

**MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE  
KINGSBURY GENERAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT BOARD OF TRUSTEES  
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2021**

**CALL TO ORDER** - The meeting was called to order at the Kingsbury General Improvement District office located at 255 Kingsbury Grade, Stateline, Nevada at 4:03 p.m. by Natalie Yanish.

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**ROLL CALL** – Present via Zoom were Trustees Yanish, Parks, Vogt, Schorr and Nelson. Also present were General Manager Cameron McKay, General Counsel Chuck Zumpft, and Utility Operations Superintendent Brandon Garden. Public present included Charles Hancock.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** – Jodi Nelson requested that future special meetings can be set at a time that is convenient for all trustees. She noted that she had a conflict and was advised that the meeting time was already set. She requested that the trustees are polled for times. Yanish stated that special meetings will be discussed in Item 7, in order to address it with the entire board. She offered for comments regarding this. She noted there was an agenda of special meeting dates which could address this. They thanked each other.

Hancock verified that public comment will not be taken during the action items. Yanish explained that public comment will be taken now and at the end of the meeting. She offered for Hancock to make his statements now. He explained that he would like to make his comments before votes are made. She encouraged him to continue with his statements now.

Hancock commented that the timeline presented looks good. He wanted to reiterate that some of them in the community have offered to assist the board. He sent the board emails and he never receives a single response. He questioned why the board cannot respond. The Braddock's and Hancock's would gladly help, adding that between them they have over 100 years' experience in executive management and management jobs. Yanish thanked him for the comments.

Nelson stated that when she was Chair, she tried to answer any correspondence to the constituents. She suggested a similar policy so that the members of the community don't feel like they are being ignored. She suggested feedback that the email was received and will be addressed at the next meeting. She noted that action cannot be taken.

Vogt agreed and added that she offered to contribute to email replies. She stated that Nelson chose to answer emails herself and noted it is tricky regarding responses to emails. She deferred to Zumpft and questioned Nelson's recollection. Nelson stated she thought it was part of being Chair and it may need to be addressed such as designating someone.

Parks questioned why the public cannot comment during each item. She noted it was permitted during Nelson's meetings. Yanish thanked everyone for the discussion.

Yanish stated that email correspondence is difficult because they don't want to promote any sort of communication that could be considered a serial meeting that could violate the Open Meeting Law. When responding to the public, as elected officials, we need to decide how to respond to constituents on an individual basis. When there is a coordinated effort, they want to be careful not to break the Open Meeting Law. She added that correspondence is reviewed and taken into consideration. She hopes this information is helpful.

Yanish explained that public comment is required at the beginning and end of each meeting as provided by Nevada Revised Statutes. Structure is required and it is at the discretion of the Chair if there will be public comment open on each agenda item. This particular board meeting is not over complicated and regarding the same item; therefore, in order to keep the meeting on task this structure would be the best way to address it. She feels it is a fair playing field and comments can be made at the beginning and end of the meeting. She appreciates

that the public is present and wants to comment. She added as elected officials, it is our job to make the decision. She explained to keep the meeting from being unwieldy, this structure has been set.

Parks questioned if all meetings will be conducted this way. Yanish explained that it is at the discretion of the Chair. She added that discussion on each agenda item can be considered at future meetings, if warranted, but it is not required. She stated that she is confident to conduct the meeting in this form, in order to create an even playing field for time allotment, comments and decision making.

Hancock requested to provide additional public comment. He stated that she is wrong to cut off public comment, noting that legally she may be correct. As a leader of the community, she is wrong and he suggested reconsidering this for the future. He feels she is cutting the public out, who elected her to do the job. Yanish thanked him for the comments.

There was no additional public comment. Yanish closed public comment.

