

## MINUTES OF THE CC COMMUNICATIONS MANAGEMENT

155 N. Taylor St., Fallon, NV 89406  
March 5, 2026

### Call to Order:

The regular meeting of the CC Communications was called to order at 11:00 AM on March 5, 2026.

PRESENT: Commissioner Matt Hyde  
Commissioner Eric Blakey  
Commissioner Myles Getto  
General Manager Mark Feest  
Chief Financial Officer Jamie Hyde  
Administrative Assistant Shelly Bunyard

ABSENT:

### Public Comment:

Chair Matt Hyde asked if there was any public comment, but there was none.

### Verification of Posting of Agenda:

It was verified by Shelly Bunyard, Administrative Assistant, that the Agenda for this meeting was posted on the 27th day of February, 2026 between the hours of 1 pm and 5 pm at all of the locations listed on the Agenda, in accordance with NRS 241.

### Consideration and possible action re: Approval of Agenda as submitted or revised:

Commissioner Myles Getto made a motion to approve the agenda as submitted. Commissioner Eric Blakey seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

### Consideration and possible action re: Approval of Minutes of the meeting held on:

#### **A- February 5, 2026**

Commissioner Eric Blakey made a motion to approve the minutes of the meeting held on February 5, 2026 as submitted. Commissioner Myles Getto seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

### New Business:

#### **A- Consideration and possible action to approve the revised Information & Communications Technology (ICT) Manager job description establishing a Hybrid Remote work model for a hard-to-fill position.**

Mark Feest, CC Communications. We have been trying to fill this position for quite some time. We are using a combination of the group that is currently in there as well as some outside support. We are requesting to create this Hybrid Remote opportunity for an ICT Manager. The job description is attached. The main point to it is the integration of Hybrid Remote work expectations and eligibility. Essentially, we want the person to be here in Fallon for two weeks and commit to one year of working in office every other week. There will also be financial consideration of what it will cost us to get them here to Fallon. Other updates to the job description include:

- Clear definition of required onsite presence and travel cadence

- Updated responsibilities supporting remote operations, cybersecurity, digital collaboration, and enterprise-level ICT oversight
- Modernized minimum qualifications and preferred credentials
- Adjustments designed to expand recruiting reach, including consideration of out-of-area candidates who can meet travel expectations

I am looking for the opportunity to talk to these candidates and let them know that we are open to someone who is within one non-stop flight away and/or one time zone away for example, Phoenix, Salt Lake, Seattle, Portland, Bay Area and Los Angeles. If we have to expand it beyond that in the future if it doesn't work, then we will expand. I would like to see them arrive on a Sunday night and leave on a Friday schedule. I don't want a lot of travel time and travel expenses.

We have engaged with several search firms that have the same type of contract. They receive 25% of the person's first year of salary, if they refer someone and you hire them. We have done several Teams interviews with several people. Actually, we were referred someone yesterday who is willing to come to Fallon to do a second live interview. Maybe the remote position won't be necessary, but I still definitely need it as an option. We've had some good candidates, but they were unwilling to do a second interview without talking about working remotely. That is all I have on this. Do you have any questions?

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. I think we all understand the challenges of getting a high-level person. I think this might open up some opportunity.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. This is sort of an industry standard and is not anything new. It is just a tool that we have never had. I appreciate you bringing that forward.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. While we recognize that, I think you could end up in a slippery slope. Once you bring one person in successful and now you start having everyone wanting to work remote. We have to be prepared for that and how we make a legitimate differentiation where you say this job can't, but this job can. You need to be good at managing people in this new way. Trying this with a senior position that is hard to fill is the way to go.

Commissioner Myles Getto made a motion to approve the revised Information & Communications Technology (ICT) Manager job description establishing a Hybrid Remote work model for a hard-to-fill position. Commissioner Eric Blakey seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

**B- Consideration and possible action re: the adoption of Resolution 5-2026 pursuant to NRS 710.151(b), and relating to certain systems and assets utilized in providing services under NRS 710.**

Mark Feest, CC Communications. CC Communications owns and maintains certain systems and assets utilized for the provision of telecommunications services both inside and outside Churchill County, NV, including the Counties of Lyon, Washoe, Storey, Elko, Carson City, Mineral, and Nye,. NRS 710.151 requires that to sell or lease such systems, a resolution by the Board of County Commissioners must be passed to evaluate the propriety of a sale or lease.

