

Speaker 1 ([00:00](#)):

First off, in the FAA meeting. One thing I want to clarify is, that we did get an answer from somebody, that was not the final answer. And if we have to pay the money back. Clearly, in the assurances that we signed up for at the FAA, when we took the federal money, there is remedy. And the answer that we did get from them, is not the final answer. We can request from the secretary, a change or a ruling above what anybody in that meeting said. They are not the final rule. I believe we have a very, very strong case in not paying back the FAA when we choose not to approve this change of use in our historic airport. We do not have a definitive answer. And we have an excellent argument to not have to pay that back.

Speaker 1 ([00:53](#)):

Even though that investment would be very well spent. That's number one. As far as SUU goes, SUU threw the first punch. I was the guy on the phone with him the very first time. I'll remind everybody Mr. Cannon used the words, you can pound sand. He also used the words that, he would show us like he did those in Northern Cedar City. That's a very close quote to what he said. That was the first punch thrown. From me, there was not. SUU has admitted to flying down here in some sort of retaliatory fashion. When they told you folks, when they went up there and disrespected you. When they wouldn't even let you in the meeting.

Speaker 1 ([01:43](#)):

They said, the reason that they are flying down here and pestering our citizens, not just Jason Campbell, was in retaliation for the way... Because he was mean. And I'll remind everybody of that. We all know what that retaliatory flight caused to our community. It caused issues between me and my friends at the airport. It caused issues amongst my neighbors. Caused issues. Do you remember, the city council just want to go? We met down to the auditorium and we put together a statement. What's the word? What did we put together?

Speaker 2 ([02:18](#)):

Memorandum of understanding?

Speaker 1 ([02:19](#)):

Well, prior to that, before the memoran-

Speaker 2 ([02:20](#)):

Or resolution.

Speaker 1 ([02:23](#)):

We put together a resolution, on the record, that reminded SUU that we were a sovereign city, and they were infringing on our rights. And we told them in that resolution, that the way that they fly may result in us closing our airport. That's how serious that flight was. It was a resolution that a city council passed unanimously. Now, I feel like we've beat them up all much.

Speaker 1 ([02:53](#)):

And I will admit to Steven and to everybody, that SUU recently has been really doing a really good job. I don't know if it... Because we're having this light debate, if somebody's spoken to SUU and just asked them, how about if you hold off a little bit? Let's see if we can get the lights in. I have no idea why

they're doing it. I would hope it was for the right reason. I do agree that we need our airport, our aviation and our airport users, help. I don't know, even as much research as I've done. I so appreciate what Scott has done.

Speaker 1 ([03:30](#)):

I have to tell you, I take issue with a presentation today, that I was not made aware of, nor was I invited to give a counter presentation to. I don't know that I would have countered a whole lot of what Scott said. But I take issue with that presentation, coming from an airport board member, that I wasn't allowed the same amount of time for. Although I do deeply appreciate Scott and just, I just respect him so much. He's just such a good guy. I also respect and appreciate Steve, and the intellect that he has.

Speaker 1 ([04:09](#)):

Back to this, to the issue of the lighting. Well, let me please start with Scott's presentation. I will tell you, the most of it I agreed with. I don't believe, based on the history with one bad actor, that I call, which is SUU retaliatory flight in a way they act. I don't have confidence that without a mandate, or some sort of ordinance, enforceable ordinance, that we can get these guys to do what we want them to do. I just, that's been proven to us. We, as a city, went through this process to put SUU on notice. And their only excuse was, is Jason Campbell was mean to him. He called him up, and was mean to him.

Speaker 1 ([05:04](#)):

I'm forceful, but I am polite. And the idea that anybody at SUU would say that I threw the first punch, I refute utterly. This city has recent history that all aviators are not controlled. And I do not believe that SUU is controllable, without a mandate. The last three incidences that Scott talked about were not from SUU. There were guys that had been working on their helicopters, and one of the local guys... Anyway, there was three helicopters. It just really wasn't flying correctly. I do agree that Scott was able, and the airport guys were able, to help not let that happen again. I still wonder, was that because this debate was happening? Is that something that we just tapped the brakes on until we look at the airport lights? That's what I question. The lighting of the airport in relationship to Scott's proposal, is the cart before the horse.

Speaker 1 ([06:24](#)):

We have lots of time left before we need to do anything other than petition the secretary, which is part of our rights, and the assurances that we have agreed to when we took federal money. This is what we agreed to on all of those dollars. It's daunting. But what we have the right to do, is petition that requirement to pay that money back. But we're not required to for quite so many months. Is it fair to say a year and a half? Close to? The cart before the horse is simple. Scott's idea, or an ordinance, should be implemented. It should be implemented and given a time to be challenged. Whether it's somebody that's mad from the AOPA that decides to sue. Or whether it's because they don't want to be restricted in their way that they fly. Or is it a challenge from the FAA? Way before we put the lights at our airport. Once we put the lights at our airport, there's no coming back from that.

Speaker 1 ([07:37](#)):

We no longer have the ability of the city to enforce rules, according to many very smart individuals in this room, we cannot enforce those rules. One way we can retard the activity that we all, including the airport community, want to restrict at night. The one way we can do that is, not approve. And I believe what's on the agenda, if you'll correct me, is to approve the bid. Is that what it is tonight?