### **APPROVAL OF AGENDA –**

**M-2/2/2021-1** - Motion by Vogt, seconded by Schorr, and unanimously passed to approve the Agenda.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS - NONE**

### **NEW BUSINESS**

### **SUCCESSION PLANNING COMMITTEE REPORT – INFORMATION ONLY.**

Yanish offered to address this item. She explained that she and Vogt are on the Succession Planning Committee. After receiving the updated timeframes developed at the last meeting from the expedited handling of hiring a new General Manager, they did not have a meeting. They reviewed the timelines for the board's consideration. They will also request feedback from counsel regarding committee use for the hiring process.

Yanish noted the report is short. She stated that she appreciates Nelson's comments regarding scheduling of the special meeting and noted that counsel's feedback was needed as soon as possible. Nelson stated that she requested the meeting time be moved one hour and was denied. She feels that wouldn't have been a big impact and added that she had to hire an employee to handle her office matters. She wanted to clarify the time was an issue, not the day.

Yanish thanked her for her efforts, acknowledging that all trustees have busy schedules. She offered to discuss meeting dates during the next agenda item to alleviate some issues. She apologized for the hardship Nelson incurred to attend the meeting.

Yanish offered for any other questions regarding Item 6. McKay did not have anything to add. Nelson requested clarification about the meeting and Yanish stated they did not have a meeting. It was determined that the items could be addressed with the entire board. She acknowledged that the board wanted more input in the process.

Nelson thanked Yanish for the scheduled meeting. Yanish apologized again. There were no other comments or questions.

### **DISCUSSION ON TIMELINE FOR GM SELECTION AND SELECTION OF POSSIBLE MEETING DATES FOR THE GM SELECTION PROCESS.**

Yanish noted the proposed schedule provided in the packet. She offered for McKay to review this or offered for any questions from the board. McKay addressed #9 Final Selections by the board. The resumes will be due by March 1. They will then be cataloged and provided to the board for review. The selection will happen at that time, if desired. Another option is to provide the resumes to the Selection Committee. He noted Zumpft's recommendations regarding sub-committee permissible actions.

McKay questioned Zumpft if the sub-committee could select the finalists and make the recommendation to the whole board. Zumpft confirmed they can make the recommendation to the whole board. By doing so, the actions are subject to Open Meeting Law, requiring notice. He confirmed they can do all of these things. McKay agreed and commented it would streamline the process. McKay noted that some applications have already been received, although some are not qualified. He added that all applications will be provided to the sub-committee.

Parks commented that she expected to receive a copy of the advertisement in the board packet. McKay explained that it was provided in the last meeting with some changes. She argued that was the job description and she wanted to see the advertisement. McKay explained that the advertisement was included with the wage range.

Nelson questioned where the advertisement can be accessed. McKay stated it would be included locally in Gardnerville. He offered that many of the papers would have it available online now; publishing will follow based on their next publication dates. It has been published on the APWA, National Rural Water and AWWA.

Nelson confirmed it would be located in the Record Courier Want Ads and McKay suggested Help Wanted.

Nelson requested Zumpft repeat his comments regarding the meetings. Zumpft explained that regarding the authority of a committee, they can do essentially anything the body can do except make the final decisions. They can follow recommendations, but if they are going to weed out applicants, make recommendations on specific processes, or carry down candidates, it has to be held in a public meeting. Nelson confirmed with Zumpft the Special Committee would have to have open meetings to review applications if they are going to make a recommendation to the board.

Parks confirmed that the sub-committee could not remove the unqualified applicants. Zumpft confirmed it would be a recommendation to delete the candidates. McKay clarified that they can do this in a public meeting and Zumpft agreed. Zumpft stated that if the applications are to be vetted by a sub-committee for the purpose of tearing them down, then the sub-committee can engage in the exercise if it is during a public meeting. This saves the whole body from entertaining that exercise.

Yanish thanked Zumpft for the information. She questioned the treatment of the personal information and if the interview committee could set up a scoring matrix for the staff to present the information to those who meet the criteria. Zumpft confirmed that would be a recommendation. Yanish questioned how the personal information is handled without a human resources department. Zumpft advised them to direct staff that personal information be redacted from applications received, as this is not necessary for consideration of the board members. Yanish questioned if all information on a resume is personal. Zumpft explained that all applicants are aware that they are applying for public comment and much of their information is going to be public record, and if they don't want to participate in that process, they don't have to. Zumpft explained that social security numbers and other identification information isn't needed until they are considered a candidate, but if it's included it will need to be redacted by staff. Yanish thanked Zumpft.

