decreased from March '24 ((1,057) to March '25 (707). With better weather coming, an increase in flying could be anticipated along with an increase in complaints. Other data seemed relatively consistent. Year to date showed a total of 1,879 complaints from 84 households, resulting from 73, 363 total operations (36,611 of those were local).

Question was asked why the noise contours did not reflect the kind of noise the public hears on the ground. Response from Kate Andrus, M & H, was the FAA opted to take all the data from a year and compress it to the figures that were used to create the noise contours. It was noted this may be useful for the FAA's purpose, but does not present an accurate total picture to which the public can relate. While the 65 DNL was established as the primary measure of noise annoyance, it has now been found that same number of people are now highly annoyed at a DNL much lower than 65, so the FAA is "looking into" the situation; there is little likelihood the FAA will change any time soon.

The FAA did approve Centennial's Part 150 using some supplemental metrics however, so there may be opportunities for the creation of more useful pictures of how noise from Centennial Airport flights interact with those on the ground. While some approaches developed from the use of the supplemental metrics may not be approved for the purpose of the Part 150 study, there may be some which could be implemented here outside of the Part 150 study, and H & M will be looking into those and helping with their development and potential use. Gabehart and Andrus were thanked for their information.

B. **PORTABLE NOISE MONITOR REPORT** – This portable noise monitor had been placed near University and Highlands Ranch Parkway, approximately 4.7 miles west-southwest of the airport, on April 8, 2025 – April 22, 2025. A number of the flights shown on the flight track map were actually DIA controlled flight; figures from 5 other airports were also shown. Of those which were associated with Centennial Airport, 191 (62%) were propellers, 116 (38%) were jets, and 1 was a helicopter. Of that same number, 139 (45%) were departures, 87 (28%) were arrivals, and 82 (27%) were training. Noise data showed a lower level than anticipated, with an average aircraft noise level of 64.6. There had been 31 aircraft noise events in the 60-69 dB range; 3 in the 70-79 dB range; and 1 in the 80-89 dB range.

Question was asked if all citizens could request a portable noise monitor be placed at their locations. Response was yes, when one was available, this could be done. Staff reviews the details involved before such placement with the resident, and provides the results, answering any questions that might arise. CACNR is also informed when a portable monitor has been requested and placed, and receives the results from the placement of any portable noise monitor

On the motion of Mike Anderson, duly seconded, the Noise Report and the report of the Highlands Ranch Portable Noise Monitor were approved.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT:

A. RECEIVED BY CACNR –

1. From Austin Wheeler with the Tulsa Riverside Airport Noise Committee, who asked for our total noise complaints from 2020 – 2024. They were evaluating an off-airport development. He had been provided with the numbers as requested, plus the overall year end numbers for 2024 so he could see where the numbers came from. His response indicated they were considering a golf course to the south of their runway. This seemed to be appropriate, and he seemed satisfied with the information he had been given.

2. Re “The Summit” at Meridian. The author acknowledged it might sound harsh, but indicated locally elected leaders in charge of zoning really did not care about the future impact their decisions would have on future residents. The author had gone to this location when there were only three planes in the traffic pattern, yet for about the 10 minutes on site, there was never a break in the noise over this location, which was very close to the end of the runway, from either pattern traffic or jet noise. Homes would be 2500-2900 feet from runway 35R, both a noise and a safety concern for both residents and pilots.

The author continued that people would move in, and ignore any aviation easements they had to sign at the last minute during closing (when they may not have even been aware of what they were signing in the pile of documents they were given). They would then attend CACNR meetings and complain, and cuss at airport staff and CACNR Representatives. They would eventually realize CACNR was advisory only and go to the airport board and demand recourses which were not possible (either by law or FAA rulings, for example). A lawsuit might be filed, which would likely be lost, and the whole cycle would be repeated by new residents or continually frustrated original ones.

The author then indicated if there was desire to solve this problem, “you” must go to the cities and counties surrounding the airport, to work with their zoning departments and boards, to obtain agreements there should not be building in such unsafe and noisy areas. There would be no noise abatements existing to save people living in such areas from the noise and the unsafe conditions there.

The author further noted the thought that the people who run some of the surrounding jurisdictions would continue to be part of the problem rather than the solution, as “The Summit” at Meridian demonstrated. The thought was expressed that the people who run Colorado are the housing developers and the elected leaders who seem to serve them.

The Chair indicated comments on any of these points would be included in the later discussion of land use.

