

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Carson City Airport Authority (CCAA)
Wednesday, January 20, 2021 • 5:30 PM
Community Center Bob Boldrick Theater
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Authority Members

Chair – Michael Golden	Vice Chair – Bradley Harris
Treasurer – Jon Rogers	Member – Stan Jones
Member – Paul Hamilton	Member – Tim Puliz
Member – Karl Hutter	

Staff

Steve Tackes – Airport Counsel
Ken Moen – Airport Manager
Danielle Howard – Public Meetings Clerk

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the Board's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and available for review during regular business hours.

Audio recordings and the meeting minutes of the Carson City Airport Authority meetings are available on www.carson.org/minutes.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(5:35:06) – Chairperson Golden called the meeting to order at 5:35 p.m.

(5:35:23) – Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Michael Golden	Present	
Vice Chair Bradley Harris	Present	
Treasurer Jon Rogers	Present	
Member Stan Jones	Present	
Member Paul Hamilton	Present	
Member Tim Puliz	Present	
Member Karl Hutter	Present	

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(5:35:40) – Led by Member Jones.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PAST MEETING OF THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY.

(5:36:15) – Chairperson Golden introduced the item and entertained comments, corrections, and/or a motion. He pointed out that the minutes incorrectly stated that Mr. Moen was directed to work with Vice Chairperson Harris on the survey referenced under Item #4, page #5, which he noted should be himself and Vice Chairperson Harris having decided to work on the survey.

(5:38:52) – MOTION: Vice Chairperson Harris moved to approve the November 16, 2020 meeting minutes as corrected.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Hutter
SECONDER:	Hamilton
AYES:	Golden, Harris, Rogers, Jones, Hamilton, Puliz, Hutter
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	None

D. MODIFICATION OF THE AGENDA.

(5:40:38) – Chairperson Golden noted that there was no modification to the agenda.

E. PUBLIC COMMENT.

(5:40:48) – Chairperson Golden stated that, henceforth, public comments would be accepted through the referenced email designated for public comments on the agenda as well as during the public comment items (Items E and N). He entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

F. PRESENTATION OF SERVICE AWARD TO JOHN BARRETTE.

(5:43:34) – Chairperson Golden introduced the item and presented to John Barrette the Service Award plaque for his service as a Member of the Authority. Mr. Barrette remarked to the Authority Members that “it was just as much a pleasure for me to serve with you as [Chairperson Golden] said it has been a pleasure to work with me.”

G. PUBLIC HEARINGS

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters listed under the consent agenda are considered routine or have been discussed at previous public meetings and may be acted upon by the Airport Authority with one action and without an extensive hearing. Any member of the Airport Authority may request that an item be taken from the consent agenda, discussed and acted upon separately during this meeting. The Authority Chair, or the Authority Vice-Chair, retains discretion in deciding whether an item will be pulled off the consent agenda.

(5:48:44) – Chairperson Golden entertained requests to pull items from the Consent Agenda for discussion and, when none were forthcoming, a motion.

(5:49:11) – MOTION: Member Hutter moved to approve the Consent Agenda items as submitted.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Rogers
SECONDER:	Puliz
AYES:	Golden, Harris, Rogers, Jones, Hamilton, Puliz, Hutter
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	None

1. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVE T-MOBILE AIRPORT BEACON AND GROUND LEASE FOR INSTALLATION OF CELLULAR ANNTENA AND SUPPORT EQUIPMENT.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

2. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION. REVIEW AND DISCUSS AIRPORT TENANT/USER SURVEY RESULTS; RECOMMENDED ACTIONS TO IMPROVE AIRPORT AUTHORITY PRACTICES AND USER INTERACTIONS BASED ON FEEDBACK; RECOMMENDED ACTIONS TO IMPROVE AIRPORT MANAGER PRACTICES AND USER INTERACTIONS BASED ON FEEDBACK.

(5:50:19) – Chairperson Golden introduced the item and referenced the Staff Report, which is incorporated into the record along with the survey results. He noted that he had facilitated the survey. Vice Chairperson Harris summarized the results of the survey and commented that, despite what the survey results indicated, the Authority has noted growth on the Airport, including three new businesses that were added in 2020. He noted that the Airport could do a better job with both Airport growth and economic activity and “promote the message” to Airport users. He mentioned that the Authority could work on maintaining a positive relationship with the community since that had a largely negative response. Vice Chairperson Harris noted that while it is difficult to promote aviation during a pandemic, it is still an area that the Airport users are concerned about.

(6:05:34) – Chairperson Golden entertained Member discussion and responded to clarifying questions. Treasurer Rogers stated that his overall impression of the survey was that the results of this survey were similar to that of the community survey that was done when the Authority had established the Strategic Plan. He noted the tension in the Airport community related to Airport growth and pointed out that every category of revenue that the Airport has can be most easily increased by attracting large, gas-guzzling airplanes because they help the Airport’s land lease revenue, personal property taxes are much higher due to how expensive large airplanes are, and gas tax revenues go up when selling more gas to aircraft that consume more gas.

(6:18:07) – Member Hamilton commented “I generally look at the survey kind of like, in my business and anyone who has a business, if you’re not getting four stars or above in that survey, then you’re not doing very good as far as customer service, and here we’re no where near four stars. If I got ratings as in this survey in my business, I would be out of business, so I don’t think it’s very good, and I think, if I go back a little ways … maybe this last meeting, I had said that we’re having incredible complaints about [Mr. Moen], and there was talk about that … and I have to say, [Vice Chairperson Harris], thank you so much for saying we need a survey. Now this has really gone from my problem to our problem, and we do have a problem, and I think if we’re just trying to do numbers on who agrees and disagrees, well I don’t think they’re very good. And if we go into the comments … has everyone read the comments? Well the comments would give us a totally different impression than just trying to run the numbers here … I went through and when I told the board we had a problem, we got the survey, and I didn’t know the problem was as widespread as what we found out. I don’t know if everyone has also been getting the letters from the customers about complaints at the Airport … I thought this one from Steve Hamilton was probably the most interesting one I’ve seen so far. These letters are a part of our survey, and when I read this one … I actually know Steve Hamilton. I’m not related to him, he’s a very upstanding citizen, he runs a great medical manufacturing business, and when I saw this, I thought ‘wow, that is really bad.’ So basically what people have been telling me around the Airport came out in the survey in the comments, and I think if we all read those comments, I think we really ought to say to ourselves ‘Carson, we have a problem,’ and so far, I haven’t heard that anyone is really acknowledging that, and so I’m going to start that conversation. So I would, first off, say that these letters that are coming in, which are essentially comments, should be part of the survey, and they’re coming in more and more. So if I was going to go down through and look at some of the things that were basically said … ‘now we’re running this like a police state,’ … and I would like you all to understand that this is what I’ve been hearing on a day-to-day basis. Now it’s coming to you.” In reference to the question “how was Ken,” Member Hamilton read the following Airport user comments: “rude,” “overbearing,” “hostile,” “hot-headed,” “thinks he owns the Airport,” “has an attitude as always being right,” “bossy,” “condescending,” “surly demeanor,” “chip on his shoulder,” “heavy-handed,” “contentious dialogue,” “someone might have a better idea,” “mean,” “less like a cop,” “stand-off posture,” “made Airport users disgruntled,” “made Airport users disheartened,” “dictatorial,” “disregard for owners,” “bureaucratic,” “placement,” “threatening attitude,” “unfriendly atmosphere,” “hates pilots,” “authoritarian manner,” “unfriendly,” “I’m the new sheriff,” “my way or the highway,” “big brother,” “overreaching,” and “oppression.” He added “now that’s what I’ve been hearing every day. This has finally come out, and I guess what I’m asking everybody here is to take this from … actually, others have been hearing it, too, but I’ve spent most of my time as a board Member dealing with this, and, as far as I’m concerned, it’s not working. So I’ve got a big, long dissertation of problems I’ve got with [Mr. Moen].” To Member Hamilton’s offer to read his dissertation, Chairperson Golden recommended saving such items for future agenda item, which Member Hamilton agreed to. Member Hamilton proceeded commenting that “I wanted to express my thoughts here as if anyone thinks this survey is good, then they need to double-check their ability to analyze what we’re trying to do, and we have a long ways to go at that, and I’m kind of surprised … we’ve been talking about the numbers and this, that, and the other thing, [and] we really haven’t been talking about the individual comments, and I think those are much more telling of our situation here, and the numbers aren’t that good … but the other thing is, too, is that I

