

## **Northern Colorado Regional Airport (FNL)**

### **Stakeholder Meeting – Official Minutes**

**Date:** January 14, 2026

**Time:** 3:00 PM – 4:00 PM

**Location:** LETA 4867 Venture Dr, Johnstown

**Facilitators / Presenters:** Airport Staff (including Airport Director: John Kinney, Business Development Specialist: Aaron Ehle, Project Manager: Jodi Doney, Airport Administrator: Kelly Pride)

---

### **Overview**

Airport staff opened the meeting by welcoming attendees and emphasizing the intent of the stakeholder meetings as an open forum for questions and discussion, contrasting this format with the more structured nature of formal airport commission meetings. Attendees were encouraged to raise any airport safety concerns.

### **Airport Safety – Agenda item open discussion**

#### Wind Conditions & AWAS / ATIS Reporting Concerns

A stakeholder raised a safety concern related to wind reporting accuracy and timeliness during a recent landing the previous Wednesday.

- The pilot described encountering significantly stronger winds than initially reported. While the system showed winds at approximately 7 knots down the runway, actual conditions upon entering the downwind leg were approximately 21 knots gusting to 29 knots out of 290, resulting in a downwind landing.
- The pilot advised other aircraft inbound from Wyoming of the conditions; several subsequently diverted to Greeley due to winds exceeding the maximum crosswind component for most general aviation aircraft.
- It was noted that the AWAS did not appear to update for one to two hours, which contributed to the discrepancy between reported and actual conditions.
- The stakeholder asked whether the AWAS update frequency could be increased to reflect rapidly changing weather conditions.

#### ATC Explanation

- Air Traffic Control personnel confirmed that:

- When the tower is manned, weather observations are updated hourly and are broadcast via ATIS.
- When the tower is closed, the AWAS can be set to provide a two-minute rolling average, which updates continuously.
- While the tower is operational, pilots can receive direct, real-time wind readings from controllers, which may differ from the hourly ATIS report.
- Switching to two-minute updates while the tower is open would require the ATIS to be updated every time the weather changes, which is operationally impractical due to FAA requirements (each update would require a new phonetic designator).

#### Phone AWAS Issues

- Additional concerns were raised regarding the AWAS phone line, which was reported as not functioning properly during the same timeframe.
- Airport staff confirmed the phone system was currently out of service and had been submitted to FAA Tech Ops for repair.
- The stakeholder noted that while stranded in Greeley, attempts to use the phone line were unsuccessful or provided inaccurate information, requiring direct calls to the tower for updates, which were appreciated.

#### Digital / Cockpit Weather Data

- Discussion included the challenges pilots face when planning runway selection using digital cockpit weather data at greater distances from the airport.
- Airport staff explained that:
  - Significant changes generate a special weather observation, which updates digital weather feeds used in cockpits.
  - Wind conditions can still vary significantly between different ends of the runway and at different altitudes, even with accurate reporting.
- Examples were given where aircraft requested approaches opposite the standard flow due to wind conditions; these requests were accommodated when traffic allowed.

### Limitations & Acknowledgment

- Air Traffic Control Staff acknowledged the limitations of wind reporting systems, particularly during highly variable conditions, and noted that winds can differ dramatically even within 100 feet of altitude.
- Air Traffic Control Staff reiterated their commitment to providing the best available information using instruments, windsocks, and direct observation.

### Next Steps

- Shawn with Air Traffic Control agreed to coordinate further internally to identify potential improvements and address gaps related to AWAS functionality and communication.

### **Staff Introduction & Website / Communications Feedback**

Presentation by Jodi Doney, Project Manager

Airport leadership introduced Jodi Doney, noting she joined the airport team approximately 4–5 months prior. Jodi introduced herself as a Project Manager for the airport and asked attendees to state their names when speaking, as she is still getting familiar with stakeholders.