3. Re FAR 61.93 Solo Cross-Country Flight Requirements. Mike Koscielniak had volunteered to follow up on the question of whether a solo student must stay within 25 nautical miles of the originating airport. He had contacted 3 certified flight instructors, 1 designated pilot examiner, and the FAA. Consensus was all flight planning starts at the ‘middle’ of the airport runways; Section 61.93(a)(1)(i) states any flight greater than 25 nautical miles from the airport from where the flight originated would mean measured from that point at the airport, not the airspace.

Section 61.93(a)(1) states that except for paragraph (b) a student pilot must meet all of the other applicable sections of 61.93 to fly greater than 25 nautical miles away from the originating airport. A student pilot could be endorsed to fly to a practice area more than 50 nautical miles away as long as all the applicable requirements of 61.93 were met; the student would not be able to log the flight as cross-country, and would only be able to land back at Centennial Airport. For a flight to count as cross-country, the student, having met all applicable sections of 61.93, and must land at a point more than 50 nautical miles from Centennial Airport.

In summary, a student pilot could fly greater than 25 nautical miles as long as the student had the required endorsements from his/her CFI.

Question was asked about the requirements which the student must meet for flying cross country. The instructor must certify the student had cross country training and had good planning (including weather) approved for flying to a specific airport. Koscielniak was thanked for looking into this and for the information.

Further discussion included perhaps more encouragement or incentives being given to moving flight training around to more than the two currently overused training boxes. This topic is being looked at by the Study Group Committee as it develops its dashboard.

B. MEETING ATTENDEES /VIRTUAL ATTENDEES –

1. Randy Johnson from Louviers had recorded 489 propeller planes and submitted 32 complaints. Some planes were still doing their turns and flying directly over his home; he had communicated with Gabehart about those. One flight today had gone over his location, then over the houses in Sterling Ranch, the houses south of Titan Road, and then had come back northeast directly over the houses in Louviers. Why had it seemingly made it a point of flying directly over houses, rather than moving to available open space areas? This one had also been communicated to Gabehart. He did note there had been periods of quiet and fewer flying circles overhead. He had also noted several newer plane numbers, but was unsure if they were new planes or replacing older numbers for some reason.

Johnson had also noted, on a day in April, there had been 37 planes overhead in the period from 10:25 a.m. – 10:38 a.m., which had seemed higher than normal. They were not just Centennial planes but included aircraft from other airports as well.

2. Michael Koscielniak from Castle Rock referenced the data with which CACNR deals, indicating the airport staff does a good job. He noted year to date there had been 1,156 complaints, with 68% of those from five households – 786 v. 32% - 369. He felt that with five households generating the majority of the numbers being dealt with, the data was skewed. He questioned why the number one household was thrown out and not all five of the highest complainers. He also wondered what is told to those who request a response to their complaints, and what they say back to those responses. He further suggested having examples of what decibel levels compare to would help everybody better understand the reports.

Finally, he questioned if there had been any FAA enforcement actions over the last two or three years. He believed an FAA official had gone to speak with one certified flying instructor about something he had done, but otherwise he knew of no enforcement action being taken against any pilots, because he believed there was nothing the pilots were violating. He suggested anyone feeling otherwise should contact the FAA which would do due diligence and investigate the complaint if warranted.

3. On-line, Brenda Dyché asked when the flight boxes were created in Elbert County, if there had been discussion with proper County authorities at the time, and had the citizens of the county been communicated with before the boxes were created. She wanted written proof that these things had happened. She noted Mike Koscielniak's suggestion about contacting the FAA, indicating she had done so with screenshots showing violations and gotten no feedback. She felt somebody needed to get to the FAA to do its job. She would be asking for a noise monitor to be placed at her house again; there had been eight planes over her house before 6:00 a.m. and before noon there had been eight planes using the training box one after the other. It felt as though there were a few schools which harassed the homeowners in the Three Towers and the Elizabeth training boxes. She had been watching them hammering the town of Elizabeth, so was requesting things get spread out so that all of the noise did not constantly end up over Elbert County.

4. Kim Hellweg from the Elizabeth area indicated she felt the FAA was a joke; it takes months to get any kind of response, if any is forthcoming at all. It seemed nobody wanted to take any responsibility for the training areas. A lot of the pilots were not doing anything wrong, but the way of life in the area was being destroyed. It used to be a beautiful peaceful place and now it was not. If pilots were not using the training boxes, they were in the process of going through the area to get to other areas. Nobody seemed to care what the homeowners were going through and dealing with on a daily basis. Pilots need to cooperate.