think that these letters that have been sent to all of us board Members should be a part of the survey because that also adds to problems [that] we've got and how we need to solve that. So those are my thoughts."

(6:25:29) – Member Puliz stated that he has a personal relationship with Mr. Moen and noted that Mr. Moen had been professional with him and has shown that he has great knowledge on Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Airport matters, safety, and security. He pointed out that there were many people who were not abiding by the Airport's security protocols in a professional fashion, and he was pleased when Mr. Moen was trying to "tighten up the security" and make Airport users more knowledgeable. He echoed Member Hamilton's comment regarding approximately 35 percent of Airport users having "a bone to pick with [Mr. Moen] right now," which Member Puliz believed was mostly related to "the delivery, not so much the message," since the delivery has been perceived as contentious. He believed that relationships with the users and the community could be improved by taking steps as the CCAA and as the Manager, and he commented that the Airport is a "fabulous place to do business" and a wonderful airport with great potential. Member Puliz was glad that the survey was done to maintain transparency.

(6:31:22) – Member Jones stated that, having been involved in many surveys, surveys should be considered as a guide and "not locked in stone." He noted that people will likely voice when there is a problem.

(6:32:47) – Member Hutter commented that the results from the survey are enough "to get a strong sense of which way the wind is blowing," and he stated that the CCAA and the Manager all need to take responsibility for the negative feedback. He pointed out that it appeared as though there may be some misunderstanding regarding who is responsible for what in regards to the Airport, and he suggested better education and communication regarding Airport roles. He noted that because the survey did not involve a political evaluation and involved safety, fiduciary responsibility, courtesy, professionalism, and customer service, the feedback was concerning. Member Hutter commented that his interactions with Mr. Moen have been positive and stated that Mr. Moen has done great at providing accurate answers to key questions, which he noted is most important to him as an Airport user. He mentioned that, as the President and Chief Executive Officer of Click Bond, he let people go at Click Bond for one instance of some of the things that were recorded in the survey. He emphasized that the point of the matter is the representation of who those who represent the Airport are in terms of public perception. Member Hutter also recommended that the Airport Authority have "a more proactive hand as truly the executive of this airport."

(6:42:42) – Chairperson Golden mentioned that he had included the question "*if the Airport Authority could do one thing to improve the Airport, what would it be?*" He noted that there were no less than 30 comments requesting that the Airport could put in a restaurant, and he pointed out that the main response to the question "*what do you like best about the Airport?*" was "location," which he believed was a valuable asset. Chairperson Golden thanked Vice Chairperson Harris and Mr. Moen for suggesting a survey. He called Mr. Moen a "polarizing figure" and stated that "if [Chairperson Golden's] business had numbers like this, [he would] be out of business," as a 60 percent approval rating is "a failing grade." He pointed out factors of the survey results, including that 32 percent of respondents were either "dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied," those who responded with "satisfied" or "very satisfied" encompassed 48 percent of those who participated in the survey, and that the weighted average for responses to questions regarding management were all close to three out of five. Chairperson Golden acknowledged

that the reason for the survey was to gauge the Airport's sentiment and stated that the Authority needs to react to their customers and improve their experience.

(6:53:24) – Vice Chairperson Harris pointed out that the responses were from a percentage of people who chose to respond to the survey and not the population of people on the Airport. He stated that he had expected the responses to be largely negative and that the purpose of the survey is to set a benchmark against which the Members and Staff measure themselves on a yearly basis and identify areas in need of the strongest improvement. He wished that the Members had done a better job with the survey and had explained to those who had received the survey what the purpose of the survey was. Vice Chairperson Harris believed that the Authority was “reading a lot of things into this that aren’t there” and cautioned being aware of a strong negativity bias in the responses.

(6:58:06) – Treasurer Rogers was pleased that people took the time to comment on and off of the survey and thanked Chairperson Golden for his contributions to the survey. He inquired about the Authority’s actions following the survey results to improve the issues identified by the survey. He was in favor of “any idea that allows the conversation to continue and to be brought to a different spot through interaction between people all about that,” and he was opposed to a specific individual being identified as the cause of structural issues.

(7:00:20) – Member Puliz proposed assigning a three-person committee to work together with Mr. Moen to address the negative issues. Vice Chairperson Harris added that the proposed committee should also focus on the weaknesses of the CCAA. Member Puliz volunteered to be on the committee, and Treasurer Rogers was willing to assist with the committee. Chairperson Golden believed that Treasurer Rogers’ input would be “invaluable,” and Member Puliz agreed that Treasurer Rogers would be valuable to the committee as well as Member Hutter. Member Hutter believed that “being of the fray of sort of the traditional user groups and perspectives … I think that is a valuable piece to have in this [because] it is that outside consultancy” in regards to Treasurer Rogers being a part of the committee.

(7:01:36) – Member Hamilton commented that he has been working hard with Mr. Moen for the past three years with trying to improve the relationships and believed that it has been difficult to make any progress.

(7:04:01) – Chairperson Golden stated that he would volunteer for the committee and would be willing to step aside for any reason.

(7:04:54) – Treasurer Rogers believed that Mr. Moen should be involved in all the committee meetings to promote communication between Mr. Moen and the community, and Member Puliz agreed with being all-inclusive.