### Website Audit & Request for Feedback

Jodi shared that the airport is currently auditing and updating the airport website, acknowledging that it needs improvement. She invited stakeholders to provide feedback, either during the meeting or via email, on the following:

- How they currently use the website
- Information they would like to see added
- Content that is difficult to find or navigate
- Features that are missing or not useful

Stakeholders were encouraged to email feedback to [fncustomerservice@cityofloveland.org](mailto:fncustomerservice@cityofloveland.org) or contact Jodi directly using the information listed on the website.

### Stakeholder Feedback & Discussion

- Webcams:  
Multiple attendees suggested adding webcams to the website, particularly views tied to the control tower or showing multiple airfield directions. Jodi noted that a

webcam does exist and is committed to exploring options for improving access or visibility.

- **Fee Transparency:**

A stakeholder requested clearer information regarding airport and planning fees, including how charges are calculated and what fees may apply.

- Airport staff agreed that this information could be added and discussed pushing fee data to ForeFlight, noting that while some information is sent to ForeFlight, update timing can depend on third-party processing.

- **Archived Meeting Materials:**

Attendees noted that archived Airport Commission meeting minutes and records were no longer visible on the website and had been a valuable resource.

- Airport staff acknowledged the issue, indicated the content was likely not deleted permanently, and committed to restoring access with help from technical support.

- **Posting & Notification of Meeting Minutes:**

Stakeholders expressed concern about needing to check the website daily to see whether stakeholder meeting minutes had been posted.

- A suggestion was made to send a push notification or email alert once minutes are available.
- Airport staff agreed this was reasonable and indicated they could send a brief notification when updates are posted.

### Website Calendar Feature

- Jodi demonstrated a new calendar feature recently added to the website, currently located on the landing page.
- The calendar is a work in progress and is being used initially to:
  - Notify users when the main office is closed
  - Share upcoming operational notices and project updates
- It was emphasized that this calendar will supplement, not replace, existing email communications.

### Maintenance Planning & Future Use

- Beginning February 1, the airport plans to post a rolling three-month maintenance schedule to the calendar.
- While weather and operational factors may cause changes, staff committed to keeping the calendar as current as possible to provide advance notice of maintenance activities.

### Expanded Community Use & Content Suggestions

- Stakeholders suggested expanding the calendar to include broader aviation community events, such as:
  - FNL Pilots Association meetings
  - EAA chapter meetings
  - Events at Ames and other aviation-related activities
- Jodi expressed support for this idea and noted she would explore how to coordinate updates.
- Jodi also requested stock photos from stakeholders, inviting them to share images of aircraft, projects, or aviation activities for potential use on the website.

### Conclusion

- Jodi asked if there were any additional questions or suggestions.
- No additional comments were raised at that time.

### **Noise Complaints Overview & Community Impact Discussion**

Presentation by Aaron Ehle, Business Development Specialist

#### Noise Complaint Program Overview

Mr. Ehle introduced himself as the airport's primary point of contact for noise complaints. He explained that noise complaint data will now be shared regularly at stakeholder meetings, generally covering the previous three months, depending on meeting frequency.

- Aaron noted that he personally responds to every noise complaint, whether received by phone or email.
- Many complaints are resolved through education, particularly clarifying the airport's authority versus the FAA's role.

- In some cases, complainants wish to pursue further action through the FAA.

#### Noise Complaint Data Summary (October–December)

- October: 6 complaints
- November: 37 complaints (identified as an outlier)
- December: 3 complaints

The primary source of complaints continues to be flight school training aircraft, particularly touch-and-go operations near residential areas close to the airport.

Aaron noted that:

- A small number of individuals sometimes submit repeated complaints, which contributed to the November spike.
- The airport is now logging all complaints and may expand reporting to distinguish repeat complainants from unique submissions.

#### Geographic Concentrations

- Lakes at Sentara (south of the airport):
  - Highest concentration of complaints, largely associated with training patterns and departures, particularly from Runway 15.
- Willow Springs (north, near Timberline & Harmony):
  - Fewer complaints overall (approximately 2–3 individuals in the past year).
  - Some aircraft noise in this area may be attributable to non-FNL traffic, including Denver-area overflights.