Yanish explained that in her prior interview processes, the other candidates are not aware of who else has applied. She has not been part of a process where 100 people have applied and the information is provided for public record. Zumpft offered to discuss the employee confidentiality qualifications with Stacy at PoolPac. He stated that he would be surprised if it was a required process to keep it anonymous. Nelson suggested numbering the applicants instead of referring to anyone by name for some confidentiality and Zumpft agreed.

Yanish stated that it may be obvious to link information based on college and employment and stated KGID's concerns with liability. She added that many people will apply that aren't qualified. She would like to establish a scoring or matrix to determine basic qualifications of applicants, noting that many spam applications shouldn't be reviewed during a public meeting.

Zumpft explained that if the sub-committee or the board wanted to develop some criteria such as a minimum college degree or minimum work experience, then staff could organize applications as such. That sorting would not require the exercise of judgement.

Parks suggested that the sub-committee could review the applications for minimum requirements. After clarification, Zumpft agreed that the sub-committee could sort applications with notice of public meeting. Parks questioned how an employee could sort through the applications without a meeting, but a sub-committee could not. Nelson questioned the activity of the sub-committee that worked on the building purchase without noticed meetings. Zumpft explained that many activities during the purchase occurred at the staff level, some of which he was involved with, in contract with this exercise. He added that these recommendations are in response to the questions provided to him at the last meeting. Nelson questioned if all future sub-committees should have noticed meetings and Zumpft replied that it depends on the activity. The sub-committee can gather facts and similar exercises.

Nelson questioned if the sub-committee could review applications and report back with qualified people to be discussed at an open meeting. Zumpft confirmed that the committee can review applications and report objective facts gathered, but they cannot make a recommendation. He added that the applicants cannot be ranked. Nelson provided an example of providing two piles of qualified and not qualified. Zumpft replied that is acceptable as long as the factors were objectively determined. Parks requested clarification and Zumpft restated. He added that the determination could not be made ahead of time and don't require the judgement of the sub-committee. Parks confirmed that parameters must be set. Zumpft confirmed that the body would not be exercising judgement. Parks added that makes sense.

Nelson questioned if the sub-committee could establish the scoring matrix based on the advertisement. Zumpft stated that the scoring matrix idea has been addressed by the Attorney General. He recalled the determination of the recommendation is that it can be done in an open meeting. Zumpft explained that there isn't much difference other than noticing the meetings and accepting public comment.

Yanish clarified that staff and board tasks need to be determined along with possible sub-committee roles to ensure rules will be followed. Parks questioned how many applications have been received and McKay responded six, so far. Parks stated that she would not like to take staff away from their jobs and added that she has extra time to allocate.

Yanish confirmed that a scoring matrix is necessary which can be established in a public meeting with the whole board. She confirmed with Zumpft that it would be acceptable to provide the matrix, as approved in a public meeting, to the staff to sort applications. Yanish reiterated her concerns of publishing and distributing personal information to anyone who requests it. She questioned if PoolPac would have a recommendation for this process. She provided an example of ten applications that meet the minimum requirements of the scoring system and questioned if all resumes would have to be published.

Zumpft noted her point. He offered to discuss the meeting aspect of interviewing a candidate. He stated that the job of General Manager of a GID is not a public office and he or she is not a Public Officer or Public Employee. That makes a difference in application of Open Meeting Law. If the body wants to consider the professional competence of an applicant, it can do so in a closed meeting. However, the applicant must be noticed. He reminded the board of closed meeting notices in the past of 21-days by mail 7-days in person or can be waived by the application. He confirmed that the notice is required and the names will have to appear on the agenda before they can be discussed in a closed meeting. He added that the board can be advised of this process. Interview discussions can be done in a closed meeting, but the board cannot deliberate or make any decisions. They can, however, determine the professional competence of the applicant and so could a sub-committee, subject to the same requirements.

