

Nanette Billings ([00:00](#)):

,... the call. We provided a few-

Eric ([00:03](#)):

Maybe we do some intros, Veronica.

Nanette Billings ([00:03](#)):

Introduction. Yes.

Dave Houseton ([00:09](#)):

Let's see if the sound [inaudible 00:00:10].

Eric ([00:09](#)):

Start [inaudible 00:00:10].

Speaker 2 ([00:09](#)):

I'm going to see if we can transfer that-

Nanette Billings ([00:11](#)):

It does.

Speaker 2 ([00:12](#)):

... to the computer or to the TV. Until then, you can put that up to mic, or to the audio.

Nanette Billings ([00:22](#)):

[inaudible 00:00:22]. Do you have more joining on your team?

Eric ([00:35](#)):

From the FAA side? No. Just will be us.

Nanette Billings ([00:38](#)):

Okay. So we can go ahead and start. And you're up on the screen, so the rest of the board, the other people that are here... I'm just going to introduce... Nanette Billings with Hurricane City. I'm the mayor, and we have in the room with us today a few people from our airport board, our public works director, who has been the coordinator through the airport board and the council. We also have a few citizens that are here, and then we have Aviation as well, and Kurt McDaniel and Brad-

Brad Davis ([01:09](#)):

Davis.

Nanette Billings ([01:09](#)):

... Davis. So a few people are in the room with me, and I was the one that asked these questions, and so I just wanted to visit. The main... Maybe you go through and tell us who you are.

Eric ([01:23](#)):

Sure. My name's Eric [inaudible 00:01:27]. I'm with the FAA airport district office. I cover the [inaudible 00:01:32].

Nanette Billings ([01:34](#)):

You're an engineer, right?

Eric ([01:36](#)):

Yeah. I'm a civil engineer, and we've also brought in [inaudible 00:01:36] manager, and [inaudible 00:01:36] was formerly the state of Utah engineer for FAA [inaudible 00:01:51].

Jason Campbell ([01:51](#)):

Nanette, could you asked him to talk [inaudible 00:01:54]?

Eric ([01:55](#)):

[inaudible 00:01:55].

Nanette Billings ([02:00](#)):

We're going to turn this volume up a little bit better so it works, but I'm not sure... Is this the best place for the mic [inaudible 00:02:06]?

Speaker 2 ([02:05](#)):

Brenda's going to see if we could switch the audio to the TV instead of...

Nanette Billings ([02:15](#)):

We're going to try switching the audio, because I'm the only one that can really hear you on this computer. It's up on the screen, but the...

Dave Houseton ([02:22](#)):

Talk [inaudible 00:02:24].

Nanette Billings ([02:24](#)):

[inaudible 00:02:24] talk in this, I'm sure that you can maybe not hear me as well, but the people in the room can. Can you talk again, Eric?

Eric ([02:36](#)):

Sure. [inaudible 00:02:37] microphone for y'all [inaudible 00:02:37].

Nanette Billings ([02:36](#)):

No, not yet.

Speaker 2 ([02:38](#)):

Do you want to see if there's...

Nanette Billings ([02:39](#)):

He's just going to see if he can switch it over to the television. [inaudible 00:02:56], do you know how to switch to the TV speakers?

Speaker 7 ([03:14](#)):

Sorry, I'm not sure [inaudible 00:03:14] any better.

Nanette Billings ([03:16](#)):

I have my little speakers on my computer [inaudible 00:03:17] those.

Speaker 7 ([03:17](#)):

The camera's okay? It's just the speakers?

Nanette Billings ([03:29](#)):

It's only the speaker. Can you speak again, Eric? Want to see if it goes up on the other speakers.

Eric ([03:39](#)):

Sure. How's that working?

Nanette Billings ([03:41](#)):

That is so much better. Awesome. I can hear you perfect. Thank you.

Eric ([03:45](#)):

Good deal. Yeah, sure. I'll let these other fellows introduce themselves here real quick, just so you know what we have from the FAA side.

Nanette Billings ([03:52](#)):

Awesome.

Jesse Lyman ([03:56](#)):

[inaudible 00:03:56] Jesse Lyman. Like Eric said, I'm the team lead for our office, so currently just handle some of our larger airports, like Denver and Salt Lake. But prior to that, I was a Utah state engineer [inaudible 00:04:08] Eric's duties in northern Utah, but helped oversee the entire state, if you will, and have some historical knowledge on Hurricane and the lighting project and stuff.

Nanette Billings ([04:16](#)):

Jesse, are you still in Salt Lake or are you in Denver now?

Jesse Lyman ([04:22](#)):

We're all based in Denver, so our office, just so you know, covers Denver... Sorry, not Denver, Colorado, Utah and [inaudible 00:04:30] so we oversee all three states, but all of our staff are least in Denver. And then each, each project manager, like Eric, has an signed region of the state that they oversee.

Nanette Billings ([04:40](#)):

Thanks, Jesse.

Jesse Lyman ([04:41](#)):

You're welcome.

Mark Miller ([04:50](#)):

Good afternoon. I'm Mark Miller, and I am the assistant manager for the Denver airports at district office. I'm actually currently serving a detail as the acting manager as well, so from that structure, I've been with the agency almost 20 years. I have a background in civil engineering, and a lot of my time outside of managing construction projects with [inaudible 00:05:14] I also serve as the compliance officer as well, so grant assurances, discrimination, those activities I led for our office for about 14 of those 20 years.

Eric ([05:25](#)):

You said that you sent over... that you might still have some additional questions or some questions not answered, so we have... The plan is to do clarifications, but if there's anything else that you need or anything that you want to talk about, we are here [inaudible 00:05:50] and ready to try to help you out.

Nanette Billings ([05:52](#)):

Sure. The first thing that I really... The main questions that I have that were not addressed in the email... Our city, we want to protect residents, and we also want to make sure we don't have accidents with the pilots if they're flying at night with lights. And so specifically in the case of an emergency landing, if we don't have lights, if we have lights on the airport, what's going to happen with the airplanes that come in if there's not visibility and they crash into the hill? So the issues that we have are... that I would like to have addressed, and it never came up in writing, saying that you had that information, but somewhere... It's going to be somewhere because our city was denied having lights on our airport. So that... though my questions are, has FAA ever changed their guidelines of safety protocol?