#### Tracking & Pilot Outreach

- When a complaint includes specific timing, Aaron uses tools such as FlightRadar24 and FlightAware to identify the aircraft and approximate altitude.
- In some cases, pilots are contacted directly and politely asked to avoid certain neighborhoods at specific times, when operationally feasible.
- Airport staff expressed appreciation for pilots' flexibility and cooperation.
- Compared to nearby airports such as Rocky Mountain Metro and Centennial, FNL receives significantly fewer complaints.

## Website & Noise Education Suggestions

Stakeholders recommended:

- Republishing and prominently displaying noise abatement procedures on the airport website.
- Creating a noise complaints information page that:
  - Explains standard traffic patterns
  - Educates the public on why aircraft may fly over certain areas
  - Clarifies that patterns are not rigid “roads in the sky” and may vary for safety, aircraft type, speed, or traffic conditions

Airport staff agreed this could:

- Reduce misunderstandings
- Help manage expectations
- Potentially reduce complaint volume

## Runway Use & Operational Discussion

- Stakeholders discussed increased use of Runway 15 compared to prior years, despite Runway 33 typically being the common wind runway.
- Questions were raised regarding:
  - Calm-wind guidelines
  - Tailwind tolerance
  - Whether runway selection practices have changed
- Airport staff emphasized that runway use is based on observed conditions and safety requirements, and that these topics warrant continued discussion.

## Future Coordination & External Engagement

- Airport staff acknowledged the sensitivity of voluntary noise abatement programs and cautioned against over-committing in ways that could create unrealistic public expectations.
- Suggestions included:
  - Forming a pilot or noise advisory committee, potentially meeting annually

- Learning from noise outreach efforts at airports such as Centennial and Rocky Mountain Metro
- Aaron noted plans to meet with:
  - FAA FSDO
  - Airport staff
  - Air Traffic Control
  - Homeowner representatives
 to discuss ongoing concerns and set realistic expectations.

#### Development & Long-Term Planning Concerns

- Airport leadership emphasized the importance of early involvement in land-use and development discussions, particularly in noise-sensitive areas.
- Stakeholders were encouraged to:
  - Participate in city council or planning meetings when appropriate
  - Help build a strong public record documenting aviation concerns to avoid future operational constraints

#### Conclusion

- Airport staff reiterated that while education and cooperation can help manage concerns, airport activity and associated noise are not expected to decrease.
- Stakeholders were thanked for their participation and engagement, feedback, and willingness to collaborate.
- The discussion transitioned to the next agenda item.

#### **City Credit & Debit Card Service Fee Update**

Presentation by Kelly Pride, Airport Administrator

Mrs. Pride addressed the group and introduced Molly Elder (DCFO) from the City of Loveland Finance Department, who was available to answer detailed questions regarding payment processing.

#### Overview of New Service Fee

- The City of Loveland has approved a 2.85% service fee on all credit and debit card transactions.



- The fee applies to airport-related transactions such as badging and other city services paid via credit or with debit card.
- The purpose of the fee is to recover processing costs previously covered by the City, ensuring that residents and customers who pay by cash or check are not subsidizing card transaction fees.
- The service fee was approved by City Council.

#### Effective Date & Scope

- The service fee becomes effective January 20.
- The fee applies across City of Loveland departments, not exclusively to airport transactions.
- Customers may continue to use checks to avoid the service fee for airport-related payments.

#### Questions & Clarifications

- A question was raised regarding whether Loveland Utilities' payments would be subject to the service fee.
- Molly Elder clarified that:
  - Utilities will not implement the service fee immediately.
  - Utilities customers will not see the fee for at least several months, with advance notification provided prior to rollout.
  - Some departments are delaying implementation to ensure adequate customer communication.
  - Additional departments that will not initially apply the fee include:
    - Chilson Recreation Center (online class registrations)
    - Shelter reservations
    - Loveland Museum
    - Rialto Theater
  - These departments may implement the fee later in the year.