NRS 710.151(3) provides that "adoption of a resolution . . . does not require a sale or lease to be completed". NRS 710.159(5) provides in pertinent part, "A meeting of the board of county commissioners held to consider the general objectives for a sale or lease . . . is not subject to the provisions of Chapter 241 or NRS". Thus, after adoption of the resolution, management and the board would meet to discuss objectives. That would not be subject to open public meetings. It is subject going backwards, if a sale were ever made then we would have to obtain those records and they would be made available to the public. We have done this twice in my tenure with CC Communications. The other time didn't result in any action. The Board will get the opportunity under this to hear from some consultants in the mergers and acquisitions field to see what's going on in the industry. We will be able to openly discuss the challenges that are ahead and what the prospects for the company are compared to what we think the value of the company would be today. That is not just a company as a whole but different parts of the company. We now are operating in Elko and now in Storey County. Elko is pretty far from us, but we chose to go there because they had an incumbent, Frontier, who had an all-copper plant. That seemed like a great opportunity and Elko is making money, but it is far. We want to look at everything we are doing and ask the question whether we should be doing all of it, or some of it. Should we not be doing some of it and reallocating some of those resources to another area that may be better aligned with what we're doing going forward. To ask all of those questions, we will need that confidentiality. I don't bring every time someone wants to have a conversation about maybe talking about selling the company. There are some very legitimate private equity players in the market that are looking to enter the State of Nevada. There are also companies adjacent to Nevada that are looking to enter the State of Nevada and want to acquire their first customers and then expand from there. I am making no comment on whether or not these ideas are or anything. I feel like I have received so many of these inquiries from very legitimate entities that it my fiduciary duty to inform the Board in a confidential manner what those entail. The Board should give me directions when we are approached with these inquiries. What is the level of interest someone may have that you feel should be brought to the Board in the future regardless of how this resolution turns out? I don't want anyone to think I'm bringing this to you because I have a pitch of a sale. That is not what is going on.

Matt Hyde, CC Communications. I appreciate your last comment very much. This isn't a pitch of a sale; it just gives us an avenue to think about the future of Northern Nevada different ideas.

Eric Blakey, CC Communications. Its industry standard for this type of thing to happen every year anyways. It's no big deal to me. This is something that is another tool.

Commissioner Eric Blakey made a motion to approve Resolution No. 5-2026, a resolution to evaluate the propriety of receiving offers for the sale or lease of certain telecommunications systems and assets utilized to provide services under NRS 710. Commissioner Myles Getto seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

**C- Consideration and possible action re: determination of an appropriate process for replacing the incumbent GM/CEO, including solicitation of applications, initial review, Board interviews, selection, timeline, and other matters related thereto.**

Mark Feest, CC Communications. Last month, Commissioner Blakey, Jamie Hyde and a Tech went to the NTCA's RTime Conference. It is the biggest rural incumbent show there is. I think one thing Commissioner Blakey heard about was looking at the company to determine its status

and where you fit in the market. I didn't go but from Commissioner Blakey's notes they had a lot of succession planning.

I happened to go to MetroConnect which is a competitive provider's and metro ethernet fiber conference in the same month. One of the main topics was succession planning staffing in the industry. The second thing is private equity money and how that flows into the industry and helping folks expand who are able to take in private equity money.

I met with a couple of people from rural ILECs who are part of the subsidy system which are companies like CC Communications. One person I had met had attempted to replace themselves and it has gone on for the last six months. They offered the job to a person they didn't negotiate a contract with, and they offered the position to a second person who had already taken a position somewhere else. It got me thinking that we need to get started on replacement.

I want to go over a couple of things on succession planning that was brought up at RTime Conference both Long-term and emergency plan. What do you do when your GM/CEO gets hit by a bus? The Board needs to be specific about what they are looking for in the next GM/CEO. Commissioner Blakey's notes stated that selecting a CEO is the most important job of the Board. The biggest mistakes when hiring a new CEO. No plan if wrong person is hired. Waiting until CEO announces retirement. Failure to understand the development time needed to replace the CEO. Failing to plan for emergency situations. Poor communication with employees can create uncertainty. Assuming that an internal successor without objective assessment. Ignoring mistakes from the past, which I'm not sure what that meant. I think we avoid the assuming that an internal successor without an objective assessment. A lot of these companies are co-ops and can do whatever they want. They will never have any process at all for interviewing people. They will just say whoever has been here the longest will get the job. I think we have something built in that we have to go through a process that is competitive to internal and external candidates.