(7:06:02) – Member Hutter agreed with Vice Chairperson Harris’ comment about surveys and setting a benchmark to which to see relative progress. However, he also believed there was value in free-form responses by “guiding the work” through the “top three things, pro and con, that we’re hearing about.”

(7:07:28) – Mr. Moen stated that the two relationships that exist are between him and the Airport community and between him and the CCAA, and he recognized the tension in the relationships, which he attributed to enforcing regulations on the Airport. He provided examples of instances when he has had to address Members about their actions on the Airport and other business activities and mentioned that a “unique issue” is created through not allowing a Member to behave differently than he asks a tenant to behave. He noted that he is opinionated and can be forceful in his manner. Mr. Moen was concerned about the issue between himself and Member Hamilton and pointed out that he had encouraged Member Hamilton to reapply for a position on the CCAA because Mr. Moen was “not looking for a group that is a rubber stamp … [and] looks at me to do their work and then they come here once a month.” He stated that he had also attempted to identify and recruit other people in the community like Members Hamilton and Puliz that he believed would provide value back to the Airport rather than for the sake of making himself look good. He explained how, during his first six months as Airport Manager, he had only observed; met people on the Airport and the community; and talked about how people viewed and what people expected from the Airport, how they saw the Airport affecting them in terms of whether it was economic development for the community, and promotion of aviation on the airfield, which had helped with the Strategic Plan. Mr. Moen clarified that the polarizing gate issue of people driving their privately owned vehicle (POV) on active taxiways and the runway surface arose numerous times and led to him printing out and reviewing the Gate Policy that states that no one is to leave the gate area until the gate closes behind them in order to prevent “piggybacking” for unauthorized people to enter the premises. He commented that the community did not appreciate the signs, marked areas, and tenant bulletins about the Gate Policy, and he had spent nine months “counseling” people who violated the policy as well as flagged people down who were driving down the roadway in order to talk to them, hand them a sheet of paper with the Gate Policy on it, and identify himself to them. He noted that he and the Authority would be liable if an incident were to occur on the Airport. He mentioned that he had received several phone calls referring to the survey as a “hit job” and asking if it was designed to help him or hurt him, and he was not aware of the survey going out. Mr. Moen stated that the relationship with the CCAA as well as how they go forward were really important to him, and he commented that there would always be people that do not like him, the Members, or what they all are doing. He stated “I know that with the framework and the foundation we’ve laid over the last three years that we’re on the precipice of great things,” including mitigating the nighttime approach, getting new development on the Airport, updating facilities, improving landscape and presentation of the community, and getting air service. He added that the budget has improved every year since he has worked with the Airport, and massive improvements in equipment and processes had been made. He also reiterated that his goal was bigger than pleasing some of the Airport tenants and encompassed safety and security as the number one priority followed by improving relations in the community and economic development.

(7:24:27) – Treasurer Rogers hoped to accomplish refining the ability to separate policy from personality over the course of time with the proposed committee and Mr. Moen. He commented that, in reference to his career in business related to sales, the key to any success that he has had came from his ability to tell people “no” while having them be confident that he “respected them as a person.” He pointed out that Mr. Moen had displayed the behavior that Treasurer Rogers wished to see the committee and Mr. Moen work on.

(7:27:07) – Member Puliz commented that Mr. Moen left out customer satisfaction when he had described his goals for the Airport, which Member Puliz believed was just as much a priority as safety, relationships, and fiscal responsibility. Mr. Moen agreed with Member Puliz.

(7:27:46) – Chairperson Golden clarified that he had volunteered his time to assist with the survey, launched the survey late Sunday night when Mr. Moen was not working, and contacted Mr. Moen the following morning with a link to the survey. Vice Chairperson Harris stated that there was no excuse for Mr. Moen to have not known that the survey was going out before Chairperson Golden had sent the survey out. Chairperson Golden disagreed with Vice Chairperson Harris because “it’s not [Mr. Moen’s] survey; it’s the Airport Authority’s survey.” Chairperson Golden stated to Mr. Moen that “it’s not what you say that bothers people; it’s how you say it. It’s not the message that you are trying to get across; it’s how you get that message across that is a major problem.” He added that Mr. Moen’s methods of communicating with people are inappropriate. Mr. Moen agreed that if he were yelling and screaming at people that it would be inappropriate and clarified that he had found out about the survey from a tenant.

(7:31:54) – Mr. Tackes confirmed that no formal action was needed for forming a voluntary subcommittee.

3. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION. REVIEW AIRPORT MANAGER CONTRACT ANNUAL RENEWAL WINDOW AND DECISION ON NOTICE.

(7:31:21) – Chairperson Golden introduced the item and explained that he had reviewed the Employment Agreement, incorporated into the record along with the Staff Report, and had found some things that he felt were important to discuss in an open meeting public forum with the CCAA. He added that he had explained to Mr. Moen that he believed that Mr. Moen’s employment relationship with the Airport needed to change. He pointed out that the Employment Agreement automatically renews on an annual basis “unless either party gives notice of termination of at least 60 days prior to the end of the term,” with the end of the term being March 22 of each year; therefore, Chairperson Golden believed it was appropriate to have a discussion at this time while the window before the renewal was there. He was opposed to automatic renewing agreements because the agreement “sits on a shelf somewhere, collects dust, [and] people don’t know about it, they don’t even know the terms of it,” and he noted that no one at the meeting, including himself, other than three people knew about the Agreement or the contents and terms of it. He mentioned that he knew Mr. Moen for several years prior to his employment with the Airport and had supported Mr. Moen to pursue the position as Airport Manager years ago and advocated for Mr. Moen to take the position if it was offered to him. He believed that Mr. Moen has done a “bang up job in many veins of what he is doing” and commended him for having done many things that no other Airport Managers would have done at the Airport. He also believed, however, that some difficult issues about Mr. Moen’s relationship with the Airport were necessary to discuss in an open setting.

(7:38:11) – Chairperson Golden entertained Member discussion. Vice Chairperson Harris stated that the Employment Agreement was a negotiated contract, and he had been involved with some of the language in the Agreement as well as Mr. Tackes. He was opposed to making any change to the Agreement. He believed that Agreement was acceptable as long as there was nothing written in the Agreement preventing the Authority from

taking action against the Manager for cause at any time and because this Agreement was what was negotiated, it was the contract that the CCAA should continue with. He stated that the CCAA would likely have a difficult time with finding and hiring good management in the future after Mr. Moen leaves his employment due to how Mr. Moen was treated during the public, recorded meetings like the current meeting being held. He believed it was “particularly true when you have negotiated a contract that you stick with it.”

(7:41:16) – Treasurer Rogers agreed with Vice Chairperson Harris that there was nothing in the Agreement to keep the Authority from managing or disciplining the Manager if necessary. He commented that it would not make sense to do yearly renewals and would be opposed to them if the Authority was not going to do automatic renewals when many actions made could take three to five years to come to fruition.

