



TRUCKEE TAHOE AIRPORT DISTRICT - INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

TO: BOARD OF DIRECTORS

FROM: HARDY BULLOCK, A.A.E. – DIRECTOR OF AVIATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES

WITH ASSISTANCE FROM:

LAUREN TAPIA, SHRM-CP – HR MANAGER DISTRICT CLERK

JOSH NELSON – DISTRICT COUNSEL BBK LAW GROUP

KEVIN SMITH, A.A.E. – GENERAL MANAGER

SUBJECT: AIRPORT COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUP (ACAT) REVITALIZATION CONCEPTS

DATE: FEBRUARY 11, 2021

At the January 14th, 2021 Board workshop Staff was directed to develop a complement of solutions to revitalize the Airport Community Advisory Team (ACAT). ACAT's mission is to employ 3 pilot and 3 non-pilot members to develop practical solutions to community noise and annoyance and enhance the benefit of the airport to the community. The design of the group focuses on the interaction between pilots and the community as a method of developing acceptable solutions that are aeronautically feasible. ACAT was not designed as a proxy voice of the community at large.

When developing a new entity, considerable legal care must be taken to ensure the group is either expressly exempt or fully compliant with the Brown Act. The Brown Act is a valuable part of the public process designed to structure input and allow transparency, so all parties have the opportunity to see, hear, and be involved in policy decisions that affect the community. Staff sought solutions supporting the proposal developed by Director Diamond. The primary tenets of which include, open membership, attendance flexibility, social media use, dialogue, and a Board of Director(s) liaison. Some of the concepts presented here track more of a traditional approach often found at other airports who employ productive community advisory groups.

It is important to note that Staff and District Counsel understand the concerns expressed by Director Diamond and others regarding the difficulty and impracticability of applying some

Brown Act provisions and similar laws to bodies like ACAT. Admittedly, these laws can increase administrative burdens on participants and discourage some from participating. That said, we should also consider the benefits of the Brown Act and its end goal of assuring transparency and a defined public involvement and notification strategy. Some community members may take exception to any advisory committee, team, or board that is not subject to the Brown Act. Modifications of and/or creation of a new ACAT that is still bound by the Brown Act, may serve to meet the bulk of the needs described by both Director Diamond and the other Board members while avoiding potential confusion related to Brown Act compliance.

Staff has prepared a summary of various options for a reinvention or enhanced productivity of ACAT. These are as follows:

Concept #1: Standing Committee of the Board, two Board members, unlimited number of public participants. All standing committees of the Board are subject to the Brown Act. Most of the difficulty associated with a formal ACAT-type body relate to requiring public participants to comply with disclosure and reporting obligations (i.e., Brown Act restrictions on communications outside of a meeting, Form 700s, etc.). It may be possible to alleviate these restrictions on community attendees while still enjoying the transparency requirements of a Brown Act body. Specifically, the Board of Directors could establish a “public outreach”, or similar standing committee composed of two Board members. This standing committee could then invite any interested public attendees to participate with the standing committee as needed or as desired. These public participants would not be Standing Committee members bound by the Brown Act but could provide advice and counsel to the Standing Committee. Only the Board members (who are already subject to these requirements) would be. Standing committees are bound by the Brown Act to post agendas and create meeting minutes. Feedback from public participants may be collected electronically and submitted to the Standing Committee and then the full Board of Directors.

Concept #2: Leave ACAT as currently constituted in scope and purpose with 6 community members including 3 pilots. Continue role as a Board public outreach arm and research and development tool for the District. Appoint a Board Liaison to ACAT that would attend all meetings. Increase the level of ACAT Board interaction by having 2 combined Board/ACAT workshops to improve alignment with District goals, activities, and emphasis areas.

Concept #3: Disband ACAT and allow individual Board members to develop and host independent advisory teams responsive to each Board member. Each Board member has the right to conduct the activities outlined in the Diamond proposal on their own. Nothing in the Brown Act prohibits this type of outreach.

Concept #4: Modify ACAT to allow for a higher or unlimited number of participants, make attendance optional (provided that a quorum attends each meeting), assign a Board member liaison and host meetings as needed or routinely. Also have bi-annual standing Board-ACAT workshops to provide dialogue and coordination. This group would fulfill the bulk of Director

Diamond's request except it would still be subject to the transparency and Brown Act requirements.

Concept #5: Modify ACAT. Assign each Board member two slots, one member and one alternate, to serve at the pleasure of each Director. The group would function much like a Planning Commission or Historical Commission whereby the Director would be connected to their appointee for a term decided by the Board. This group would still be subject to Brown Act requirements.

Concept #6: Modify ACAT and assign membership based on geographic area of residence. E.g., one member from Tahoe Donner, Glenshire etc. This group would be bound by Brown Act requirements, but additional modifications may be made to enhance the size or attendance criteria, provided that a quorum attended each meeting.

Concept #7: Disband ACAT and drive all public dialogue to the Board meetings. Essentially this option could enhance civic engagement with concerned community members on a topic-by-topic basis. Outreach initiatives could be directed to gain social media participation and public involvement. This option works in concert with the foundations of our public dialogue process and removes any filters between the elected Board members and their constituents.

Concept #8: General Manager Smith could create a staff-level advisory group similar to that provided by Director Diamond. This body, if developed by Mr. Smith, would not be subject to the Brown Act. The Board would be prohibited from providing direction or input on the composition or structure of the group. The Board could provide input on group ideas or projects similar to how staff seeks Board input on staff-led outreach efforts.

Concept #9: Disband ACAT in favor of quarterly outreach meetings in an open house format where participants attend. No person would be bound by the Brown Act. The Board may or may not participate through the meeting notification process. Meetings may be conducted on specific topics or general outreach related to the airport. A summary of findings may be produced and provided to the Board for use in policy directives.

Concept #10: The above concepts could be combined or modified as deemed advisable. For example, Concept #1 could be paired with Concept #8 so that the standing committee was involved with meetings of the staff-led group.

****Please find the *Restructuring ACAT for Increased Reach and Value by David Diamond* attached to this memorandum.**

*****Please find the attached BBK Major Provisions and Requirements of the Brown Act.**