Yanish confirmed that if a sub-committee held a closed meeting to interview applicants and provide a report, but not a recommendation, it would be required to be noticed. She questioned if the notice would take 21-days, and Zumpft explained that the notice could be waived as the right is the applicants. If they don't waive the notice, the meeting cannot be closed.

Nelson stated that she would like the board to review all applicants and doesn't feel it is a good use of staff time to sort through applications. She would like to see all applicants and volunteered to review them. She feels a

board member should be involved in all aspects of the application process. She offered for other opinions from the board. Parks agreed that a board member should be involved at all times and added that it is not staff's responsibility to process applications. Yanish replied that this will require many board extensive meetings, requiring notice. She requested clarification from Zumpft, possibly from PoolPac, regarding public meeting packets.

Nelson explained that she is referring to the initial application review, as if performed by staff, that doesn't require public notice. She confirmed that there would be no determinations. Zumpft confirmed that if applicants qualify based on the criteria of education and experience, they are not subjective judgement calls. Nelson added she wasn't sure if two trustees are needed and offered to review applications, adding that two trustees would be better. Parks offered to join Nelson on a sub-committee and noted that parameters would be set in advance. Yanish argued that this would be a recommendation. Parks disagreed, explaining it would be based on parameters. Zumpft agreed with Parks.

Yanish commented that McKay would likely determine qualifications of applicants based on the job description.

Schorr stated that the discussion has been regarding the process, which he feels is cumbersome to the board. He questioned McKay how he would go about hiring a General Manager. McKay explained that the advertisement is placed, the job description includes requirements, and a draft matrix can be provided to the board at the February meeting for revisions and approval. The score sheet will allow anyone to review and sort qualified applications. Both piles are provided to the board which reduces board efforts. He admitted the process can be simpler than discussed. He offered for staff to sort the applications based on the matrix and the board make the final determination. Schorr supported this recommendation. He added that is similar to a process at private entities, such as US Bank. He explained there would be a Human Resources or hiring manager to review information. McKay explained that he and Judy Brewer are trained in HR and that is not an issue. In addition, McKay contacted PoolPac as they were previously involved in hiring General Managers for GID's. PoolPac no longer gets involved or makes recommendations. Stacy will help when possible but they have no official direction to provide to GID's.

Yanish confirmed that the least cumbersome process is to have staff sort the applications for basic qualifications and present them to the board for review. She confirmed that no recommendations would be made. She questioned if an Open Meeting would be required to approve staff's recommendations and proceed to review applications. Zumpft and McKay agreed. Yanish questioned if an interview committee is needed and what they would be tasked with.

McKay explained that the interview committee would determine the final interview questions. He also has question recommendations that he will provide to the board for approval along with the scoring matrix. He offered for the staff to sort the applications. He says it's similar to other issues presented to the board that are prepared at the office for board consideration. He stated the board would have to interview potential candidates in an open meeting for the public to hear. McKay added that the public can also submit questions they feel should be asked. McKay suggested limiting public comment during each action item as the interview process can be skewed if one applicant is asked a question and not another. He reiterated that the questions and matrix will be available at the February meeting. Applications will be due by March 1, 2021 and should be categorized and provided to the board prior to the March 16, 2021 meeting. The board can determine at that time who the finalists should be.

Schorr supports McKay's approach, adding that Open Meetings can be rigorous. He supports McKay and his team to look for the best interest of a candidate to move forward as General Manager.

Yanish confirmed that the interview committee would be tasked with preparing a list of questions along with a scoring matrix for the response. She questioned how the scoring would be rated. McKay explained that would be determined in the board meeting. He questioned if an interview committee is needed. Yanish questioned who would be doing the scoring based on the matrix the board approves. McKay suggested that he and Brewer could do it as the matrix will be reflective of the job description requirements. Yanish thanked him for the comments.