Jesse Lyman ([06:54](#)):

Sure. I'll try to get that. I don't think I can speak specifically to if FAA's ever changed the guidelines to safety protocol. We've always obviously encouraged airports to be as safe as they can be. Certainly design standards have changed throughout the year, but like I said in the email with Hurricane, coming into the [inaudible 00:07:16] into the federal airport system back in about 2008, anything before that wasn't really...

We weren't involved in that from a federal standpoint. Once you guys came into the [inaudible 00:07:27] in 2008, that's where our office got involved in [inaudible 00:07:32] all these requests for light or other projects [inaudible 00:07:36] have always come through our office. There hasn't been other offices involved in those funding type of decisions.

Jesse Lyman ([07:42](#)):

So for the lighting, or for any project [inaudible 00:07:45] airport, it's all based on, is the project eligible, and is it justified? So lighting at Hurricane's airport, since you've been in [inaudible 00:07:54] always been eligible for us, it really came down to the justification piece. And again, like I said in the email, when we brought you guys in, the runway at the time didn't [inaudible 00:08:05] for the type of aircraft from the aircraft coming into your airport, and so we didn't feel at the time it was appropriate use of funds to put lighting onto a runway that, one, didn't meet standards, and two, we were planning on lighting and bringing up the standards in the near future. And so we didn't want to... We didn't feel it was justified [inaudible 00:08:26] then to have to repay for them to get moved out once that runway is [inaudible 00:08:32].

Nanette Billings ([08:34](#)):

I don't think you've answered my question, though. My question is, has FAA changed their standard for Hurricane City to have lights on the airport? Because we were told no.

Speaker 10 ([08:44](#)):

Nanette, he answered that in that, when it was narrower and didn't meet federal standards, they denied it. Now that it's been brought up to federal standards, now it qualifies. That was the perspective. I was on the city council back then [inaudible 00:09:04] was over at the airport, and it was denied because it wasn't wide enough. It wasn't smooth enough. It did not meet federal standards, and they knew down the road, because it was becoming [inaudible 00:09:17] that eventually it would qualify, once we got the monies back from the feds, that the users of the airport pay their \$250 a gallon taxes that we give back anyway.

Nanette Billings ([09:31](#)):

So what was the year that the airport... the widening of the airport to make it so it was up to the standard?

Jesse Lyman ([09:41](#)):

2019, I believe. 2020.

Speaker 10 ([09:45](#)):

Yeah, 2019.

Jesse Lyman ([09:45](#)):

I'd have to look for sure.

Nanette Billings ([09:48](#)):
[inaudible 00:09:48] 2019.

Jesse Lyman ([09:48](#)):
It was-

Nanette Billings ([09:49](#)):
[inaudible 00:09:49] said 2019.

Speaker 10 ([09:53](#)):
It was approved in late 2014, but we let another airport do theirs, and it ended up being done in 2019, 2020.

Jason Campbell ([09:59](#)):
So I think the difference in what John is talking about and what both Chuck and Matt have talked about, they both said that the reason that it was turned down was because of the terrain, not what the FAA has said or what you're saying, John, is that both of those men said specifically that-

Nanette Billings ([10:18](#)):
Had nothing to do with the [inaudible 00:10:19].

Jason Campbell ([10:19](#)):
... the airport was turned down... Wasn't the width. And it may have also contributed, but-

Speaker 10 ([10:25](#)):
It's been turned down for really big lights and big... but not for... These are just the basic [inaudible 00:10:33] outline to kill the [inaudible 00:10:35].

Jason Campbell ([10:34](#)):
But if we don't know who turned them down, we really don't know... We can't question them and ask them, was those lights the ones proposed or not? [inaudible 00:10:44]

Nanette Billings ([10:44](#)):
So this is the question, Jesse.

Jason Campbell ([10:46](#)):
It's really important. We need to find out. I think we found them, actually. We got an old phone book, and we've got to chase down to find out who... And they said it was in the Salt Lake office... to try to chase down two different people at the FAA specific to terrain hill, not with a runway. What I will say is it very easily could have been a contributing factor later, the width of the runway.

Nanette Billings ([11:08](#)):

So we're saying that the runway width could be, but that isn't what the people that we've talked to in our community... It's not... and that were on the airport board, that is not the reason that it was turned down, because of the width.

Dave Houseton ([11:21](#)):

But I [inaudible 00:11:23].

Jesse Lyman ([11:22](#)):

I've also heard about the terrain issue in the past, and like I said, that's something none of us on the call can speak to because none of us have made that statement. We don't have written documentation of that statement anywhere. I'm not denying that it may have been said by someone in the past, made by some other office, but none of us have said it, and the person that may have said it or [inaudible 00:11:46] 10 years ago, when that timeframe probably happened, are no longer in our office. So we don't have anyone within our office to check with to see if that statement was ever made.

Jesse Lyman ([11:56](#)):

Again, from the FAA, I'll say, official standpoint, we don't have anything in our guidance that would specifically deny runway lighting because of terrain, as a... if you have terrain [inaudible 00:12:15] airport, you're automatically denied. You don't have anything like that. We do send it through what we call our airspace process, which Eric did on this project, where we have the other FAA lines of business look at it, like flight standards, flight procedures, tech ops or traffic. So we have all the other lines of business look. I can't speak to what they do or don't look at, if terrain was part of their evaluation or not, but we did run it through our airspace process, and we didn't get any objection to the project or any comments on the project specifically. So from that standpoint, we've met our criteria to continue on with the project. And again, like I said, now that the runway's widened and meets our standards in that regard, that's where the lighting from our standpoint now becomes justified to do as a project.

Nanette Billings ([13:01](#)):

Here's a question. During the capital facilities plan and during... I don't know what's the name of the other type of plan, when they put it on and say, "Hey, will you fund this project?" Is there a different process for the...

Jesse Lyman ([13:15](#)):

I'm sorry, for the what?