## Conclusion

- No additional questions were raised.
- Airport leadership thanked Molly Elder for her participation and clarification.

## **Runway Widening Project Update & Stakeholder Discussion**

Presentation by John Kinney, Airport Director

### Background & Context

Airport leadership provided an update on the runway widening project, noting that the topic was introduced at the previous stakeholder meeting. At that meeting, stakeholders raised concerns and frustrations regarding the project's history, public process, and anticipated operational impacts from a prolonged planned closure time of 161 days, particularly for airport operators and flight schools.

Airport staff agreed some historical assumptions were incomplete or inaccurate and committed to reassessing the project approach.

### Funding Status & FAA Process

- Airport staff explained that earlier limitations on revisiting the project were due to uncertainty around FAA funding and required actual bid numbers only derived from the contract being awarded – Fall of 2025.
- Since that time:
  - Contractor Bids were received
  - The contract was awarded to a specific contractor allowing further review of project approach while not changing the scope of the project
  - Final project costs are now known “down to the penny”
- With firm costs established, the FAA Airport District Office (ADO) was then able to secure full grant funding for the project – final funding slate for spring of this year.
- Contract award occurred only a few months prior to this meeting to Amrize.

A more articulate background with greater context to this discussion is captured in an email to tenants from the two city managers dated January 23, 2026, to provide clarity to these important evolving discussions and secondary analysis.

### Revaluation of Project Approach

- Airport staff emphasized that the current review is not about whether the runway should be widened, but how the project can be carried out with less operational impact too all airport users.
- Internal coordination was initiated with:
  - Legal
  - Procurement
  - City management
  - FAA
- A third-party engineering review was commissioned through Kimley-Horn and Associates, engaged as a subconsultant to avoid procurement delays.
- Kimley-Horn assembled a multidisciplinary team to perform a zero-based review of the design and construction approach.

### Project Duration & Phasing Concerns

- The original construction duration was approximately 161 days.
- Airport staff's secondary review stemming from Stakeholder input revealed a key issue:
  - Phase 2 runway length, as originally designed, would not support flight school operations as their operational needs were in excess of the published distance available of 2,815 feet.
  - Despite this, Phase 2 had been presented as a solution for flight school continuity. But the usable length of the runway remaining for flight schools is inadequate to meet their FAR 141 curriculum.
- This one detail alone was very problematic and further validated stakeholder frustrations from the new airport staff's perspective.

### A few of the Alternative Construction Scenarios Under Review

Airport staff requested the contractor evaluate multiple scenarios, including:

1. Hard closure with 24/7 work, staying within the existing budget
2. Accelerated construction with budget flexibility, to further reduce duration

3. Phased construction options, including potential three-phase approaches
4. Delay of the project by one year
5. Alternate operating surfaces, including grass or unimproved areas
6. Temporary taxiway concepts to increase available runway length during construction

Contractor feedback on accelerated options was expected the following day, with a comprehensive engineering workshop scheduled for January 24, involving:

- Kimley-Horn engineers
- Airport staff
- Dibble representatives

#### Stakeholder Feedback & Appreciation

- Stakeholders confirmed that:
  - The new analysis is based on Kimley-Horn's independent numbers, not prior Dibble estimates.
  - They appreciated airport leadership's willingness to revisit the project.
- Airport staff acknowledged past frustrations and described the process as "challenging," affirming that stakeholder concerns were valid.

#### Operational Realities & Safety Constraints

- Airport staff emphasized that a full closure is unavoidable at some point due to FAA Runway Safety Area (RSA) requirements. Specifically: Construction involves trenching approximately 25 feet wide and 53 inches deep along the runway length, on both sides while requiring soil remediation tactics of layered reconstruction that cannot be temporarily backfilled which would result in mixing erasing the layered requirement.
- FAA safety standards prohibit aircraft operations within the RSA during active construction.