Hellweg further asked for feedback about what was said to those who complain to the airport, what kind of discussion goes on at the flight school meetings, what are flight schools told and what do the schools say in response, etc. She suggested some kind of communication needs to take place so the public understands and receives feedback about what is going on as no feedback takes place now. It seems the pilots have the attitude that they are not doing anything wrong by the FAA's rules, so they can do whatever they want and the people on the ground do not matter. She was looking for help from CACNR, ACPAA, the FAA, the pilots, the flight schools or anyone who could help restore her area to the peaceful place she and her neighbors moved to.

There were no further speakers waiting to be heard. In response to the questions of when and what happened when the training boxes were established, CACNR did not exist at that time and is not in charge of them, and it was doubtful the airport had records as the boxes are not within the airport's jurisdiction. It did have some input with the latest update, and gave the flight schools some options, so there was a possibility of diluting some of the noise causing activities a little. The Study Group Committee was potentially going to look into utilizing its dashboard to encourage use of some of the lesser used training boxes. How the flight schools get to the further out training boxes might also be part of a future discussion.

Question was asked if there were notes or summaries from the flight school meetings which could be shared. Notes are not taken, but the airport's Power Point presentation might be placed on its website so the public can see what message is being given to the flight schools; the airport would look into doing that. Point was made that in addition to the message being sent by the airport, the public wants to know what the flight schools' responses were to that message. One possible measure of flight school response has been reports from the Study Group Committee which show some of the numbers trending in a downward direction. Question was asked if a Representative from CACNR could attend the flight school meetings to observe. Response was that the CACNR Chair Chris Eubanks had attended the last two meetings; any CACNR Representatives were welcome to join the meetings. It was also suggested perhaps Eubanks could report back on what transpired. One Arapahoe County Commissioner and one Douglas County Commissioner had each attended the last meeting and spoke to what had been heard from their communities, thanking the flight schools for what they had done so far but noting there was still much work to be done.

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

The first quarter 2025 update report from the CACNR Study Group Committee had been included in the mailing for this meeting. The foci of prior reports had been provided; the focus of this report was data analysis specifically comparing the first quarter of 2024 with the first quarter of 2025. New information had been included in the various sections in blue font. Mitigation strategies adopted and not adopted were also provided.

Brad Pierce reviewed the specifics of the report, which showed the number of touch and go aircraft entering the study area decreased from 10,348 in the first quarter of 2024 to 7,408 in the first quarter of 2025. The percentage of touch and go aircraft also dropped from 50.7% in Q1 2024 to 44% in Q1 2025. Proactive outreach and education to the flight schools and proactive checking of extended traffic during nighttime hours were two highlighted sections.

The fifth meeting of the flight schools took place in March 2025, with approximately 25 flight school personnel attending; FAA personnel were unable to attend. Airport staff discussed the noise abatement guidelines, the usage of the practice boxes, and provided current noise data. The second meeting of this group would be in June, 2025. Pierce then presented the remainder of the report in detail as outlined in the report included in the mailing.

It was noted that having lived in this study area, things had improved as the data showed, with hope that the people in Elbert County could be helped in the same way. It was noted that pages 9, 10, & 11 included statements that data would be included in future reports, or data would be collected or data would be forthcoming. Question was asked if those statements could be updated to show where the status of the data collection is for each. It seemed this could be done.

Question was asked about the difference between nighttime complaints and an outlier. A nighttime complaint is just that, any complaint that relates to a flight made between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. If there was no reason a nighttime flight should have extended into the study area without being ATC directed, and that flight generated a complaint, that is classified as an outlier. Staff then reaches out to start a dialogue. The number of outliers had decreased, but might increase again with increased flying in the summer.

One thing the study group was continuing to work on was the dashboard. Work was being done to create a list of things that might be wanted on the dashboard, and this work is continuing.

6. **PART 150 STUDY UPDATE/PROGRESS:** The meeting of the Part 150 Study Group Advisory Committee was held here on April 9th, 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon. That was followed by the Public Meeting from 4:30 – 6:30 p.m. at the Greenwood Village Maintenance Facility. This agenda item covered the information that was presented at both meetings and the Power Point presentation is available; presenter was Kate Andrus of Mead and Hunt where she was the project manager. Forecast approval had been obtained from the FAA and draft noise exposure maps were available. The study identified two main parts – aircraft noise and land use. She reviewed the existing components and in five years out. Noise contours and the land use associated with the contours were included.