Nelson commented that is the board's responsibility to hire the General Manager and she feels they would be asking McKay and Brewer to process the applications. She noted that board members are willing to do this which would allow staff to perform their duties.

Schorr suggested that Yanish work with McKay and Brewer on this task and she stated she would be happy to. Schorr questioned if this would be covered under the Open Meeting Law. Parks added that she would also like to be involved.

Yanish stated that the need for a sub-committee needs to be determined. She commented that it is common for staff to do these things and she doesn't see board of directors wading through applications. Generally, a HR Representative handles applications and she feels the initial sorting should remain a staff responsibility without the board involved. She also added that she would like to follow the rules. She questioned if any of the board members have run a water company or are aware of the qualifications required. She deferred to staff for this.

Nelson clarified that she is not trying to exclude anyone and restated her interest to be involved. McKay offered that this could be accommodated. Nelson added that they haven't had a Human Resources person and Brewer is new; therefore, the board's experience will be helpful. McKay agreed as long as the matrix is approved and the forms. He noted the process provided with forms to be approved including candidate ratings. He noted the items on the General Manager Replacement Process form provided. He offered for each trustee to have a copy of each application and to score them based on the matrix. He noted the importance of the timeline, including staff requirements of sending out letters and second round of questions. He noted that many items need to be approved and the staff will ensure items are done timely, as required.

Parks stated that the staff has enough to do and she and Nelson can assist with application scoring based on the matrix. She restated that she wants to be involved in hiring.

Yanish thanked Nelson and Parks for their comments. She noted that as a board they are decision makers and elected to decide who will be hired as General Manager. She added that the board shouldn't be involved in day-to-day operations at the staff level. She noted that McKay is generous enough to go through this process of assisting in the process of hiring his replacement and we have to rely on him to delegate those responsibilities within the office. She feels that two people scoring candidates would be subject to Open Meeting Laws and wouldn't be just the two. She referred to Zumpft's comments regarding this. Parks argued that they wouldn't be making recommendations. Nelson requested clarification.

Zumpft clarified that it would be a recommendation and Yanish agreed.

Yanish referenced McKay's timeline provided and questioned when the board meetings should be scheduled, assuming it will be weekly or bi-monthly. McKay explained that the job application process closes at the end of February and the applicants will need to be selected for a second round of questioning. He suggested that could occur on March 16, 2021. He noted it will take time for the second round of questions to be mailed out and returned from the selected applicants. The questions could be mailed on March 17, 2021 with responses due by March 26, 2021. The next meeting will be held on April 6, 2021, Budget Workshop Meeting can include the finalists for interview. Interviews will start between April 13-May 15, 2021 which will depend on the applicants and interview method, along with the third round of questions and Covid-19 restrictions. He stated that the date in option #2 is the biggest decision, noting there may be flexibility depending on board availability.

McKay explained that the list of dates should be reviewed. Additional dates can be confirmed after April 6, 2021. He confirmed this is a good plan and needs confirmation of availability for the regular meetings, and additional availability in April. He explained that interview times may vary, depending on the candidate's availability and he advised the board should be prepared for odd times, adding that they will provide as much time as possible.

Yanish confirmed that there will be additional meetings in April. She questioned if action is needed on this item. McKay confirmed he has enough direction. Yanish offered for the trustees to comment or ask questions on the timeline.

Nelson questioned the formal date and option #2. McKay explained this would provide additional time to review resumes which would change the subsequent dates. She questioned which dates will be followed and McKay replied the normal dates.

Vogt stated that she doesn't have a problem with Nelson and Parks or anyone else being involved. She noted available will be key to stay on task. She added that it may save time for McKay and Brewer to do the initial sorting, but agreed with both sides.

Yanish restated that two trustees cannot perform scoring or it will result in an entire board meeting. McKay offered to notice any meetings as needed. Zumpft confirmed that it requires an Open Meeting, but not an entire board meeting. It can consist of the committee, as long as it's noticed. Vogt stated that she is referring to Parks and Nelson's objective review of the applications based on the qualifications. Yanish requested clarification on her preference and Vogt stated it doesn't matter either way. She noted that they will have to be available in order to comply with the timeframe.