Nanette Billings ([13:19](#)):

For the lighting, because that's when it was turned down. Wasn't with the [inaudible 00:13:23] facilities, because from my understanding, when they met with this FAA rep in like 2015 or '16, the rep said, "Listen, just put it on your capital facilities plan and

just let it work its way up, and when it gets to the top, you'll be able to have it approved that way." So what I'm saying is there are two separate ways, and they're not looking at it the same. The FAA is not there scrutinizing it the same as they would through the capital facilities, not as much as if it was a different avenue.

Jesse Lyman ([13:53](#)):

I'm not aware of any separate process. We do have one process to go through, the capital improvement plan process. We offer airport the opportunity to meet with us yearly, or when we used to go in person to the airport conferences, we'd meet with airports twice a year at those conferences. But our formal process takes place once a year. We have the option for airports to meet with us, discuss projects. We give our feedback on projects, if they're eligible, they're justified, depending on the type of funding being requested, when [inaudible 00:14:24] having that funding available.

Jesse Lyman ([14:27](#)):

So again, it's hard for me to see that far in the past, because I, as the Utah state engineer, I was only there from about mid 2017 on, so I can't speak to the past conversations before that. But my understanding was, again, with the runway project, we were looking at doing lighting with it. It just didn't work out with the funding available, and so that's why we then programmed the lighting as the next big project for the airport, because we knew... We've heard [inaudible 00:14:56] the airport for a long time is important to them to have the lighting, and so we planned it as our next large project to do after the runway, knowing the importance to the airport.

Nanette Billings ([15:06](#)):

It's been important to the airport since the airport was built, but the last 20 years, the understanding I have from other board members previous to this board is the reason has nothing to do with not having a wide enough runway. It had to do with the terrain, and so that's why it's been taken off of the... Not there's just the capital facilities, but taken off the plate and not even being able to be addressed, because they said it will not work. And so they were told by an FAA representative to put it on the capital facilities, and then it could work its way up and not have any problems.

Nanette Billings ([15:41](#)):

So my concern is Hurricane City's liability to say, "Oh, the FAA told us no because of the bluff and [inaudible 00:15:49] but now we're putting it on the plan because it went through a different process." And then what's our liability to say there's an airplane at the end of the runway that turns to the east instead of the west out of our ascending flight path, and they run into the hill, and the city's now liable for having lights on the runway in the night? [inaudible 00:16:13].

Jesse Lyman ([16:13](#)):

Sure, sure. No, absolutely. And we understand your concerns, and again, it's just hard for us to speak to the terrain issue because none of us were there at that time. I can say with almost a hundred percent confidence, because I can't be a hundred percent

sure all the time, but I can say that lighting project has never gone through a different process to get where it is today. I don't know that I can say anymore on that really. And we definitely understand your concerns from the safety and the liability perspective.

Jesse Lyman ([16:38](#)):

If you choose to move forward with the project... And again, that's another point I want to reiterate here, is it is the city's choice to move forward with the project. We are not here to tell you to do the lights or tell you to not do them. We're just here as the funding mechanism and showing support that way for the project. But there are a couple other things we can do as part of this. [inaudible 00:17:04] already been done. We're on your 5010, which is the airport master record, and the resource that pilots can use when they fly into airports. We already have listed that for your circling approaches. They normally go in a left hand pattern when you take off. We do have it as a right hand pattern, if I got that right, for one runway end, so that way both... no matter which direction an aircraft departs, they're turning away from the bluff or mountain, if you will.

Jesse Lyman ([17:34](#)):

So we already have that place, and I did go and do some digging as well, because we have another airport up in Wyoming, Dubois, Wyoming, that has a similar situation. Their mountain is not as tall as yours. It's not 400 feet tall, but about similar distance or maybe a bit closer to the runway. And they also have a note under 5010 to warn pilots to stay north because there are mountains south. That's another thing we look at for Hurricane, is to say west because there's a mountain east of the airport. So there's some things we can help put in place to give pilots, especially the ones that aren't familiar with Hurricane, give them more education what's around that airport. But ultimately it is on pilots to look at those things and know what they're flying into before they fly into the airport.

Speaker 10 ([18:21](#)):

Nanette?

Nanette Billings ([18:22](#)):

Yes? Do you want to talk? Talk in the microphone. Then they'll be able to hear you on Zoom too.

Speaker 10 ([18:26](#)):

Sure.

Nanette Billings ([18:27](#)):

Thanks. This our mayor, John [inaudible 00:18:30], who was our previous mayor. He's been on the airport board, so he's going to address you.

Speaker 10 ([18:34](#)):

Hi, Mr. Lyman. When I moved to Hurricane in 1990, my friends flew me in, and they clicked and the lights lit up through 90 to 93. But there was settling on the airport, and it became no longer safe in those pilots because the terrain, the up and down of the airport... They said, "Hey, we don't want people landing at nighttime with this rough stuff unless they knew the airport." But I don't know when the lights were taken out or why or what. I know Larry for 20 years has been saying, "We want lights on the airport." Chuck has been saying, "We want lights on the airport," and we've been told no for all those years.

Speaker 10 ([19:23](#)):

But bless Ethel and Humphrey's heart [inaudible 00:19:30] 2008, applied and got and kept it, putting on and tried... But once we got it to this level, we're grateful that they'll put on now that we have a nice level one that meets... We didn't even meet 1985 standards back then, so now we meet 2022 standards, and I think it's a real blessing. But it's not like we're going to become a regional or a international airport. It's just-

Nanette Billings ([20:01](#)):

I don't think [inaudible 00:20:01] worried about any of those [inaudible 00:20:03].

Speaker 10 ([20:04](#)):

It's just this safety factor that's...

Nanette Billings ([20:06](#)):

Yeah. So...

Speaker 10 ([20:11](#)):

Anyway...

Nanette Billings ([20:12](#)):

Okay. And I'm even hearing from our previous mayor that it's been denied, and so that's a concern. I want to get to the real question as, where do we find out about the denial and why?

Jesse Lyman ([20:26](#)):

Again, it's hard for us to speak to because we don't have anything in writing. And I don't want to discount what anyone's saying and say that it wasn't said. I can't say that it was said. I can't say that it wasn't, but we don't have-

Nanette Billings ([20:39](#)):

[inaudible 00:20:39] council, and we are the only municipality or municipal airport that doesn't have lighting. I think the only one is maybe one with [inaudible 00:20:49] and they have one airplane.