(7:42:08) – Member Hutter was also not in favor of automatic renewals due to the reasons Chairperson Golden outlined and because “they have a tendency to not stimulate review … but I think more importantly it constrains to very specific window times when you can raise issues, take actions, and they have to very preciously coincide with meetings that are hard to schedule with the public board.” He questioned why the Agreement was written to renew automatically and pointed out how a method of yearly review of a contract reminds the organization that there needs to be a conversation each year to invite not only discussion about the performance or the “fit” of the employee but also update and review of the document. He brought to the Authority’s attention that there is no “termination by CCAA without cause” for the “Termination Pay” scenarios under Section 6.4 of the Agreement, which he believed was a flaw in the document. He inquired about why the employment of the Airport Manager is not an at-will employment. Chairperson Golden agreed that Mr. Moen’s contract should be as an at-will employee.

(7:46:58) – Mr. Tackes explained that why the contract was created in such a way was because one of the problems with the previous Airport Manager was that there was no clear statement as to what his responsibilities or what the goals were and whether there would be some benchmarks to make. He also clarified that creating an at-will employee contact was not the approach that the Authority Members at the time wished to take, and he did not remember the negotiation process with Mr. Moen, though he did recall that the negotiation included insurance coverage. Mr. Moen added that he was presented with the Agreement, and there had been discussion about salary and the one adjustment made to the original Agreement was related to training and maintaining accreditation.

(7:50:58) – Member Puliz stated that, having been a businessman for 42 years, he would have voted for an at-will employment contract instead of a yearly renewal. He believed that having an annual contract was poor business practice.

(7:55:29) – Member Hamilton agreed with Member Hutter and Member Puliz and believed that the Authority should do a better job at evaluating the Airport Manager and suggested doing so every month so there would be some type of measurement to show whether progress is being made and become “a faster-acting group.”

(7:56:35) – Chairperson Golden stated that there was no reason that the current Agreement could not be terminated by a vote and the Manager continue his employment as an at-will employee and did not believe it was a good

agreement for the benefit of the Airport. He noted that the Members represent the Airport and not an employee. He read the following from the Agreement:

"The Chairman of the Airport Authority may take disciplinary action on matters for cause in lieu of termination and such action shall include notice to the Manager and a right of review by the CCAA of actions taken" and "failure to follow through on requests or directions made by the CCAA, such that said failure impedes the business of the Airport/CCAA" as a matter "for cause."

Chairperson Golden mentioned that one of the reasons Mr. Moen was hired and why Chairperson Golden was in favor of hiring Mr. Moen was because he had worked for the Director of Economic Development managing general aviation properties in Reno, and he was hired to support economic development at the Airport. He read the following essential core function from the Agreement:

"Develop and implement plans for economic and business development that work to maximize the use of land side and airside Airport owned lands to enhance budget and ensure the future financial visibility of the Airport."

Chairperson Golden pointed out that Mr. Moen had been employed with the Airport for three years, and a new land lease had not been signed within the past three years. He noted that the Authority also needed to take responsibility for having not signed a new land lease.

(8:00:33) – Vice Chairperson Harris commented that the item was sounding like a performance review when he expected a discussion about contracts and believed that Chairperson Golden was “way off topic.” Discussion ensued, during which Treasurer Rogers stated that an open, candid conversation with employees did not belong in a public forum but rather in a yearly performance review. Chairperson Golden disagreed with Treasurer Rogers because he was advised by Mr. Tackes that the best way to have the current discussion for the sake of transparency was in an open meeting in accordance with the Open Meeting Law (OML). Vice Chairperson Harris agreed with Treasurer Rogers’ comment and clarified the suggestion to follow the process outlined in the Agreement and sharing the results of the conversation, which he believed was “much more appropriate.” He apologized to Mr. Moen for his involvement in the survey and stated that it was “not at all how I imagined it being used … and now it’s just been turned into everything I hoped it wouldn’t … I wanted it to be a benchmark so we could look for improvement.” He also apologized for “this despicable performance review you are getting today,” as he believed that the only thing that would come out of the discussion was disengagement. He also commented that Mr. Moen had also always taken Vice Chairperson Harris’ feedback at the meetings and put them to good use.

(8:08:44) – Mr. Tackes confirmed that he had advised Chairperson Golden that “if you are going to look at that review window, this is the time to do it because you cannot look at it a month from now; it will not be ripe again for another year.” He stated that it sounded like Chairperson Golden was being cut off from presenting reasons why he believed that review window should be considered. He did not believe that the discussion was a “rehash” of the previous item regarding the survey, and his legal advice was to “hear [Chairperson Golden] out to find out what his rationale is” as the correct approach under the OML.

(8:10:20) – Member Hamilton stated that a problem had been identified and needed to be fixed and remarked that he had two people chase him back to his hangar to make sure that he represented them during this meeting and

worked to find a solution. He believed the solution was being ignored by the Authority and it was getting frustrating that the Authority was not addressing the problem when the survey had addressed the problem, and the Authority needed to solve it with the contract potentially being one way to do so. He wished to modernize the Agreement to the CCAA's current needs. Vice Chairperson Harris believed the time to revise the Agreement was when the Airport had a new Manager and that the current Agreement should stay in place until Mr. Moen's employment ceases because the terms of the Agreement were part of the value of the position that would be taken away. He stated that altering the Agreement was "extremely unfair."

(8:13:21) – Chairperson Golden wished that Vice Chairperson Harris "had the same concern for our Airport tenants" and reminded the Members that he had authority to take disciplinary actions per the Agreement that Mr. Moen had signed. Vice Chairperson Harris believed that it would be best to raise terminating the contract as a motion. Member Puliz also wished to take a vote on the matter, and Chairperson Golden stated that he had promised Mr. Moen that the matter would not be a negotiation.

(8:15:34) – Chairperson Golden recessed the meeting and reconvened the meeting at 8:29 p.m.

(8:29:57) – Chairperson Golden announced that he and Vice Chairperson Harris had consulted during the break and read the following from the Employment Agreement regarding "Reporting Relationships":

"[The Manager] Reports to the Carson City Airport Authority; primary contact with the Chairman of the Authority, as well as, other officers and Authority Members."

He suggested that the Agreement be terminated by a vote of the Authority effective immediately, and the Manager continue his employment with the Authority under the same economic terms and conditions and the duties as set forth in the Agreement, and that Sections 6.1(c), 6.3, and 6.4(c) all be deleted and strike the automatic renewal in Section 1.4 in order to convert the document to an at-will Agreement. He mentioned the other option of terminating the Agreement as well as Mr. Moen's employment, which he clarified he was not advocating for. Mr. Tackes affirmed that the Authority could legally take the action described by Chairperson Golden, and Chairperson Golden entertained a motion.