#### Flight School Requirements

- Flight schools indicated they require approximately 3,500–4,000 feet of runway for operations.

- Larger training aircraft could potentially be relocated temporarily if needed.

#### Project Delay Considerations

- Delaying the project was confirmed as a possible option under review, however:
  - The FAA would not provide additional funding.
  - The cities have stated they will not contribute additional funds to increased project costs
  - A projected cost increase of 5 to 8% could raise the project cost from over \$1.5M
- Airport staff described delay as a financial risk, not a design change.

#### FAA Obligations & Strategic Risks of not proceeding with the project

- Airport leadership explained that declining or canceling the project could:
  - Severely damage the airport's relationship with the FAA
  - Jeopardize Part 139 Group III compliance goal
  - Trigger potential repayment obligations related to previously funded projects, including the terminal
- FAA standard for runway design is accommodating 500 operations annually and must meet Group III design standards for runway width.
- Airport staff relayed FAA warnings that declining the project could place the airport "at the back of the line" for future funding for an extended period.

#### Tower & Funding Sequencing Discussion

- Stakeholders questioned why runway widening is prioritized ahead of a permanent control tower. Staff agreed – safety should come before convenience, a decision made several years prior that we are living with today and into tomorrow. Staff is working with the FAA and our Congressional Delegation to get a new control tower back on the radar of all decision makers.
- Airport staff explained:
  - Grant funding priorities are dictated by FAA criteria
  - Runway safety improvements rank higher than control tower funding
  - Funds cannot be reallocated from runway projects to tower construction

- The airport is actively pursuing funding opportunities for a permanent control tower, though no firm FAA commitment currently exists.

### Construction Start Date

Under the current project schedule, **construction is anticipated to begin on May 14**, subject to final project phasing decisions, FAA coordination, and funding constraints.

### Private Sector Participation

- Questions were raised regarding potential private-sector financial contributions to offset construction impacts.
- Airport staff confirmed interest from some operators but noted:
  - No commitments can be structured until the revised scope, cost, and value proposition are finalized.

### Next Steps

- Airport staff will:
  - Receive contractor scenario evaluations
  - Complete the January 24 engineering workshop
  - Compile revised options and supporting data
  - Schedule a stakeholder-construction project focused meeting in February
- Engineers will attend the next stakeholder meeting (February) to present findings and answer questions.

### Conclusion

- Airport leadership reaffirmed that all options remain under consideration.
- Stakeholders were thanked for constructive input and continued engagement.
- Further updates will be provided as analysis progresses in the coming weeks

### **Winter Operations Update**

Presentation by Simeon Anderson, Airport Operations

Airport Operations staff provided an overview of winter operations, noting that winter weather activity has been limited to date but reviewing expectations and procedures in anticipation of potential future storms.

### Current Conditions

- Winter weather conditions have been relatively mild so far this season, resulting in minimal winter response activity.
- Operations staff advised that additional winter weather is still possible later in the season.

### Staffing & Equipment

- Winter operations are supported by a four-person operations team.
- One operations staff member is newly hired and continuing to become familiar with winter procedures.
- Snow removal equipment includes 24-foot plows used for runway and priority surface clearing.

### Snow Removal Operations

- Normal winter operations begin at 7:00 a.m.
- Operations staff will respond to operational notifications as needed outside normal conditions.
- The airport's baseline objective is to reopen Priority 1 surfaces within approximately 35 minutes following 1.5 inches of snowfall, assuming snowfall has ended.
- Continuous snowfall, equipment changes, staffing constraints, and 12-hour shift limits may extend response times.
- Staff emphasized that each snow event is unique, and response timelines vary based on storm characteristics.

### De-Icing Procedures

- Standard aircraft de-icing must occur at Stall 3, which is equipped with the required glycol collection system.
- De-icing procedures are governed by stormwater permits and environmental compliance requirements.
- Emergency de-icing at alternate locations (such as Taxiway Alpha 1) may be considered on a case-by-case basis if operationally necessary.