Scott ([20:51](#)):

I think they have lighting.

Jason Campbell ([20:51](#)):

They have lights.

Nanette Billings ([20:52](#)):

They have lights now? [inaudible 00:20:53] so we're the only one, and there was a reason. Why did this come up like this? And that's what we're wanting to find out, why, and if that's only... because it was never even mentioned about the width of the runway. That's never even been said anything to me until I received [inaudible 00:21:09].

Jesse Lyman ([21:09](#)):

Go ahead.

Dave Houseton ([21:09](#)):

The thing is that we-

Nanette Billings ([21:17](#)):

Hang on. I'm going to let... So this is Dave Houseton. He's on the airport board.

Dave Houseton ([21:24](#)):

All the time that I've been involved with the airport, we never had any official word, any written document from the FAA or anything like that, that said the Hurricane airport couldn't be lighted. It was always just rumors from pilots. It had been there for many years. When I first came on out here in... I think it was 2004, maybe, something like that. I asked about lights and where it was, and, "Well, the FAA won't let... because we have this bluff out here next to us." But as I would fly around to other airports, I saw airports that had much worse terrain features than that, than we had here, and they had lights.

Dave Houseton ([22:08](#)):

And so, when I got involved with the airport board, and I started going to the planning meetings that you guys had with us here at UAOA conferences, Art, who was the airport manager at the time, I remember sitting there with him, and we asked the current FAA representatives, "Can we get lights?" And we brought up the point that, "We've heard that because of our bluff, we can't get lights, but where is that documentation that says we can't have lights?" And they said, "Well, we'll look into it." And they said, "We don't know anything about it, but we'll look into it."

Dave Houseton ([22:46](#)):

And over the course of about a year and a half, it seems like, maybe a little bit longer, they finally came back and said, "We can't find anything that says that you can't qualify for lighting. And so if you want to put it on your capital improvement project list, go ahead." And that's what we did, is we talked about it at the board

meetings, and this was wide open to the public. Nothing was ever hidden, like has been mentioned as in previously.

Dave Houseton ([23:14](#)):

Anyway, that's how this all came about, is we just asked, "Can we put them on the capital improvement list?" And they said sure, so we did, and they worked their way up. Like mayor [inaudible 00:23:25] said, we had to loan the money sometimes, the loan [inaudible 00:23:28] money a time or two to other airports, but finally... And we put in fencing, and we put in drainage work, and we did the new runway and the new taxiway, and all this time, the lights just moved their way up the list. And they were talked about at airport board meetings for years as being on that capital improvement list.

Dave Houseton ([23:50](#)):

And now they've made it to the top, and we all went through this process, and they got approved, and you guys paid for the engineering, and we got to the point of awarding the contract to the contractor, and now all of a sudden people start... all worried about, what are the lights going to do for us? I'm just telling you how I remember it happening. All that time where they said that was because of the bluff, that was just rumors. We never had any documentation from anybody, and you know how rumors get going and how they change, and they get expanded and whatever else. It's very possible that's why, years and years and years ago, they said we couldn't have lights, because of the width of the runway and the condition of the runway. But I never saw any written documents that dealt with that or dealt with the bluff per se. That was just rumors from local pilots.

Nanette Billings ([24:45](#)):

It wasn't just local pilots. Charles Reeve is one of the people that I've talked to, and he is... Charles is actually... He was a pilot, and he was on the airport board, but he actually met with a FAA representative, and during his communication with him, the representative, that's an engineer, just like Mr. Eric, he actually told him it's because of the bluff. So whether or not it is or not, when a pilot's told that on the airport board, it makes you question. So I don't know. You're saying you can't find anything. All of you are new. It sounds like that not any of you have been in there for those the last 15, 20 years that some of this has been happening.

Jesse Lyman ([25:35](#)):

No, no, I'll say we're... We're not all new. I've been in the office for almost 13 years now. Mark's going on 20-

Mark Miller ([25:41](#)):

20.

Jesse Lyman ([25:42](#)):

... years. So Mark and I have both been around for quite a while, just not necessarily working in the southern region and a part of those conversations. We all had our own

areas. Again, I'll just say from our side, we can't find anything. All we can speak to really is where we're at now, in that we do support the project, if the town or the city decides to move forward with it. We've gone through our airspace review, which is part of our process. We didn't get any comments or objections back from the other lines of business. So again, I've talked about a couple of things we could do with your master records, identify the terrain there. So at this point it really is up to the city to decide to move forward or not with the project.

Nanette Billings ([26:27](#)):

Okay. A couple of questions that I had besides that. One of them was regarding not lighting the project if it wasn't approved by the council. It was brought to the council, and they said, "We have free money. It's a grant that's been issued because of COVID, and this is to pay for engineering." And the council specifically asked the question, "What if we don't approve the lights after they've been engineered?" And they said, "It's fine. We don't have to approve them because the council has to pay for the lighting, and if we decide not to do that, that's up to the council. And it was never brought up to us that we'd have to pay that back." Tell me what the... because in the emails that have come back to you, it was, you would have to pay the \$138,000 back.

Jesse Lyman ([27:17](#)):

Correct. So as a condition of the grant last year you guys accepted for the design, there was a condition in there that if you don't construct the lights within two years of finishing up the design, that we would need the design money paid back, because by our policies with our airport improvement program, we need to get a useful unit of work at the end of the day. And so for us, that's getting a functioning lighting system, if we're going to pay for the design of the lighting system. And so we have... and the grant agreement has a condition that if we don't get a useful unit of work at least started under construction within two years of that design grant, then we would expect the design money paid back, because we didn't get our useful unit at the end of the day.

Jason Campbell ([28:06](#)):

I have a question.

Nanette Billings ([28:06](#)):

Okay. We have a citizen. He's been on the airport board before, Jason Campbell.

Speaker 7 ([28:13](#)):

Higher.

Jason Campbell ([28:15](#)):

In that process of the payback, is that policy something... What I want to do is not sound... The question is... My concern is that the council approved the engineering of the lights. After that process happened, then the rumors that the FAA had turned down the airport lighting in the past due to the terrain were then verified, both in

written form and in witness testimony. So the city, after they approved that engineering to go forward, then confirmed that the rumors were true. Is there a process in which Hurricane City can work with the FAA, look at those facts, and use that as some sort of negotiation or work on a negotiation with the FAA on the request to return the funds? You guys used the word request to use the funds instead of demand or require. Was that on purpose or was that...