I think, what I've proposed in number two addresses the issues that Commissioner Blakey had as his take aways. I will go through this now.

Incumbent GM/CEO will retire no later than July 31, 2027. I gave that date because I feel like our timeline to get to the point where we are hiring someone is this summer before we're offering. If it's an external candidate, they will not be here until this summer. It would be difficult for someone to move here, if they're told you get hired by the board, you're going to get promoted after a confirmation meeting when the incumbent gives notice of leaving but you have to wait an indetermined amount of time. I put that date in because if an external candidate comes here this summer, you're asking them to wait about a year. There are two jobs on the NTCA board right now. They don't disclose how long they are asking a person to wait. I did talk to one of them and found out they were asking eighteen months for them to wait. That is a decision of the Board about what that timeframe will be if they go with option two.

Incumbent has the right to provide 30 days' notice and receive pay out for unused vacation and sick leave. However, I don't not feel comfortable providing only 30 days' notice. I believe

based on other postings I've seen and other reposting's where they don't hire someone the first time around or they say this has a closing date for applications and were a month past the closing date and they are still accepting applications. I believe 30 days would leave you in a bind. I'd like to have a right to give 30 days' notice without feeling like I'm leaving you in a bad position. The agenda item is intended to work through the Board's preference with respect to (1) timeline, (2) recruitment and solicitation of applicants, (3) evaluation, screening and selection of those that will be interviewed by the Board subject to open meetings and public records, (4) Interviews, (5) offer and negotiation, (6) model proposals. We will discuss those two proposals. One is just a traditional flash cut, I will give notice the Board will post the job announcement, and you hope the person gets here before I leave and there is an overlap you feel is enough. The second option is that we hire someone as an Assistant General Manager designated as the GM/CEO in waiting. It's up to you whether we can or cannot give them a drop-dead date, that no later than we can hold that to offer the job to them and have that as part of negotiation. The Board that preceded you approved the Assistant General Manager with the GM/CEO in waiting job description. Those were different people on the Board then; I wanted to make sure you understood that there are options and you are the ones making the decision now.

If it's not a problem for you the first thing is working through the timeline, are we on the same page that we believe this timeline I've put out there, publishing for approximately 45 days, 15 days to review and screen applicants and one month to conduct interviews and visits. At around day 90 we will be offering and completing negotiations. By day 120 the person will be here and there will be absolute minimal overlap. In the event you want to go with a flash cut hire where we basically have two weeks' overlap, that is all they're going to get. If you want to go with the second option where we have a GM/CEO in waiting, I still think the timeline is valid, the overlap just extends. Do you feel that that timeline is reasonable or unreasonable?

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. My personal opinion is option two. I think it's irresponsible for an inadequate overlap. There is a lot to this position. I would like to go with the GM in waiting option. I would love to hear your thoughts on it from my fellow commissioners. I think that is the responsible thing to do. I'm fine with the timeline being tied to that.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. I think the timeline to hire someone is correct. The question will be is when do you want to start that timeline. How much timeline do we want the new person to overlap with you. I know I want more than two weeks and more than thirty days. That is just my personal opinion. At this point, we have to keep all of our options open as far as how we are going to hire. Are we going to do the in waiting or are we going to do the external. We can talk about it a little more or we can have them both open to see how it works out.

Myles Getto, Commissioner. The timeline looks good to me. I'm leaning more towards the GM in waiting personally. I think that's in line with the company and is better for the next person in line. Those are my thoughts.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. I think it adds an opportunity to put a succession plan in place for the future. If there is an opportunity to get an Assistant GM it will be a good opportunity to have someone ready.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. I don't have a problem with that. When the new person comes on board, they can work together to create an emergency plan and a succession plan. Mark knows where the direction is going and the new person may not. They can work on that together. That is a product they can produce before you leave. We just have to keep our options open. I don't want to go down one solid road if it's not going to work out.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. I added that in the event we go with the in-waiting model, that taking the timeline above we will get them this summer, and they will have about a year overlap. While I have seen two recent examples of this model, I have no information of how many applicants they produced. If people are uncomfortable with this and it's not producing applicants, I think we go through the posting period and decide is that applicant adequate to move forward to interviews. Then you do the interviews and if you don't like what you have then maybe we have to repost the position and state this is traditional and you come here. I think it provides flexibility.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. What would be the max overlap time? Is it eighteen months?