Next step would be the development of a noise compatibility program, with alternative ways to reduce noise and reduce non-compatible land uses. Consideration would be given to what alternatives would be modeled, what alternative would be looked at from the land use perspective. It was noted that although a Part 150 generally looks at a five year planning horizon, this study does show a 10-year noise contour because land use planning has been identified as so important due to the encroachment which is happening around the airport now. There would be opportunity for community input about the possible alternative ways to reduce noise and non-compatible land uses, before they were presented to the FAA for approval.

Question was asked what had happened to the ideas from the community meeting which had been placed on stickies. Response was the ideas had been photographed and were being consolidated and would be rolled into the preliminary alternatives that would be looked at. One of the frequent questions had been if the 65 DNL was the right metric to be used. Response was it had to be because it was the one the FAA uses. However the FAA did allow this study to include some supplemental metrics, even though no decision the FAA makes would be based on them. The community could, however, look at the supplemental metrics and make decision on whether some operational changes could be done outside of the Part 150 study.

Comment was made that it would be a goal to have all of the jurisdictions using the same noise contours when doing their planning for and approvals of land use. There was considerable interest in the looking at noise contours for the 55 DNL, and Andrus indicated that the 55 and the 60 could be plotted and brought to the next CACNR meeting. Such information might also end up as an appendix to the Part 150.

Andrus was thanked for her presentation and information. It was anticipated she would be here again.

7. **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:**

- A. ACPAA MEETINGS – Pam Thompson continued to represent CACNR at these meetings. Her report to the April ACPAA meeting had been included in the mailing and she had nothing further to add unless there were questions and there were none.
- B. CACNR FEES – Treasurer Andy Jones was not present, but an update today indicated there were still two jurisdictions which had not submitted their fees: Cherry Hills Village and Foxfield.
- C. WEBMASTER - No report.
- D. WORK PROGRAM – No activity to report.

8. **1ST QUARTER LAND USE REFERRAL:** Zach Gabehart indicated he would be bringing the quarterly land use referral reports to CACNR regularly in the future. The first quarter 2025 report was provided showing the airport received 11 land use referrals from January through March 2025. Two were approved as submitted, eight were subject to comments, and there was one that was not recommended. The comments vary depending on the individual situation involved, such as assuring there are no building height issues. The one development not recommended was a filing of the Ridgeway development in the City of Lone Tree.

Question was asked if there was any way CACNR could help with these in the future. The airport does look at referrals and comprehensively identifies ones it knows were going to have a negative impact on the people living there because of the airport. Gabehart indicated the airport does provide considerable data and evidence as to why something is not compatible, but if there were things identified that CANR could support, it could be a good idea. One example of support demonstration would be for someone from CACNR going to a meeting with airport personnel and speaking with the board or zoning group or whomever.

“The Summit” at Meridian had last been under review in 2020 or 2021, but had been referred a few different times prior to that. Basically, anything the airport had to say had always been ignored. The airport had consistently been heavily opposed to the

development for several reasons, one of which was the very close proximity to the runway. Such opposition does go in the public record with the application for development, so all decision makers are very clear of the opposition and the reasons why.

Question was asked if there is a disclaimer which acknowledges that developers know there will be airport traffic and noise overhead and which they send out to prospective buyers. Response was this is a recommendation, with an avocation easement or overflight disclosure that is ready for the developers to share, but the airport does not really know if the recommendation and materials are used by the developers.

At this point the discussion was turned to the Ridgeway development which had not been recommended by the airport in the first quarter land use referral, and there was no further consideration of "The Summit" at Meridian. The history of the Ridgeway development was reviewed by Mike Anderson, as were the various other agencies such as fire and water which were consulted and whose recommendations needed to be considered. He noted the things which were being done by Lone Tree to develop a safe community and which it felt were being sensitive to the quality of life for the residents. The decision-makers have the results of all the responses from the agencies so they can make an informed decision about each project. He further commented that every document that is prepared as part of the planning process has general notes on it that are very specific about buying into an airport influence area and that buyers need to decide if that is where they want to live. This is on the deed, on the purchase documents, on all documents that people at one point in time would be exposed to in terms of making that decision. People need to be aware of what is going on if they decide to buy housing in the area.

It was noted CACNR hears that the documents related to airport noise may not be seen until closing when buyers are handed piles of papers which need to be signed, so they may not really be aware they are signing an acknowledgement that they are buying in an airport influence area. Question was asked if Lone Tree made an effort to assure the people who were considering buying in its airport influence area see those documents before closing. Response was the city was committed to having those things in the documents, and follow-through by the sellers and the builders was thought out and planned. Question was asked when prospective buyers see those documents. Response was before they sign them. When that time was in relation to closing seemed to be unknown, although there was expectation people adhere to the builders' follow-through process.