Jesse Lyman ([29:26](#)):

No. I'll say it's required to return the funds if you don't start the project within two years.

Jason Campbell ([29:34](#)):

And then the outline of the timing of the events wouldn't mean anything in that requirement?

Jesse Lyman ([29:43](#)):

Unfortunately not, because at that point those were... city discussions with the airport and users and citizens, and perhaps a consultant. But no, that probably wouldn't be a consideration. We can try to ask it up the line, but I'm not aware that would play into our consideration to not repay the funds.

Jason Campbell ([30:02](#)):

Thank you.

Nanette Billings ([30:08](#)):

Okay. Just another quick question, and then somebody else has a question. I just wanted to ask about... look at my notes. If we don't take any more money from, I guess, FAA, if we don't take more, does that just mean that right now it stops, and we have no more funding for our airport? Because this was one of the suggestions that was brought to me by a citizen, so I just wanted to ask about this. Two things. The city's required to pay about \$40,000-ish for the lights, so if that doesn't come from the city, and it wants to come from pilots that actually use the airport, then they can help maybe fund that. If their funding isn't coming from the city or pilots, then what's the process here? I want to hear what happens.

Jesse Lyman ([31:12](#)):

I'll try to answer the local share portion first. Yeah, for Hurricane airport, federally, on most grants, we pay 90.63% of the project costs. The last couple years, with COVID thrown in the mix, it's been a little bit different because Congress has given us additional money, so we can pay a hundred percent of the project costs, which is how your design grant for the lighting was funded. That one was a hundred percent federal, but for grants issued this year, it's back to the normal federal share of 90.63%. So the local share is left at 9.27%, which in Utah gets split half and half between the local sponsor and Utah Aeronautics. So for the share that needs to come from the local sponsor, we don't dictate necessarily where that comes from. It

doesn't have to be a city general fund. Like you said, if pilots want to chip in and pay that local share, we don't dictate any of that.

Jesse Lyman ([32:09](#)):

If the city... And I'll probably turn it over to Mark here in a minute, but if the city chose not to accept the grant, repay the design fund, and clear this project out of the way, it doesn't mean we won't stop funding the airport. With the lighting project specifically, though, I can say that the funding for the project for us came from two different pots. One of it is an airport's entitlement, which Hurricane gets 150,000 each year that they can save up for projects. So this year, I think Hurricane had saved up just under 400,000 to put towards this project of entitlement.

Jesse Lyman ([32:46](#)):

And then the second pot of money we're using to help cover the remaining project cost is what we call state apportionment. It's still a federal pot of money through the airport improvement program, but it's money given to the state as a whole. So in Utah, we get about 3.75 million per year of state apportionment, and through funding requests from all the airports, we look at and decide which airports receive that funding. And so again, we looked at Hurricane and said, "Hurricane needs about an extra..." I think at the time it was four or \$500,000 towards the lighting. So we're putting that additional state apportionment towards it.

Jesse Lyman ([33:24](#)):

So if you decide not to move forward with the project this year from a funding perspective, and came back to us in, let's say, five years and said, "Yeah, we want to do lighting now and move forward with it," the state apportionment piece is probably going to be harder to find because we already have that money committed to other airports for probably about seven to nine years out. So you'd probably be looking at your entitlement funding only.

Jesse Lyman ([33:46](#)):

And the part that's going to be turned over to Mark to speak to is, with each grant you accept, there are grant assurances associated with it, and all the strings attached part of the grant that tells the airport and sponsor, the city in this case, that you need to live up to these grant assurances, or else we may not continue to fund your airport. So Mark, with that, if you want to talk just a little on grant insurances and how long they apply and that sort of thing.

Mark Miller ([34:12](#)):

Yes, absolutely, Jesse. Grant assurances do accompany each grant, so it's almost like starting [inaudible 00:34:24] generally they are looked at from a 20 year lifespan perspective, so they're effective for 20 years. The caveat is if a sponsor has taken federal funds to purchase or reimburse land acquisition on the airport, those grant assurances associated with the land acquisition run in perpetuity. For simplistic discussions, the 20 year life cycle of a grant, several of the grant assurances still apply. Even if the sponsor were to not accept another grant from today, it would be

20 years going forward that the airport has agreed to maintain and operate the airport in a open to the public, safe, efficient manner.

Mark Miller ([35:24](#)):

That would include [inaudible 00:35:27] maintenance. By 20 years, it will have needed probably rehabilitation of the runway and the bigger surfaces. So it is more than just crack seal, seal coat, going down and bandaid the runway together. So yeah, it's a tough one. It is part of the, as Jesse said, strings. Sometimes they're steel cables a little bit, to help ensure that the airports are effectively serving a role within the national airspace system as a whole. It's basically the federal highway system for... and aviation activity. So having that assurance up to 20 years is where the sponsors have committed themselves with the acceptance [inaudible 00:36:21].

Nanette Billings ([36:20](#)):

Okay. Does someone else have another question?

Jason Campbell ([36:32](#)):

Is there a [inaudible 00:36:32]?

Scott ([36:32](#)):

Yeah, I have a question.

Nanette Billings ([36:35](#)):

Let Scott, and then Jason... Scott's on our airport. He's a pilot, and he's on our airport board as well.

Scott ([36:42](#)):

The question about... I think from what I've listened to, one of the primary concerns here is, was there a denial because of terrain? So my question now is, the standards that are in place, the review process that took place for this lighting project through the airspace... I can't remember what you called it, but the airspace review system... does it really matter whether it was denied from the FAA perspective 30 years ago, if somebody made that statement, because now it has passed all the current standards? Is that correct?

Jesse Lyman ([37:33](#)):

Sure. Yep. Yeah, from our perspective, it doesn't matter what was said in the past about the denial with the terrain, especially unfortunately because nothing is in writing. [inaudible 00:37:46] this discussion, we would like to see something in writing as well, just to have a better discussion on it, but since it was, sounded like, just verbal statements, and we can't find anything, all we can look at right now for us is moving forward. And obviously, it is a project we supportive for at least a few years, because it didn't just pop up overnight on the [inaudible 00:38:06] especially to get the state apportionment need for it. It's been on for a few years, so it is something we have supported from that standpoint, at least financially.