Nelson questioned if the applications can be reviewed in the office in a 3-hour period with McKay and Brewer. McKay explained that it is very simple to notice a meeting with trustees coming to the office. Nelson thanked him.

Yanish referred back to her initial question if the applicant's resumes would be included in the packets and made public. McKay explained that the resumes would be sorted based on the matrix and provided to the board for review. Yanish confirmed that the applications would become public at that time. She noted that 100 applications would all be included in the packet and questioned the district's liability. McKay noted that they are applying for a public position. He suggested the confidential information could be redacted. He noted that Social Security and Driver's License Numbers would not be included on the applications. Yanish stated that personal identifying information is included in resumes. She added that it makes her very uncomfortable publishing that information. She referenced her experience working in Human Resources and commented that she has never experienced personal information being published as part of a first round of interviews. She added that applicants would be aware of other applicant's qualifications. She offered for any other questions regarding time frames.

**DISCUSSION ON SELECTION OF INTERVIEW COMMITTEE FOR GM HIRE** – Yanish noted the previous comments regarding processes. She added that Nelson and Parks may be referring to a screening panel and not an interview committee. She clarified that interviews would select a candidate for recommendation. She referred to McKay's comments about approving questions and a scoring matrix approved from the whole board. McKay explained that the interview committee selects candidates for an interview, noting the volunteers.

Yanish clarified that Nelson and Parks would screen applications with McKay during an open meeting to present to the board. She offered for trustees to comment. Schorr requested clarification regarding the noticed meetings and McKay explained that it would notice the public regarding the meeting in accordance with NRS and it is not a responsibility of the trustees to meet.

Parks provided an example of 50 people applying and 20 deemed initially qualified. McKay explained that those 20 applicant's information would be presented to the board on March 16, 2021. The board would select from those 20 who should move on during a board meeting. If 5 are chosen, they will have the second round of questions and responses can come back to the committee or the board. The board will decide which applicants will be selected for an interview. Parks confirmed they can interview any number of candidates.

Yanish questioned if there is a designated EEO Officer and McKay confirmed that HR is EEO. She noted that most places offer EEO training and the EEO Officer is present for meetings and interviews to ensure there are no violations to the Fair Hiring Process. McKay agreed and noted that he and Brewer have received training from PoolPac and he also has twenty years of experience. He noted they do not have a designated EEO, but he qualifies as one. Yanish questioned if the board should schedule training for this. McKay explained that he will oversee questions for compliance, noting the approval process for the questions in advance. He added that the questions must be followed. He explained there are many questions that cannot be asked.

Yanish questioned if a formal discussion is needed prior to the public meetings in order to prevent inappropriate discussion resulting in a liability for the district. McKay explained that PoolPac has written guidance that will be followed. This information will be provided to the board. Yanish appreciated that offer. She offered for any questions. She questioned if Nelson, Parks and any other trustee could be available during a meeting to sort through applications. McKay advised that the interview committee was a suggestion and can be called anything.

Yanish confirmed that applications will be sorted during an application in an open meeting. McKay answered that they would be sorted based on the matrix and job descriptions. She confirmed that technically the entire board and public could be there to screen applicants for qualifications during an open meeting. McKay explained that four people would be physically in attendance and all others would be on Zoom.

Parks questioned if there should be more than one meeting scheduled to review applicants. McKay noted it will depend on the number of applicants. Parks noted that more can be determined at the next meeting.

Yanish confirmed that staff will propose the matrix and interview questions and a committee isn't needed. McKay responded that the matrix and questions will be presented to the board for approval. Yanish confirmed a committee isn't needed and the board, staff and public will be available to screen applications. McKay agreed.

