

# Aspen/Pitkin County Airport Advisory Board

Meeting Minutes February 19, 2026

The agenda items contained in these minutes are written in an action only format.

For the agenda, minutes, and recording, go to:

<https://www.aspenairport.com/about-aspen-airport/>

- Call Meeting to Order: 3:00PM
- Roll Call:  
In Person: Jacque Francis, Meg Haynes, Andrew Doremus, Howie Mallory, Mike Solondz, Bruce Gordon, Jim Light, Ann Mullins, Lara Whitley, Clint Kinney  
Virtual: Gloria Kaasch-Buerger, Evan Marks  
Absent:
- Diane asked to make a change to the agenda by pushing the Pilot Safety Committee Interviews to March at which time the Board would take final action.
- Public Comment:  
-(2:40) Allen Jones representing the Woody Creek Caucus read a statement supporting the demand to measure not just model Nano Particles.
- Approval of the Meeting Minutes (4:38):  
**Bruce Gordon made a motion to approve the January meeting minutes as is, and Mike Solondz was the second. Approved.**
- Board Comments:  
-(5:21) Howie said he had heard of arriving planes sitting on the deice pad, unable to get to a gate over President's Weekend. He asked Diane if the future construction would eliminate this. Diane responded that there were several issues due to wind that Sunday. (7:22) Board discussion follows.
- Priority Item(s):
  - (13:00) **Benchmark Airport Visits Recap** – ZGF
    - (22:13) Mike and Ann make remarks about their observations
- (24:46) Questions from the Board
  - (36:25) **Runway Update** – G.R.  
-Board Questions/Discussion Follows
  - (47:10) **Task Force/Communications Update** – Melissa and Miles
  - (50:00) **Emissions Update** – Mead & Hunt  
-Board Questions Follow
  - (1:13:35) **FWI Noise Update** -Mead & Hunt
  - (1:16:30) **Wind Monitoring Presentation** – Arnaud Dumont
- Old Business:
- New Business:
- Standing Items:
  - (1:25:31) **FBO Update** – Jonathan Jones
  - (1:29:02) **Staff Update** – Diane
  - (1:30:30) **Communications Team Update** – Kelsey

- (1:34:35) **Commercial Passenger Update** – Bill Tomcich
- Public Comment:
  - (1:41:03) Ellen Anderson stated to the consultants that “per passenger emissions” only pertains to commercial which is only about 20% at ASE. She added that she wants to talk about Nano Particles now – not at a later date as stated by Jen from Mead & Hunt. Ellen then read her comments that included a presentation previously made to the BoCC. This document is attached as she requested it be entered into public record. (see document attached)
- Board Follow Up Comments:
  - (1:45:37) Jim Light congratulated the AAB on moving the design forward to the BoCC as he was absent during that time. He was also pleased at how quickly it all happened.
  - (146:43) Howie Mallory asked Diane how the Wind Monitoring was paid for.
  - (1:47:27) Clint Kinney spoke about his hope that there wouldn’t be both ramps and jet bridges, but one or the other.
  - (1:48:16) Jacque asked Ryan if the BoCC has the final determination on whether it will be ramps or jet bridges.
  - (1:50:06) Lara Whitley asked if the AAB is invited to the Joint Task Force meeting. Ryan replied that they would not be invited to participate in the conversation, but they could attend as a citizen and make public comments.
- Adjourn (1:52:08)

## Comments to AAB February 19 2026 FINAL

At the BOCC Regular Meeting on February 11 2026 I and Michael Kinsley gave a three-minute demonstration to illustrate why the County must measure ultrafine particles at ASE as part of the air quality study. We used a softball to represent PM2.5 and tiny BBs to represent ultrafines. Ultrafines are so much smaller that they can travel from lungs to blood to every organ in the body. PM2.5 particles, while damaging lungs, are too large to travel into blood and organs. Ultrafines are therefore much more deadly, which is why we must measure them. We must “Follow the....science”.

Commissioner Jacober said it was “entertaining”. Commissioner Clapper said, in a stern voice directed at me, “A section of FAA law prohibits the mitigation or management of emissions from jets. It’s the law”. Yet, she could not say what law she was referring to, and after several written requests from both Amory Lovins and me, she has failed to provide any law that matches her paraphrase. We must conclude there isn’t one. Amory has requested Patti please make an appropriate correction at the next BOCC meeting.

Meanwhile, just yesterday yet another scientific paper was published (in “Environment International”): *Dispersion of ultrafine particle pollution from an international airport: Characteristics and short- and long-term effects in surrounding areas*. This one was conducted at Helsinki, Finland, Airport. The ultrafines in this study hugely exceeded the World Health Organization thresholds, even 4.4 km away. And yes, WHO *does* have a threshold for ultrafines. 20,000 per cubic meter. (And, the European Union requires measurement of ultrafines, too.) But, the United States does not. Here is the link to the study. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0160412026000747>

Also of interest is that, right now, ultrafine particles are being measured at Boston’s Logan Airport. Results are posted on-line for the public, and if you like you can go to the website and see for yourself the very high readings. The study is paid for by MCAC – MassPort Citizen Advisory Committee. Here is the link.

<https://massportcac.org/mcac-deploys-ufp-monitors-near-logan-airport/>

The point:

- The deadly effects of ultrafine particles are well documented in many studies.
- The World Health Organization has determined thresholds for ultrafines.
- Many airports in Europe have studies measuring ultrafines, and the news is alarming as the WHO threshold is being greatly exceeded.
- The European Union requires measurements of ultrafines.
- Now, Boston’s Logan Airport is measuring ultrafines, and the news is not good.
- Yet, I just heard Pitkin’s consultants say we should not measure ultrafines in our air because we don’t have to.

Got to these links and read the science for yourself.