Nanette Billings ([38:21](#)):

Do you have another question? Yes.

Jason Campbell ([38:27](#)):

Yes. It's Jason again. My question is, in that process, is there a safety review portion of that process for lighting in particular? Can we look back at the FAA... Is there a document or a recording of that safety process or that safety assessment at Hurricane, and does it have anything specific that we can get ahold of and read?

Jesse Lyman ([38:56](#)):

I'll try to be clear on this. Terminology's a little important on this one. There is no safety assessment, like a form or evaluation process in that sense. Again, the airspace processes are our analysis of the safety of the project and our evaluations. Does the project present a hazard to air navigation? Again, I can't speak to what other lines of business look at throughout that process. I don't know if terrain played an impact or not through their reviews, but the aerospace processes are a way to evaluate whether that specific project will cause a hazard in air navigation. But I just want to be clear again that I can't speak to if terrain played into other lines of business review.

Jason Campbell ([39:47](#)):

And that's really important, certainly important to me. Where was that safety... Sorry, [inaudible 00:39:58]. It seems to me that somebody had to do some sort of safety analysis before you do any kind of projects anymore. It seems that it should be part of the process. Somebody else other than you, I think is what you're saying, is responsible to ask those questions about safety, including terrain. Is that correct?

Jesse Lyman ([40:24](#)):

We could probably reach out to flight standards, which I think would be the one that would provide most input on this specific topic, and see what they review or look at, because each... Including ourselves, each line of business within the FAA has certain parameters of that project they look at from an airspace perspective. Our parameter in airports is to look at the project and make sure that it doesn't impact our design standards. Another office looks at it to see if it impacts the part 77 airspace, but again, it's only for that object. Really, to me, I think where the terrain would come into play more so down the road is if the airport decided to get instrument procedures into the airport. That's something that flight procedures would take into account as a potential obstruction, and it may affect the type of procedures that can come into the airport, but for the lighting...

Nanette Billings ([41:20](#)):

[inaudible 00:41:20].

Scott ([41:21](#)):

No, no. That's an instrument.

Jason Campbell ([41:26](#)):

Okay. There was a lot of information there that I was trying to wade through.

Jesse Lyman ([41:29](#)):

And the other part too is [inaudible 00:41:31].

Jason Campbell ([41:32](#)):

Specifically, I'm looking for somebody that we can send a message to that requests whatever, if any, safety thoughts were put towards... or safety approvals, if there were anything concerning the terrain. It's important because... I think what the mayor has been trying to say is that it's not necessarily that the FAA will or will not be in trouble. It is specific to the liability and the exposure Hurricane City has. We're in public meetings. They're recorded. We have witness testimony that says the FAA has told Hurricane City not to put lights there, and we're looking for a reason other than to approve lights, where if there is an accident on that terrain, it's going to be Hurricane City's liability. It's not going to be yours.

Jason Campbell ([42:33](#)):

This process is well documented. The FAA has turned down the lights at Hurricane City for terrain issues, and that will be presented in a court of law in case of accident. It's unreasonable to think that it won't. So is there somebody somewhere in some department that's associated with these lights, because that's the thing on the table now in particular, but improvements at our airport that have to do with the safety of the terrain? Do you know who that person is?

Jesse Lyman ([43:03](#)):

Sure. Like I said, we'll reach out to flight standards, because I believe they'd be the line of business that would evaluate something like that, again, through the airspace process. And I don't know what all they look at, but we'll reach out to flight standards so we can get you guys in contact as well. Probably be up at Salt Lake flight standard district office [inaudible 00:43:24].

Nanette Billings ([43:23](#)):

Jesse, the reason they... This is what people are saying, and they're credible people. These aren't people that lie in our community. So if these people are saying that it's because of the bluff, I want to know that the flight standards are saying it's not because of the bluff. It's because your runway didn't have a fence around it. It didn't meet the standards because it wasn't wide enough. It didn't meet the standards because it wasn't smooth enough, whatever those are. But we don't have anything. All we have is that they've said this has happened. And so what you're telling me is we don't have anything documented, and it just doesn't make me feel better to say, let's go to the council and have them say it's fine. Before, it wasn't fine, but today it's fine.

Jesse Lyman ([44:01](#)):

Sure. Believe me, we do understand your concerns. We really do. Again, like you're experiencing too, it's just hard to talk about some of those past conversations without any written documentation to really go off and see who might have said it and what exactly was said and that sort of thing.

Nanette Billings ([44:17](#)):

The written documentation we have is many minutes in the meetings. And so that's what I'm concerned about, is that they're saying this, and then it's coming back saying it's fine. So I really want to make sure that we are addressing this and that it's not because of...

Jesse Lyman ([44:36](#)):

I understand.

Nanette Billings ([44:36](#)):

So if you want to reach back out to me, I will just let you get ahold of the...

Jesse Lyman ([44:41](#)):

Yes. I'll just try to find a contact. I'll talk with them first and let you know who we talked to and if needed to reach out and see if they can answer any additional questions.

Nanette Billings ([44:50](#)):

One second. Our councilman [inaudible 00:44:53]

Speaker 12 ([44:53](#)):

Keep your microphone up. Did you tell him we had a wreck last week?

Nanette Billings ([44:58](#)):

We had a wreck last week, and it was after dark. It was just probably an hour after dark, and it had missed the runway. It overshot it, went into the ditch, just past the runway, ruined the plane. Two people were in the plane and walked out of it, but that's one of the concerns.

Jesse Lyman ([45:16](#)):

Sure.

Speaker 13 ([45:16](#)):

Two broken backs, one lacerated mouth, and one lacerated head, according to [inaudible 00:45:22].

Nanette Billings ([45:21](#)):

I didn't hear that they were even injured. I heard they weren't injured.

Speaker 13 ([45:29](#)):

They were in the hospital in Las Vegas, I read in St. George news.

Dave Houseton ([45:30](#)):

[inaudible 00:45:30] that was St. George.