Nelson questioned Zumpft how the interested public can contribute and how they can comment during the meeting. Zumpft replied that they can participate and comment by invitation of the meeting Chair. Nelson noted that some of the public expressed their interest in participating but the open meeting allows anyone interested in participating in the process. Based on Zumpft's research, he determined that any member of the public can serve on a committee. He added that a sub-committee can consist of only two board members. She confirmed that any member of the public can listen and comment during the public meeting.

Yanish questioned if action is required. She offered for any other comments from the trustees. McKay added that action is not required and action will be in a public meeting. He noted the next meeting will address the application review process and deferred to Zumpft. Zumpft requested the question be restated. McKay questioned if the applications must be made public on the website. Zumpft stated that personal information must be statutorily removed and other information will be included. McKay requested a list of items to be redacted and Zumpft agreed.

Nelson clarified that if McKay and Brewer may sort applicants outside a public meeting. Zumpft confirmed that their actions will be non-objective based on determinations made by the board and is fact-finding. She questioned why two board members in addition to McKay and Brewer would result in a need for an open meeting for the same act. Nelson noted the extra work involved for a public meeting with all applications and offered to come in later. McKay confirmed that the board will see all applications. He and Brewer will review the applications and all information will be made public, and posted on the website for the board's consideration. Nelson questioned if the applications have to be published. Zumpft confirmed the information must be made available to the public at the same time it is made available to the board. She questioned if that could be done in the office instead of online. Zumpft offered to research. Nelson noted that board packets were not published in the past, and one was available at the desk for review. She suggested having a binder for review at the front desk. Zumpft noted that the information has to be made available to transients. He added that anyone that requests a packet is entitled and they have to be available online at the same time the packets are available to the board. He offered to confirm if the information has to be published online. McKay explained that many rules were added because of Covid-19.

Parks questioned if the applications must be scored via matrix in an open meeting. Zumpft confirmed that if the action requires open judgement it is required. Parks noted that it would be based on the matrix approved at the meeting. McKay explained that a number chosen from 1-5 would be a judgement call. Zumpft stated that it would have to depend on the matrix. Zumpft acknowledged her concerns and stated that it is possible to craft a matrix in that way, but cautioned if judgement would be used. Zumpft offered to consider her request and report back at the next meeting.

Yanish added that experience could be considered subjective. She offered for any other questions regarding the process or other concerns.



Nelson reviewed the timeline and confirmed with McKay that the after the applications close on March 1, 2021 and someone will compile the information for the March 16, 2021 meeting. She confirmed that the board will review qualified prospects on March 16, 2021 and the office will send out a second round of questions. On April 6, 2021, at the Budget Meeting, the board will select the candidates for interview. She confirmed that an additional meeting would be needed to review applications from March 1 – 15, 2021. McKay noted this is possible or it could be reviewed at the meeting. Nelson questioned when the information would be available. McKay explained that when the matrix is approved by the board, they can score them as they come in. He would expect the applications to be sent in advance or by March 5, 2021, possibly, for review.

In response to Nelson’s next question regarding the March 16, 2021 agenda, McKay explained that it would include the Personnel Policy.

Yanish confirmed that Nelson is questioning if an additional special meeting is needed from March 1-16, 2021. Yanish questioned if this is necessary. Nelson replied that if applications could be provided by March 5, 2021, she could review them and ask McKay questions, if applicable. McKay agreed. Yanish questioned if a special meeting should be scheduled for March 9, 2021. McKay noted this can be scheduled later, if needed. Nelson offered to assist in the process. She added that she would like more than three days to review the applications.

Yanish offered for any other questions or discussion. She thanked everyone for the thorough discussion. She confirmed McKay has the direction he needed and he concurred.

**PUBLIC COMMENT** – Yanish confirmed that there was no further public comment from the public or trustees. She thanked everyone for attending the meeting, noting the advanced timeframe to hire a new General Manager. She apologized for the short notice.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**M-1/2/2020-4** - Motion by Parks, seconded by Vogt, and unanimously passed to adjourn the meeting at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
Natalie Yanish, Chairman

Attest:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Darya Vogt, Secretary