This transcript was exported on May 19, 2022 - view latest version [here](#).

Speaker 2 ([08:11](#)):

It is.

Speaker 1 ([08:11](#)):

To approve the bid? I wonder, is that bid even valid still?

Speaker 3 ([08:15](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 2 ([08:15](#)):

Yeah.

Speaker 1 ([08:16](#)):

Or is it still valid? So the bid is to, is... That does not stop anyone in this room from bringing this matter back up, in eight months from now and 12 months from now, heck two years from now, after we petition the secretary with a very good case, not to pay the money back. Let's put policy, or an ordinance, in place. Let it mature, let it be challenged. Way before we put the lights in there, which we cannot retract. Once the lights are in there, we generally all agree that we lose control. The FAA now controls those lights that are there.

Speaker 1 ([09:04](#)):

The other thing is, if we don't take these lights, it has nothing to do with our ability to take on a project to fix our runway. If we don't take this lights, this money for the lights, the FAA ain't going to kick us out of the program, and we don't get to do anything else out there. That's not the case at all. This is a single project that we have valid information, that came after we approved, through some staff issues, the engineering for the lighting program. As I understood it, general construction practice all the time is, let's look at the project. It seems like a good project. Let's engineer the project. We still have a pause. My understanding was, is we did not have to pay that money back. Even post-accepting the engineering money. Standard business practice in the construction industry.

Speaker 1 ([10:12](#)):

You take a look at the engineering. You go, whew, that's way too expensive. Or the job's not viable. Or the ROI is not what it should be. Or we don't want to spend that much. We don't know what it costs until we get the engineering. Standard business practice all the time stops a project post-engineering. And we did have a staff member that certainly alluded to the public and et al, that we did not have to pay it back. I think that's a city mistake. That shouldn't be beholden on the rest of us. I personally am willing to make the payment back, after the petition to the secretary. We have a remedy. And a very, very, very good argument not to have to spend that money.

Speaker 1 ([10:59](#)):

There was a question on how many people that I represented, as I stood up here. I've I have made the statement, the true statement, that it was hundreds. Today, in seven hours, some really good girls in our lives... And seven hours out of 274 people on our list, they gave you 133 wet signatures in seven hours. There was zero retractions out of 274 citizens in close proximity to this airport, that wants zero night flights. Not opposed to the lighting of the airport. No night flying. It's amazing. In seven hours, 133 wet

signatures, that I will give you. And I will tell you, 141 individuals. We just couldn't, they were at work today, folks. We started at eight. The times are on here. At eight-something this morning and they quit at three because my wife and they, were just too hungry. They didn't eat all day. There are very close to 300 Citizens. Not people from Vegas, not people from St. George, not people that just moved here. The quintessential move-ins, who didn't have what we have in our valley. They moved here for a reason. Because they liked it. But they missed the little amenities that they had wherever it was they came from. We all know that. We talk about it all the time.

Speaker 1 ([12:51](#)):

I hate to pick on the Californians, but they seem to be the easy ones to pick on. When you get here, it's easy to miss the amenities that you have in communities that aren't rural. That don't have a historic value. It's easy to miss them. And maybe you want to live in that community, but you want to fly into an airport that's got lights. Maybe it's, you want nine restaurants up and down the main road. All of those have costs. And those are costs that we have avoided in this historic town, with historically silent nights, without lights. This is a change of use application, period. To the safety of both the pilots and the people on the ground. I know of no pilot that I've spoken to that will not agree that an emergency landing situation, it is safer to land an emergency landing during the day than it is at night. The unfortunate direction of our runway points us to the heart of our town.

Speaker 1 ([14:09](#)):

If during the day, again, we have an engine failure on takeoff, which is primarily when engine failures happen. Almost... The vast majority of them happen. And if you're cruising out over Hurricane, and you have an immediate engine failure, you're over my town. You're over the houses where our babies are putting their heads in their beds. That's who's sleeping there. As a pilot, have to get the nose over, try to maintain flight of their aircraft, and find a safe landing zone. At noon, we have examples of that. They've flown around our houses, landed into the fields. I spoke to one pilot who told me that in his training, his training was not to land on the streets because of the power lines up and down the street. He needs to choose a spot not on the street. Our town is dark. So, it's not just pilot safety. The very safest thing our pilots could do is continue to land in St. George, where the runway is longer. Emergency is available directly. Continue to land there. Not land here, historically. Land in St. George. \$10 uber ride, arguably \$20. I keep getting some, every time I say 20 minutes, somebody says, no, it's 23 minutes.

Speaker 1 ([15:38](#)):

That's where those night landing should take place. It's safer, both for the citizens of our community, and it's safer for our pilots. That's the truth. I got so much more. I'm going to end there with as Steve... As I appreciate the extra time. I also appreciate that you gave Steve the extra time, because I think he had a lot of good points to say. I'm sorry the meeting's going to run long. Almost 300 of our immediate, affected citizens do not want any flying at night. We do not want you to approve this change of use to our historic airport. Thank you for your time.

Speaker 2 ([16:46](#)):

Thank you-