Nanette Billings ([45:30](#)):

That was the St. George ranch, but people that were in Hurricane walked away, and the reason I know is because they put their plane in the [inaudible 00:45:38] ranch area. I know where it's at, and I talked to... They didn't have any lacerations.

Dave Houseton ([45:42](#)):

And what happened on that accident was the aircraft tried to land at night, without lights, landed halfway down the runway. Runway's only 3,300 feet. Couldn't get stopped, went off the end of the runway. To me, that's testament why it's important to have lights and a [inaudible 00:46:00] so that doesn't happen.

Jason Campbell ([46:03](#)):

Another question. Is there any money available from the FAA to put a culvert in and extend that runway with pea gravel? That would be something to slow that same situation, maybe slow the airplane down enough so that it would stop and not run into the fence or wreck.

Nanette Billings ([46:29](#)):

I'll ask this question, but really, airplanes, or pilots, I guess, the pilot, they have the information if we have lights are not, and that is their responsibility to make sure they're not landing after dark in the middle of a dark place. And so it really is their fault, not that we don't have lights. It's their fault for flying when it's night and they can't see. But the question was, would it be an option for the culvert and put some pea gravel there to slow down the airplane? I have never heard of an airport that's done something like that to slow something like that down. I think that'd be even more dangerous. I don't know.

Jesse Lyman ([47:04](#)):

I think there's a couple things there. One, from a funding perspective, I think the short answer is no, that there's... From our side at least, there's not funding available for it. When we reconstructed that runway back in 2019, we constructed it to the standards of that airport, which includes runway safety area. It comes around the runway. There's a certain [inaudible 00:47:27] the end the runway and to the sides that we dictate the grades and the slopes and the smoothness and everything, so if an airplane does run off, in theory. That should be enough that aircraft can get stopped within that area. That's something that's being looked at. We'd probably have some discussions on that, because I think we would have concerns potentially having loose gravel around, because it creates a fog issue for [inaudible 00:47:54] I think it's [inaudible 00:47:54].

Nanette Billings ([47:53](#)):

We have one more question by Dave Houseton, board member.

Dave Houseton ([47:53](#)):

I don't have a question. I just have a comment. Along that same thinking where this pilot landed at [inaudible 00:48:07] and took on the responsibility for himself to land, it's the same kind of deal with any pilot who would come in at night, when we have this published on that form you talked about, where it lists-

Nanette Billings ([48:22](#)):

[inaudible 00:48:22].

Dave Houseton ([48:21](#)):

... all of our... Yeah, yeah, [inaudible 00:48:23]

Nanette Billings ([48:22](#)):

5010 flight path.

Jesse Lyman ([48:23](#)):

Yeah, 5010. Yeah.

Dave Houseton ([48:25](#)):

Yeah, 5010. Okay. So when we have that published on that, and it goes into the flight guides and the chart supplement and everything else that you have to turn to these right or left hand patterns, that pretty much alleviates the city from liability. If somebody happened to turn to the east and hit in there turned the wrong way, they're not following... As a pilot, the FAA regulation, 91103, says you have to become familiar with all available information about that flying. That shifts the burden of responsibility from the FAA, from the city and everybody else onto that pilot. If they make the mistake and turn the wrong way, they're the ones that are at fault, same way this guy landed too long the other night. He's not going to be able to do much about suing the city.

Jason Campbell ([49:11](#)):

I understand that his engine shut down. Is that true or false?

Nanette Billings ([49:15](#)):

No, [inaudible 00:49:16] we have another [inaudible 00:49:16] by Jason.

Speaker 12 ([49:15](#)):

That was my engine that shut down, and I ended up in the ditch. And I've talked to Nanette about that, and I'd say the city of Hurricane isn't very concerned with injuries to pilots, because this has been a problem. The fix is easy. Just put some culverts, as you had said, and cover that up. Blade it out so there's a smoother area.

But having a massive drainage ditch off the end of the runway, I got to experience it firsthand. There was another pilot that died because of that. So I can appreciate your comments, but I don't think the concern is really for the safety of the pilots. It seems to be that your concerns are more for trying to keep the lights out, and the nighttime operations, is what you said in the last city council meeting.

Nanette Billings ([50:07](#)):

What I said in the last city council meeting is I am concerned about pilots. I'm concerned about the residents that are having lights on the air... Right now we have an historical airport that has never had lights, and so I'm concerned that if pilots choose to fly at night, and they crash, is it the city's fault that they chose to fly at night and they crash? We're not wanting someone to crash. We don't want anyone to crash. We want to help everyone, but there's always going to be things that the city can do to mitigate that, always. We'll never get rid of that.

Speaker 12 ([50:43](#)):

How about filling in the... putting culverts in that area so it makes it safer if you lose an engine on takeoff?

Nanette Billings ([50:51](#)):

Yeah, and those are all part of the airport plan of things that we can work on, for sure. No one's wanting to have [inaudible 00:50:58]

Dave Houseton ([50:59](#)):

This really isn't part this meeting.

Speaker 12 ([50:59](#)):

No, I understand.

Dave Houseton ([51:01](#)):

[inaudible 00:51:01] discuss later.

Nanette Billings ([51:02](#)):

Jason has another comment.

Jason Campbell ([51:03](#)):

I do. What I want to comment on is the city's liability, and this is not something that I'm guessing. I can assure you that because of the past conversations from the FAA, the credible witness, that absolute [inaudible 00:51:19] that is the city's liability. If they don't properly get through this process, there is no question that liability will fall onto Hurricane City. They will be involved in that lawsuit.

Dave Houseton ([51:34](#)):

I disagree.

Speaker 10 ([51:35](#)):

You don't know that.

Jason Campbell ([51:36](#)):

I do know that.

Speaker 10 ([51:36](#)):

No, you don't.

Jason Campbell ([51:36](#)):

I don't know [inaudible 00:51:37] I know that the city will be involved in that lawsuit.

Dave Houseton ([51:41](#)):

They may be involved. Anybody can be involved in a lawsuit.

Jason Campbell ([51:44](#)):

I agree with that.

Dave Houseton ([51:45](#)):

But they're not going to be held liable.