(8:38:10) – MOTION: Member Hamilton moved to terminate the existing Employment Agreement and to continue employment with [Mr. Moen] on the same economic terms and conditions and all other terms and conditions set forth in the Employment Agreement with the automatic renewal being removed, the termination for cause provision being removed, and the termination pay for cause being removed. Chairperson Golden clarified that the salary would need to be reflected in the Agreement and would be worked out with the Authority and Mr. Moen at Mr. Moen's current rate of pay.

(8:40:03) – Vice Chairperson Harris noted that there were other parts of the Agreement that would need to be brought up to date regarding benefits.

(8:40:25) – Member Hutter wished to specify that the Employment Agreement would be the same terms and conditions with the articulated parts of the Agreement removed rather than entering into another employment contract that happens to not automatically renew “because that goes down a weird road because if you have pulled out the termination for cause definitions, you are now in a strange space if it is indeed an employment contract that runs a term of a year.” He suggested taking “the things that are important and meaningful in clarifying aspects of the job from this Agreement and [articulating] them in an at-will employment offer.”

(8:44:21) – In response to Member Hutter’s question, Mr. Tackes indicated that he did not see anything in the Agreement that the Authority should be aware of in a legal sense and/or that the Authority would not want for the position. He stated that if the termination provisions are removed from the document, the Agreement may be utilized instead as the terms for an employment at-will offer.

(8:45:18) – Vice Chairperson Harris proposed working on an employment offer letter to Mr. Moen at another time and take action at this meeting on whether or not Mr. Moen keeps his current contract. Member Hutter and Mr. Tackes pointed out that the Authority has approximately 60 days before the Agreement expires to outline the terms of the at-will employment offer to provide to Mr. Moen so he has the assurance and has “no break in employment.”

(8:47:11) – Chairperson Golden entertained a new motion to terminate the Employment Agreement at this time. Mr. Tackes offered the terminology for the motion “to give notice of termination at this time.”

(8:48:30) -- Member Hutter suggested an amended motion.

(8:49:42) – MOTION: Member Hutter moved to give notice of termination, as defined in the Employment Agreement, and allow the Employment Agreement to thus expire at the end of its one-year term. Chairperson Golden entertained discussion. Member Hutter commented that he supported the motion as presented because of some of the flaws and deficiencies he had noted in the Agreement itself, and he believed that an at-will Agreement provides the Airport Authority with flexibility for collaborative improvement in service of the Airport community, to look at definitions of performance improvement, and for periodic review. Member Puliz echoed Member Hutter’s comment and wished to clarify that the Agreement needed to be replaced by an at-will Employment Agreement that does not in any way take away the economic benefits currently enjoyed with the current contract.

(8:53:16) – Treasurer Rogers wished for the Authority Members to “discipline” themselves to accomplish regular performance reviews with metrics in order to show the community that they care and are taking action. Chairperson Golden agreed with Treasurer Rogers’ comment.

(8:54:39) – When no further discussion was forthcoming, Chairperson Golden called for a vote.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-2-0)
MOVER:	Hutter
SECONDER:	Puliz
AYES:	Golden, Jones, Hamilton, Puliz, Hutter
NAYS:	Harris, Rogers
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	None

(8:55:05) – MOTION: Member Hutter moved that, between now and the time of the expiration of the Manager’s Employment Agreement, the Authority draft and present to the Manager an at-will employment offer reflective of his current salary, benefits, and, generally speaking, the terms in description of the rule as described in the Employment Agreement that is expiring. Chairperson Golden entertained discussion and, when none was forthcoming, called for a vote.

RESULT:	APPROVED (7-0-0)
MOVER:	Hutter
SECONDER:	Puliz
AYES:	Golden, Harris, Rogers, Jones, Hamilton, Puliz, Hutter
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	None

(8:56:33) – Chairperson Golden suggested scheduling a special meeting of the CCAA before March 22, 2021, the expiration date of the Employment Agreement, and have a “Manager’s employment review.” Mr. Tackes suggested that an employment offer be prepared for Mr. Moen by the next regular meeting in February 2021

4. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: REVIEW AND UPDATE STRATEGIC WORK PLAN FOR NEXT YEAR.

(8:57:55) – Chairperson Golden agreed to reschedule this item for a later date.

I. AIRPORT ENGINEER’S REPORT.

(8:58:26) – Chairperson Golden introduced the item, and Mr. Moen noted that the Airport Engineer’s Report was incorporated into the agenda materials and offered to entertain any questions.

J. AIRPORT MANAGER’S REPORT.

(8:58:44) – Chairperson Golden introduced the item, and Mr. Moen referenced his report, which is incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions.

K. LEGAL COUNSEL’S REPORT.

(9:04:25) – Mr. Tackes did not have any additional items to report.

L. TREASURER’S REPORT.

(9:04:29) – Chairperson Golden introduced the item and noted that the Annual Budget would be coming up on the CCAA agenda. He suggested that Treasurer Rogers and Mr. Moen prepare a tentative Budget for review by Members through email.

M. REPORT FROM AUTHORITY MEMBERS.

(9:08:21) – Chairperson Golden entertained Member reports; however, none were forthcoming.

N. PUBLIC COMMENT.

(9:08:28) – None.

O. AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING.

As articulated during CCAA discussion.

P. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT.

(9:08:45) – Chairperson Golden adjourned the meeting at 9:08 p.m.

The Minutes of the January 20, 2021 Carson City Airport Authority regular meeting are so approved on this 17th day of February, 2021.

DRAFT MINUTES
Regular Meeting
Carson City Airport Authority (CCAA)
Wednesday, February 17, 2021 • 5:30 PM
Community Center Robert "Bob" Crowell Board Room
851 East William Street, Carson City, Nevada

Authority Members

Chair – Michael Golden	Vice Chair – Bradley Harris
Treasurer – Jon Rogers	Member – Stan Jones
Member – Paul Hamilton	Member – Tim Puliz
Member – Karl Hutter	

Staff

Steve Tackes – Airport Counsel
Ken Moen – Airport Manager
Danielle Howard – Public Meetings Clerk

NOTE: A recording of these proceedings, the Board's agenda materials, and any written comments or documentation provided to the recording secretary during the meeting are public record. These materials are on file in the Clerk-Recorder's Office, and available for review during regular business hours.

Audio recordings and the meeting minutes of the Carson City Airport Authority meetings are available on www.carson.org/minutes.

A. CALL TO ORDER AND DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

(5:29:35) – Vice Chairperson Harris called the meeting to order at 5:29 p.m.

(5:29:53) – Roll was called, and a quorum was present.

Attendee Name	Status	Arrived
Chairperson Michael Golden	Absent	
Vice Chair Bradley Harris	Present	
Treasurer Jon Rogers	Present	
Member Stan Jones	Present	
Member Paul Hamilton	Present	
Member Tim Puliz	Present	
Member Karl Hutter	Absent	

B. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

(5:30:12) – Led by Member Puliz.

C. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PAST MEETING OF THE AIRPORT AUTHORITY.

(5:32:46) – Vice Chairperson Harris introduced the item and entertained comments, corrections, and/or a motion. Member Hamilton wished to have his comment on page #4 reflected in its entirety, and Ms. Howard agreed to provide a verbatim revision of Member Hamilton’s comment.

(5:40:47) – MOTION: Vice Chairperson Harris moved to approve the January 20, 2021 meeting minutes as revised.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Hamilton
SECONDER:	Jones
AYES:	Harris, Rogers, Jones, Hamilton, Puliz
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	Golden, Hutter

D. MODIFICATION OF THE AGENDA.

(5:41:25) – Vice Chairperson Harris noted that Item #2 would be removed from the agenda.

E. PUBLIC COMMENT.

(5:42:00) – Vice Chairperson Harris entertained public comments; however, none were forthcoming.

F. PUBLIC HEARINGS

CONSENT AGENDA

All matters listed under the consent agenda are considered routine or have been discussed at previous public meetings and may be acted upon by the Airport Authority with one action and without an extensive hearing. Any member of the Airport Authority may request that an item be taken from the consent agenda, discussed and acted upon separately during this meeting. The Authority Chair, or the Authority Vice-Chair, retains discretion in deciding whether an item will be pulled off the consent agenda.

(4:42:20) – Vice Chairperson Harris introduced the item, and Mr. Moen referenced the Staff Report and the accompanying documents for Item #1, all of which are incorporated into the record. Vice Chairperson Harris entertained comments and a motion.

(5:43:59) – MOTION: Member Puliz moved to approve the Consent Agenda item as presented.

RESULT:	APPROVED (5-0-0)
MOVER:	Puliz
SECONDER:	Rogers
AYES:	Harris, Rogers, Jones, Hamilton, Puliz
NAYS:	None
ABSTENTIONS	None
ABSENT:	Golden, Hutter

1. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVE GROUND LEASE TERMS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT STORAGE HANGARS EAST OF MOUNTAINVIEW COMMUNITY HANGARS AT TAXIWAY BRAVO AND CHARLIE PARCEL APN 005-091-30.

2. FOR POSSIBLE ACTION: APPROVE CLASS 2 FBO APPLICATION FOR TAHOE SKY VENTURE PROVIDING FLIGHT INSTRUCTION.

Per Vice Chairperson Harris' modification under Item D, this item was removed from the agenda.

END OF CONSENT AGENDA

3. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: REVIEW AND DISCUSS FY 21/22 BUDGET PRIORITIES. REVIEW AND DISCUSS CAPITAL PROJECTS BUDGET PRIORITIES FOR FY 21/22.

(5:44:20) – Vice Chairperson Harris introduced the item. Treasurer Rogers referenced the Staff Report and presented the CCAA Fiscal Year 2021/2022 Draft Budget and the CCAA Capital Projects Budget Priorities for Fiscal Year 2021/2022, all of which are incorporated into the record. He and Mr. Moen also responded to clarifying questions. There were no changes requested for the Budget, and Vice Chairperson Harris directed the Members to send any new comments about the Budget to Mr. Moen and Treasurer Rogers. No formal action was taken on this item.

4. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: REVIEW AND APPROVE AIRPORT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (ACIP) FOR FY 2021-2026.

(6:06:07) – Mr. Moen presented the Airport Capital Improvement Plan (ACIP), which is incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions. No formal action was taken on this item.

5. FOR DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION: REVIEW AND UPDATE STRATEGIC ANNUAL WORK PLAN FOR NEXT YEAR.

(6:18:29) – Vice Chairperson Harris introduced the item and referenced the Staff Report and the Five Year Implementation Schedule, both of which are incorporated into the record. He noted that his intention was not to offend anyone and that “I just need to state this stuff so that you understand … my objections and then hope that we can do some straightening out and put together a reasonable Work Plan for [Mr. Moen], and also maybe build some trust back into the situation because I can see where Mr. Moen could feel like he was ambushed.” He stated that the tenant/user survey, which was done to gauge customer satisfaction and was incorporated into the January 20, 2021 CCAA meeting agenda materials, did not give the Authority a proper benchmark for measuring improvements due how the survey was handled, including that the email list of recipients for the survey contained individuals that are not Airport tenants, the email with the survey was sent from an unrecognizable email address that was not affiliated with the Airport, the email did not explain the purpose of the survey, the email did not ask those responding to limit their answers to actual interactions and communications with the Airport Manager, the survey had duplicate questions and several questions that were unclear, the rating system in the survey was inconsistent without descriptions indicating what the ratings meant, and the survey was not administered by a third party and throws anonymity into question. Vice Chairperson Harris referenced the three-person committee that was proposed during the January 20, 2021 CCAA meeting that consisted of Chairperson Golden, Treasurer Rogers, and Member Puliz. He read from the January 20, 2021 meeting minutes about how the proposed committee would work together with Mr. Moen and pointed out that Mr. Moen had been excluded from the first committee meeting, during which the committee had created a letter outlining issues for Mr. Moen to work on within 60 days, which was presented to Mr. Moen. He stated that the expectation was that the committee would conduct the meetings as indicated in the previous meeting minutes, and he commented that “this is not the way to do things.” Vice Chairperson Harris stated that a lot of the existing problems at the Airport are related to the culture of the Airport due to not having been run professionally for years, which he attributed to the Airport not having a meaningful budget, capital budget plan for replacements of worn out equipment, or good security or safety programs. He added that “tenants could get away with just about anything,” but the Authority was now trying to “change the culture to recognize safety, security, and professionalism as essential parts of the day-to-day operations of the Airport and its tenants’ facilities. … This change in culture is not going to happen in 60 days.” He asserted that “we must improve as a board,” as the survey results indicated that there were also issues for the Authority to work on. He posed the following questions related to the Work Plan:

- “Should the Work Plan reflect the Strategic Plan of the Airport?”
- “What time period should the Work Plan cover?”
- “Who is the customer?”
- “How do we measure customer satisfaction other than regurgitating anecdotal evidence?”
- “Do we add quarterly meetings with tenants to the performance measures? If so, will you attend? Are you willing to present acts, figures, and information about the board? Are you willing to be the MC? Will you take ownership for these meetings? If these are poorly attended, will we just continue this effort?”
- “Do we need a maintenance measure?”
- “How do we make sure that the Manager gets a review?”