### Communications

- Stakeholders requested improvements to winter operations email notifications, including unique subject lines for each update.
- Operations staff acknowledged the request and will review notification practices, particularly for information shared with external flight operations teams.

### **Financial Overview & Budget Update**

Presentation by John Kinney, Airport Director

Airport leadership provided a financial overview in response to stakeholder requests. Written financial materials were distributed for reference.

#### **2025 Budget Performance**

- The airport closed the 2025 budget, under budget.
- Revenues increased due to:
  - Improved lease administration
  - Higher collection rates
  - Enforcement of escalation clauses

#### **Administrative & Compliance Improvements**

- A review of prior practices identified gaps in:
  - Lease administration
  - Environmental clearances
  - Regulatory documentation
- These issues have since been addressed, improving compliance and financial accountability.

#### **Revenue Growth & Fund Balance**

- The airport managed approximately \$700,000 in unanticipated revenue during the year.
- Revenues are projected to increase by approximately \$600,000 in 2026 from new parking agreements
- Approximately \$886,000 is projected to be returned to the airport fund balance from outstanding grant reimbursements



- The airport fund balance is expected to exceed \$3 million, compared to approximately \$1.5 million at the beginning of 2025.

#### Budget Structure & Future Planning

- Future budgets will be presented with greater clarity through separation of:
  - Operations budget
  - Administrative budget
  - Facilities budget
- This structure is intended to improve tracking of revenues, expenses, and cost-benefit analysis.
- Leadership confirmed that T-hangars will not be eliminated and may be evaluated through a consortium-based approach.

#### Upcoming Budget Process

- A more detailed line-item budget is expected to be presented in March as part of the upcoming budget development cycle.

#### **Open Discussion:**

##### Stakeholder Meeting Frequency

A stakeholder suggested increasing the frequency of stakeholder meetings from quarterly to monthly, noting the complexity and pace of current airport initiatives, particularly runway design and construction issues. It was acknowledged that additional meetings would require more staff resources.

Airport staff confirmed another stakeholder meeting is already planned for February, primarily related to runway project updates.

##### Airport Governance Update

An update was provided regarding the status of airport governance restructuring and the potential establishment of an airport authority.

Airport leadership stated that governance restructuring remains under consideration, but progress has been intentionally slowed to allow staff to focus on core priorities and operational stabilization. At this time, establishment of an airport authority is not anticipated before approximately 2029, as staff remain in a corrective and stabilization phase.

**Update:** Airport Staff reviewed the status of the IGA Committee comprised of both city managers and elected officials from both cities and found all future meetings have been cancelled simultaneously with the decommissioning of the airport commission in Fall of 2025.

#### Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Services Update

An update was provided regarding expanded Customs and Border Protection (CBP) services at the airport.

The airport now has a full-time CBP officer assigned, with expanded availability for international arrivals, including Jet Center operations. Services include aircraft clearance, firearms registration, and related customs activities. The airport is actively pursuing the addition of Global Entry enrollment services, pending CBP approval and equipment allocation. If approved, Global Entry interviews would be conducted onsite at the airport, eliminating the need for travelers to travel to Denver.

Airport leadership also noted that requests have been submitted to allow CBP clearance operations at Greeley and Cheyenne during periods of runway construction or lighting projects, subject to CBP approval.

#### Air Traffic Control Communications Issue

Stakeholders raised concerns regarding a communications dead zone northeast of the airport, reporting difficulty establishing radio contact with air traffic control at extended distances.

It was noted that the communication equipment is operated by the contract tower provider, and the issue may be related to antenna configuration or legacy equipment associated with prior tower systems. Airport staff acknowledged the concern and committed to following up with the tower contractor to further evaluate and address the issue.

#### Closing Remarks

Airport leadership thanked stakeholders for their continued participation and input, emphasizing that stakeholder feedback plays a critical role in shaping airport operations, planning, and decision-making.

The meeting concluded with appreciation for collaborative engagement and ongoing dialogue from airport leadership with stakeholders.