Jason Campbell ([51:46](#)):

I disagree, strongly disagree with that.

Nanette Billings ([51:50](#)):

So Jesse, will you get the information, reach back out? Okay. We're meeting on May the seventh. That's when our city council meeting, but I'd love to meet before so that we can have information. There's supposed to be an airport board meeting on April the 18th, I think. I cannot be at that airport board meeting. I have to be at a different meeting which is April 19th.

Dave Houseton ([52:14](#)):

Mayor?

Nanette Billings ([52:14](#)):

Yes.

Dave Houseton ([52:17](#)):

The city council meeting, I think was the fifth. You said the seventh.

Nanette Billings ([52:20](#)):

Sorry. May fifth. Thursday, May fifth. I said the wrong date. Thanks.

Dave Houseton ([52:26](#)):

The airport board meeting is on the 19th.

Nanette Billings ([52:26](#)):

Because April... Yep. The airport board meeting's on the 19th, and I will not be at airport board meeting. I'm going to be at another meeting that day.

Speaker 13 ([52:33](#)):

Has it been reinstated? Because I got a message saying it was canceled because nobody put any agenda items on.

Nanette Billings ([52:40](#)):

For the airport board meeting?

Speaker 13 ([52:42](#)):

The airport board meeting for April.

Dave Houseton ([52:46](#)):

That hasn't even been issued, hasn't even been [inaudible 00:52:46].

Speaker 13 ([52:46](#)):

Well, I got an email.

Speaker 10 ([52:48](#)):

March's was canceled.

Dave Houseton ([52:50](#)):

That was [inaudible 00:52:50].

Nanette Billings ([52:49](#)):

No it was the water board that was canceled, but the airport board meeting has not been-

Dave Houseton ([52:56](#)):

It hasn't been issued.

Nanette Billings ([52:57](#)):

... issued. But I'm going to recommend we hold off until May to have an airport board meeting, and the reason I'm going to say that is because there's some things that need to be addressed with our council, because there's been some things that have been approved through the airport board that haven't gone through the proper channels. For example, they have to come to the council, and they either have to have a recommendation for the mayor, and then the council chooses what they are that they're voting on, and that hasn't happened in some of that process. So I'm

going to say, let's just wait until after our city council meeting, have the following airport board meeting on May the 17th. So Jesse, we'll wait and hear back from you, and I will send this information to everyone. I've got emails, and I can send this out so the airport board's aware, and then they'll be at the city council meeting where [inaudible 00:53:48].

Jesse Lyman ([53:47](#)):

Sure. Okay. I think we can get you a flight standards contact here [inaudible 00:53:53] really a couple days to probably track that down. The one thing that too I did want to mention [inaudible 00:53:58] I know Eric has probably talked to you guys a little bit about as well, but we are in the middle of our grant season right now.

Nanette Billings ([54:05](#)):

Of your what season?

Jesse Lyman ([54:05](#)):

Of our grant season, the June grants. Our fiscal year is in September. It is our goal to always have grants issued by middle of summer at the latest. With Hurricane, since we already have... It's open. We know the costs. We have the funding there. For Hurricane, we could probably issue a grant by the end of May. So what I was going to say, just from a timing perspective, with your city council and airport board meetings, in those main meetings I think is when we're going to be looking to you guys for a go or no go on the project.

Nanette Billings ([54:42](#)):

Yep, and I think that's... We're planning to... I was going to say, the council's planning to make a decision on May fifth. Okay. Sounds great. Appreciate your help, Jesse.

Jesse Lyman ([54:56](#)):

Great.

Nanette Billings ([54:56](#)):

Thank you.

Jesse Lyman ([54:58](#)):

Mark or Eric, you guys have any final comments from our end?

Mark Miller ([54:59](#)):

Thanks, Jesse. I do. I just wanted to recap a little bit, because I heard discussion about exposure, liability. The FAA and our national airspace system is set up on a foundation of standards, whether they come through statute, through the FAA order, the advisory circulars, which help lay out... on the various design categories, including a runway safety area off the end of the runway, spaces that have been

protected, runway lighting standards. You can look at the requirements for a pilot to get their license.

Mark Miller ([55:44](#)):

As I mentioned earlier, there's responsibilities that when somebody gets into that cockpit, they are going to follow all applicable rules and regulations. All of these come together and make the fabric that is the safest airspace system within the world. We still have accidents. It does happen. There are mishaps. They happen at night. They happen during the day. They happen due to loss of situational awareness of pilot, sometimes with mechanical failure. Unfortunately, those are [inaudible 00:56:17] but it's a very small fraction. So I guess I would just stress-

Nanette Billings ([56:22](#)):

We want to mitigate that. Yeah.

Mark Miller ([56:25](#)):

... that as things are standardized, whether it's the lighting, the runway width, the notices, the notes on the 5010 documents, all of those play together to help hopefully at least alleviate some of that burden or the responsibility that might be felt initially from an accident. All parties, ourselves included, get roped into it at the very beginning. If there's a fatality, it [inaudible 00:56:56].

Jason Campbell ([57:01](#)):

Disconnected. And Nanette, are we going to be voting on the lighting issue on May the fifth?

Nanette Billings ([57:04](#)):

May fifth.

Jason Campbell ([57:05](#)):

Okay. Scott has a presentation there, a PowerPoint presentation, that he'd like to make at that meeting too.

Nanette Billings ([57:11](#)):

Yeah. No, Scott and I are going to meet before that. We're probably meeting Wednesday to talk about the noise ordinance, because that's a very important aspect of [inaudible 00:57:19].

Jason Campbell ([57:19](#)):

You're going to be meeting when?

Nanette Billings ([57:22](#)):

I don't know. I sent him some dates and told him some times that I could meet. He said he'd meet when I am available, and I sent him some times. So I don't know, but-

Scott ([57:31](#)):

Wednesday.

Nanette Billings ([57:31](#)):

... we're going to meet. We'll talk about the presentation and the noise ordinance. Okay. I appreciate everyone. I really do. Thank you for your work and effort.

Speaker 2 ([57:41](#)):

Was that on our end or their end?

Nanette Billings ([57:48](#)):

I don't know. It just clicked off, so I'm going to say either the meeting ended or someone actually-