(6:31:41) – Vice Chairperson Harris entertained Member comments. Member Puliz stated that he was “very, very displeased” with Vice Chairperson Harris’ comments as well as the comments Vice Chairperson Harris had made

at the January 20, 2021 CCAA meeting that were directed at the Members. He added that it was “pretty serious stuff, the fact that we’re being insulted for things that I feel is completely misrepresented.” He wished that the survey had been done differently and believed that it was rushed. He also clarified that, according to Chairperson Golden, the distribution list that the recipients of the survey were chosen from had come from Mr. Moen’s distribution list, which Mr. Moen suggested was possibly his gate card list. He agreed with Vice Chairperson Harris that had Chairperson Golden worked with Vice Chairperson Harris and Mr. Moen on the survey, the outcome of the survey would not have been a problem. Member Puliz did not believe it was fair to say that the committee meeting that was held prior to meeting with Mr. Moen was “not in the spirit” of the original plan, and he explained that the purpose of the first committee meeting was to analyze the information from the survey and determine how much of the information was accurate or worth considering before compiling the list to bring to Mr. Moen’s attention for the joint effort to improve relationships. He stated that the reason he, Chairperson Golden, and Treasurer Rogers wished to do that was because they all spend a lot of time at the Airport, and what they all had been hearing from Airport users and had communicated with Mr. Moen was that there is a percentage of people at the Airport that are not satisfied with the way that Mr. Moen communicates and delivers his messages. He added that they were aware of there being Airport users that they had not heard from, and a majority of those users “do not really care much,” some of those users are satisfied or do not wish to be polled. He mentioned that the committee’s intention was not to exclude Mr. Moen, and they had scheduled a meeting with Mr. Moen to discuss the joint feels about what the survey results depicted and what the Manager and the Authority needed to do. Member Puliz believed that the meeting with Mr. Moen was “pretty positive.” He stated that there was an Airport users meeting scheduled for February 24, 2021 at Mountain West [Aviation] Hangar with the three committee members, and he encouraged any of the other Authority Members to attend, as he intended for the event to be a “very positive meeting” during which there would be discussion about the recent snow removal project and the recent Airport accident, an introduction to the new Airport Maintenance and Operations Technician, Rick Lee, and some moments of silence for three of the Airport’s long-time tenants that had recently passed away. He acknowledged how Mr. Moen could have felt ambushed during the January 20, 2021 CCAA meeting and stated that he would have used a different strategy at the time. He also reiterated that “it was difficult for me to hear that I’m not a professional person when … I put a lot of time and effort to be fair and equitable with everything I do, and I have a lot of respect for Mr. Moen as an Airport Manager and as a person, and I want to give him every opportunity to hear what’s going on and make those kind of adjustments where necessary, and if he has to stand his ground, he should be able to make his case.”

(6:38:35) – Discussion ensued between Vice Chairperson Harris and Member Puliz, during which Vice Chairperson Harris reiterated his points regarding the committee having not worked with Mr. Moen and devising a list of issues for Mr. Moen to work on, and he cited his 25 years of human resources (HR) experience. Member Puliz disagreed with Vice Chairperson Harris’ assertion and, citing his 42 years of running his own business, stated that what was done by the committee was very professional and “completely above board.” He added that Mr. Moen was given an opportunity to discuss and share his feelings on every issue outlined in the letter he was given.

(6:40:09) – Member Hamilton noted that “one of the problems is you can’t solve a problem or work on something until you know what the problem is” regarding the committee having met and outlined the issues they wished to

raise with Mr. Moen. He suggested that the letter to Mr. Moen be shared with the other Members, and he commented that it appeared that the committee had reviewed the information they had available to figure out what the problem was and had spoken to Mr. Moen about how to work on it, which he believed was practical.

(6:41:36) – Treasurer Rogers believed there was more of a communication issue rather than, per Member Puliz's inquiry, an issue with whether anyone was being honest or dishonest, and he did not believe that the committee was engaged in "some kind of a subterfuge." He noted that Vice Chairperson Harris was concerned about the communication process that was used by the committee and the Authority. He commented that he did not like that Vice Chairperson Harris "treated us tonight exactly the same way that he accuses us of mistreating [Mr. Moen] ... during the last couple of weeks." He believed that, materially, some of the items that Vice Chairperson Harris presented were wrong because he had not clarified his assumptions with the Members that were at the meeting. He wished to hear Mr. Moen's opinion on the process. Treasurer Rogers advocated for the Members to "stop doing the bomb throwing" and converse with the people who were involved with the meetings.

(6:44:55) – Mr. Tackes informed Vice Chairperson Harris that "we are no where near the topic that is noticed for the meeting tonight, ... it's noticed for to establish a Strategic Annual Plan." He advised Vice Chairperson Harris that, unless he were to stay on topic, the Authority would be "way off the limits of the Open Meeting Law and what you are permitted to discuss and deliberate over." Vice Chairperson Harris agreed that the discussion went off topic, and he clarified that he wished to discuss the questions he had for the Strategic Plan. Member Puliz did not believe the discussion regarding the survey needed to go any further.

(6:47:54) – Member Hamilton commented that "I thought we were going to be kind of talking about what we were going to do rather than go back and regurgitate the survey" and suggested putting the topic on the next agenda if Members wished to discuss it further. He and Member Puliz disagreed with Vice Chairperson Harris' statement that the survey results were not a good benchmark, and Member Hamilton stated that "the survey is what we hear all the time."

(6:49:13) – Mr. Moen noted that the majority of the feedback from the survey was positive while a minority of the feedback was from individuals who repeat the same sort of feedback and may be the same ones "that are barking in your ear." He did not wish to continue revisiting the survey and suggested discussing the Work Plan. He pointed out that Member Hutter, who had served as a Member on the CCAA before, was impressed with the work and structure that was put into the Strategic Plan, and Mr. Moen believed that what had stood out to Member Hutter was that the Authority worked diligently together as a group. He recommended going back to the focus of the Strategic Plan and the mission and the vision for the Airport. He added that the Budget Priorities were intended for reflecting the mission and the vision by investing in such areas as proper staffing, equipment, and the ACIP, and he noted that the Annual Work Plan reflected what had been done and accomplished. Mr. Moen mentioned that customer satisfaction had just been added to the Annual Work Plan because the previous Annual Work Plan and the Strategic Plan had not addressed that. He noted that customer satisfaction could be added to the Implementation Schedule and inquired about who the Airport's "customer" is. He advised that the Strategic Plan is the guiding document that would move the Airport forward while the Authority operates as a group and outlined the items that the

Authority has discussed working on. He believed that the people that should be spoken to about the survey are those from the Experimental Aircraft Association (EAA), Pathways to Aviation, and the Civil Air Patrol, since Staff routinely reaches out to these entities. He emphasized that “we’ve got some huge stuff that’s coming on board,” including Telemax, which had purchased 11 acres to move its operation to base it on the southeast corner of the Airport with a through-the-fence agreement. Mr. Moen stated that “if you think this is the direction the Airport should go, then get on board,” and he mentioned that if the Members did not believe that he was serving their needs, he will leave.

(6:56:09) – Treasurer Rogers remarked that he “couldn’t agree with [Mr. Moen]’s assessment more.” He believed, however, that the “Economic Development” portion of the Strategic Plan requires maintenance of satisfied tenants, and word of mouth matters in the market space of the Airport.