In addition to the aviation information provided by the airport, it also recommends disclosure in the sellers' sales trailers or sales offices. The intent would be prospective buyers would see the information when going into sales offices. Unfortunately, there have been reported scenarios where the material was posted behind the door and did not get seen. Comment was made that realtors are reluctant to reveal that information for fear of losing the sale.

It was noted there may be opportunity for airport staff to do periodic spot checks of the sales offices to learn what people are being told and advised ahead of time. Finally, Anderson noted Lone Tree had building codes requiring structures be built to 45 db inside.

9. **REPRESENTATIVES' COMMENTS:** None

10. **AIRPORT DIRECTOR'S REPORT:** Mike Fronapfel indicated the Colorado Division of Aeronautics had done an economic impact study and as part of that, they looked at all the international or IFR flights in and out of Centennial Airport. The last study was 2018-based numbers, and this time it was 2023. Fronapfel showed a video which tracked such flights across the months; by February, all 50 states had been included. By the end of the time frame, there had been some 70,000+ IFR flights to and from 42 countries.

Overall, there had been 1,663 different places flown to or from, which was more than DIA. DIA had reached all 50 states, and 43 countries, but it had taken it 700+thousand flights to do so. Comparison to Rocky Mountain Airport, it had about half the number of IFR flights as Centennial, about 1,300 places flown to and from, all 50 states, and 23 countries. Aircraft flying out of Centennial can fly directly to Tokyo or Moscow or the Pacific Rim or Europe or parts of Africa, or Australia. The study showed the impact Centennial Airport has both nationally and internationally. The economic impact went from \$2.1 billion in 2018 to \$2.4 billion in 2023. Centennial Airport has marked two years as the first and only GA airport in Colorado to make unleaded avgas available; recognition was given to Aspen Flying Club and Centennial Flyers for buying the unleaded fuel, to Jet Centers of Colorado for freeing up a tank and a fuel truck and taking the risk to begin selling the unleaded fuel to tenants, and to the airport board for supporting the program. Legislation providing grants to GA airports transitioning to unleaded fuel was noted with appreciation; Centennial Airport had been awarded \$650,000 in grants under that program, easing a heavy financial burden for the airport during the beginning phases of this project.

In annual recognition of Earth Day, the airport partnered with Modern Aviation and Signature to conduct a FOD (foreign object and debris) walk to pick up trash around one runway and one taxiway; at least six large trash bags were filled, so the event was considered a success.

Centennial Airport's operations and maintenance staff and Zach Gabhart recently received honorary mention for the 2024-2025 Balkan Post Award for excellence in snow and ice control. Centennial Airport has won the Balkan Post Award 14 times and had honorable mention five times, both more than any other GA airport in the country. The hard work of the staff during the snow events was appreciated.

Brian Beatty had been appointed to the airport board by the Arapahoe County Commissioners. He had been on the planning commission for the city of Centennial for about nine years and is an active pilot. He seemed to be community minded as well. The control tower refurbishment would begin the first week of June and street repaving will be done in August. New street signs would start being installed in late summer. The Four Points at Sheraton Hotel was hiring staff and now anticipated opening at the end of May.

The Runway 5K was still scheduled to be held on June 7th., with approximately 1,600 registrants; goal was to raise over \$70,000 for the Centennial Foundation. Donations go to the Tuskegee Airmen and aviation programs at Cherry Creek and Douglas County Schools. Three scholarships of \$10,000 each are also given to aircraft management personnel, pilots, and aircraft mechanics.

Permission was given to extend the meeting to address the remainder of the agenda.

11. **OLD BUSINESS** – None

12. **NEW BUSINESS** – None

13. **PUBLIC COMMENT**: Completed.

14. **ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIVES' COMMENTS**: Mike Fronapfel was asked to comment briefly on the resolution of the lawsuits against Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport. One related to having the airport reduce the number of training flights and pattern traffic allowed at the airport. A judge dismissed the case on the basis that it was federal jurisdiction and outside his purview. Other lawsuits involving Rocky Mountain Metropolitan Airport related to such things as aviation easements, limitation of operations, obtaining a certificate for commercial operations, and the power to shut down the airport once the grant assurances run out, if they ever do. The outcome of such legal activity should be interesting for the airport and those involved with it to watch as possible legal markers for activities here.

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

16. **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

5. PART 150 MEETING –

17. **ADJOURNMENT**: The meeting was adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Alison Biggs, Secretary