From: Mike Mayo
To: Info
Cc: Robb Etnyre; Comments; David Diamond
Subject: Fee capture rate higher than 100%, for real
Date: Monday, July 27, 2026 9:20:10 AM
Attachments: dqGoniimnWle44BC.png
PLANEPASS landing fee demand.pdf

I was most amused ....

Found in .....
<https://truckeetahoeairport.com/board_meetings/391/view_file?file=tab+04a+-+trk+rfp+2025-03+vector+response+final.pdf>

PROPOSED SYSTEM OVERVIEW

Project Objective Musts

- **Demonstrate** the ability to achieve a **100%** or higher fee capture rate.

Fascinating ..... "100% or higher fee capture rate". Reminiscent of Trump's 400% reduction in costs.

Greater than 100% capture must, surely, mean charging fees when not warranted.

Well, fancy that, I got a demand from them for $20. For landing my glider on June 30th, apparently. (.pdf attached)

I searched https://truckeetahoeairport.com/ looking for fees. And I searched, and I searched. And I failed to find a list, or explanation, of 2026 fees.

Can you help??? For now, I am ignoring the demand.

Kind regards,
Mike Mayo

From:	9853275389424@proton.me
To:	Comments
Subject:	4. Employee Recognition and Awards Program
Date:	Tuesday, July 28, 2026 10:09:20 AM

President Diamond and Members of the Board,

After reviewing the District's policies, 2026 budget, internal audit report, July Board materials, and watching last week's meeting, I have a basic question:

What rules governed the performance bonuses issued in 2026?

The above documents do not provide a clear answer.

Policy Instruction 110 allows cash awards for "exceptional performance", but it also requires those payments to be reported to the Board at a public meeting. The June internal audit found that payments had not been reported as required.

That is not a minor oversight. The reporting requirement exists so the Board and the public can see how this authority is being used. Instead, a policy that appears to have been used rarely in the past became a recurring bonus program without the Board's knowledge.

At last week's meeting, Director Rohlf asked why one employee received $100 while another received $1,000. The General Manager did not point to written criteria, a formula, or defined award levels. He referred generally to effort, responsibility, overtime status, and supervisor recommendations.

That is not enough when public money is being distributed to selected employees.

The District should be able to answer a few basic questions:

What qualifies as "exceptional performance"?

How are employees considered for an award?

How is the amount of each award determined?

Are employees across departments evaluated under the same standards?

What documentation supports each payment?

Who reviews the awards for fairness and potential conflicts?

Without clear standards, the program will inevitably appear subjective and vulnerable to favoritism.

The funding also needs to be explained. The General Manager referred to a "pot of money" for bonuses, but the adopted budget does not appear to identify a separate performance-bonus program. The only budget item I found that could be the "pot of money" is "Employee Relations Activities" which is budgeted at $75,500.

The Board should determine if this is the budget item and whether it knowingly approved those funds for recurring cash awards to selected employees. My hunch is, likely not, since they had no idea this program was being executed by their General Manager. There is an important difference between budgeting for employee relations activities and establishing a discretionary compensation program. One should not be treated as authorization for the other without an explicit Board decision.

The Board should also ask whether these payments were truly for "exceptional performance" or for employees doing difficult work already associated with their positions. Directors and managers are compensated at higher levels to lead, make decisions, and oversee major projects. At last week's meeting, the General Manager also appeared to suggest that hourly employees' performance bonuses are calculated at a lesser amount because they are eligible for overtime.

That is a troubling basis for determining the value of an employee's "exceptional performance".

Overtime compensates hourly employees for additional hours worked; it is not a reward for "exceptional performance". Salaried employees also receive compensation for their additional time and responsibilities through higher salaries and additional leave benefits. Using overtime eligibility or authority level to reduce an hourly employee's bonus risks favoring the District's highest-paid employees over its lowest-paid employees.

Those factors reflect an employee's classification and regular compensation... not necessarily the quality or value of the "exceptional" work being recognized. Without written standards, the amount of each award appears to depend largely on subjective judgment.

This is not criticism of the employees who have received a bonus so far in 2026. The issue at hand is whether District leadership used a fair, transparent, and accountable process.

The Board should seriously consider pausing further bonuses until it decides whether this program should continue at all. Any future program should have clear criteria, defined award amounts, spending limits, a clearly identified funding source, and timely public reporting.

The public should not have to reconstruct an employee compensation program from an internal audit finding, a budget spreadsheet, a list buried in a Board packet with zero reference made by the presenting staff member, and questions raised by a single Board member.

<u>This is the responsibility of the entire Board.</u>

Every single director is accountable for ensuring that public funds are spent under clear rules and with meaningful oversight. The District has not shown that this program meets that standard.

The Board should fix that now.

Kindly,

Grant A.

Sent from Proton Mail for iOS.