(6:57:43) – Vice Chairperson Harris recommended that the Authority consider who is defined as the referenced “customer” of the Airport and who is responsible for their satisfaction. He was concerned about the data from the survey and did not believe that it would be comparable to the results of a future survey “if we do it the right way.” He repeated the questions and his observations from the beginning of the discussion. Vice Chairperson Harris noted that he had spoken to Treasurer Rogers, Chairperson Golden, and Mr. Moen about the committee meeting and apologized for not having spoken to Member Puliz prior to this meeting, though he also stated that “it’s not like I just made this up.” Member Puliz disagreed with Vice Chairperson Harris’ comment regarding professionalism and pointed out that Vice Chairperson Harris was off topic.

(7:01:09) – Member Hamilton reiterated that customer satisfaction needed to be placed on the Work Plan as well as the Strategic Plan. He acknowledged that some of the questions posed by Vice Chairperson Harris were good questions and involved areas that needed to be worked on. He believed that the Airport needed an emergency response team and pointed out that the Carson City Fire Department is not going to haul airplanes off the runway. Member Hamilton clarified that an emergency response team is necessary for when an aircraft goes off the runway and all of the fixed-based operators (FBOs) need to be brought together as a team to get the aircraft off the runway so the runway can be opened back up as fast as possible. Mr. Moen was in favor of this idea and noted that this responsibility of the FBOs is typically written in the lease agreements at most airports, and he had reached out to every FBO on the Airport as well as at the Reno-Stead Airport and the Minden Airport to assist the Airport. He commented that the Authority is “not in the aircraft removal business, nor should we be” and added that such tasks are meant for FBOs, with which Member Hamilton agreed. Mr. Moen suggested amending leases or developing “some sort of memorandum of understanding” if Member Hamilton wishes to do so. Member Hamilton believed that figuring out a procedure for such emergency measures as what he had described should be a Strategic Goal. Member Puliz suggested adding this item to the Work Plan, and he commented that customer satisfaction could be a part of the Airport’s implementation as a discussion item. Member Hamilton pointed out that the Authority had failed as a board to add customer satisfaction to the Strategic Plan and commented that Mr. Moen had done a great job at going after the Strategic Plan and every item that is written in it.

(7:06:29) – Treasurer Rogers pointed out that Mr. Moen was the person who was the most closely involved in the development of the Strategic Plan, and in response to his question, Mr. Moen indicated that he did not recall the item of customer satisfaction ever coming up when developing the Strategic Plan. Mr. Moen believed that people on the Airport could be considered under “Community Relationships” within the Implementation Schedule, and he proposed making an item to fit that Strategic Goal with an Initiative to address it.

(7:08:06) – Treasurer Rogers preferred to have had this discussion in the form of a proposal by Vice Chairperson Harris for the Annual Work Plan.

(7:08:48) – Vice Chairperson Harris entertained further Member feedback; however, none was forthcoming. He stated that he would “take it from here and see what I can do.” No formal action was taken on this item.

G. AIRPORT ENGINEER’S REPORT.

(7:10:52) – Vice Chairperson Harris introduced the item, and Armstrong Consultants Engineer Operations Manager Chris Nocks presented his report, which is incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions.

H. AIRPORT MANAGER’S REPORT.

(7:14:12) – Vice Chairperson Harris introduced the item. Mr. Moen presented his report, which is incorporated into the record, and responded to clarifying questions.

(7:17:36) – Member Puliz complimented Mr. Moen and his assistant for “working like crazy” for three days to clear the snow at the Airport during the last incident. He mentioned that his only comment was that Mr. Moen could have come back on the morning of Saturday, [January 30, 2021] on overtime for Staff to clean up a few remaining items, and he noted that Mr. Moen’s rationale was the Budget. He explained that he and Mr. Moen had a discussion on whether it should have been done anyway for safety, and that was why Mr. Moen added the item about overtime to the Budget. Member Puliz added that “this was a very positive way of working together as an observation from a user, as a board Member, and as a collaborator to come up with a plan going forward that should make it a little bit safer, and I was pleased with the way we handled that.”

(7:18:46) – Mr. Moen commented that performing storm removal operations during aircraft operations is a “very intense project” and can lead to safety issues. He noted the point made by Reno-Stead Airport in the report that a big component of snow removal is to get the “loop” done, which is what was done at the Airport. He added that he, Member Puliz, and Member Hamilton had collaborated with Mr. Lee about relooking at Staff’s priorities for snow removal. Mr. Moen complimented Mr. Lee’s work ethic and noted his technical training in snow removal.

(7:20:56) – Member Hamilton noted that Staff had done a good job with the snow removal and commented that his only complaint was that the mid-field Taxiways were not plowed, and he was opposed to closing down the Airport rather than closing down only the runways. Discussion ensued between Member Hamilton and Mr. Moen regarding

regional airport closures and closing the Airport in the event of snow covering the movement areas of the Airport, and Vice Chairperson Harris requested that the topic be agendized as an item for a future CCAA meeting.

I. LEGAL COUNSEL'S REPORT.

(7:24:32) – Mr. Tackes did not have any additional items to report.

J. TREASURER'S REPORT.

(7:24:36) – Vice Chairperson Harris introduced the item. Treasurer Rogers referenced his report, which is incorporated into the record, and commented that Mr. Moen was doing an “excellent job” with working with the Airport’s bookkeeper.

K. REPORT FROM AUTHORITY MEMBERS.

(7:26:10) – Vice Chairperson Harris entertained Member reports. Member Jones commented that the tenant/user survey was “so flawed that I would be ashamed to even admit I had a part, and if we went to court, we would lose. ... You should never do your own survey; you should always have an independent party doing it.” He added that he did not wish to discuss the survey anymore, and he believed that the Authority should move forward in a different direction.

(7:27:23) – Vice Chairperson Harris believed it would be important for the Members to receive some training in the ethics rules that operate under the State and pointed out that the Members may not always rely on the opinion of the Airport Counsel because attorneys cannot know what they are thinking or what their business involvement is. He believed it would be beneficial for the Members to clearly understand the rules in the State for recusal and disclosure. He also wished to have some training on Open Meeting Law (OML) for the Members. Member Puliz agreed with Vice Chairperson Harris’s points about receiving training.

L. PUBLIC COMMENT.

(7:31:00) – None.

M. AGENDA ITEMS FOR NEXT REGULAR MEETING.

(7:31:19) – Vice Chairperson Harris advised the Members to send requests for future agenda items to Chairperson Golden.

N. ACTION ON ADJOURNMENT.

(7:31:34) – Vice Chairperson Harris adjourned the meeting at 7:31 p.m.

The Minutes of the February 17, 2021 Carson City Airport Authority regular meeting are so approved on this 17th day of March, 2021.