Mark Feest, CC Communications. It's difficult for me to say. There are two of these positions posted in this manner. Neither of those positions posted give an overlap time. I've talked to one of the people who posted the position and they are telling applicants it's eighteen months. I don't know the other company and didn't ask them. I think we can negotiate that when you decide who the right person is. If it's an internal candidate, it will make things much more smooth because somebody doesn't have to move across the country. The question is the overlap time frame a year or more. I think it changes a person's evaluation of it. Maybe the best time to set the overlap time is when you have selected the person.

Unless I'm told otherwise, we will publish this on the NTCA's job board, our website and go from there as we see applicants. Unless you can think of someplace else better or additional. The big question that needs to be answered is the screening of applicants. The pairing that down to the group that the Board sees and becomes public record. Do you want to screen all of them if you don't want to screen them what is your target for interviews? Is it three quality candidates? How will we create the screening team? Who do you want on the screening team? I think Commissioner Blakey has some input from the NTCA meeting regarding whether or not your incumbent should have input.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. There were a lot of advantages in the existing General Manager being part of the screening process. When you ask the question of the cons, I never received any answers. If a board is satisfied with their General Manager, is he part of assisting and where does his responsibilities stop.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. I don't think there is a better expert than Mark for what CC Communications needs. For me it would be a yes for him to be part of the screening.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. Since we're going to publish this in a week and the posting will be open until the end of April and at the next April meeting I can bring to you a list of the

people that will be on the screening committee. I will throw out some names to people I've thought about. We have a former HR person that may be willing to work on it. I was thinking of only three people myself. We have someone else who has a lot of knowledge in this area, but I have to verify that they don't have interest in applying for the job. I can bring you a few names and you can let me know if those names are good or not. We can have that approved at the April meeting so that we have our screening committee, if that's ok with you.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. Sounds good to me.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. When the screening committee is looking at this, in section 3.2, I listed out characteristics and skills:

1. ILEC experience – That will be company that has to comply with the NECA rules.
2. CLEC experience – We are also a CLEC but someone else can be one and not be ILEC.
3. ISP experience – Person could come from a Wireless ISP, fiber or whatever.
4. Transport fiber experience
5. Reporting to CEO experience
6. Reporting to Board experience – Is someone who has reported directly to the Board important to you? The categories in NTCA on a revenue category are 0 - 5 million, 5 – 10 million, 10 – 15 million, 15 -20 million, 20 – 25 million, 25 – 50 million and 50 million and over. We are a category 5. That means you have 4 categories of people and the salaries for CFO, CTO, COO and CEO are almost directly tied to revenue. You have people in categories in 1 – 4 that could get up to a pretty good raise by coming here. You might find people who are willing to apply that have had the position at a company of 13 – 25 employees. Is that important to you that they have sat in the chair to report directly to the Board or not?
7. Prior GM/CEO experience
8. Rural community experience – I will guess that we will get applicants that have been rift at big companies who will apply. How applicable is their experience is the question?
9. Nevada ties
10. Technology
11. Finance/Accounting
12. Regulatory
13. Marketing
14. OSP
15. CS/CX

This is as in filling in the names, I think we can do at the April meeting if you can literally rank these by number. There can be ties and you can say two or equal. That will give that group that's chosen for the three to do screening an idea of how you rank these primary categories of skill sets we will be seeing on applications.

Is there any desire to have a video call that the Board participates in or could that just be handled by the screening committee?

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. I don't see a lot value in that.

Myles Getto, Commissioner. Neither do I.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. Are there any other concerns you would like to bring up on this?

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. I don't like number 9 on the list. I think when we're looking at a hard to fill position and we say Nevada Ties.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. Ok, you can rank them at the next meeting and that will be number 16.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. Or we can remove the Nevada Ties.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. Ok

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. You're looking at a very small pool. When you shrink that pool just to Nevada Ties.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. It almost eliminates it quite honestly, because in Nevada there are no Co-ops, they are all family-owned companies.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. Right.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. You're probably not going to find somebody that fits any of these bills unless they are already an internal candidate.

The Interview part doesn't have to be decided today. I do think it will need to be decided by the April meeting, which is the role of the incumbent providing:

1. Approve and provide interview questions and scoring rubric?
2. Available for commentary or feedback on interviewees?
3. Score the interviewees for consideration by the Board?
4. Ask the questions?
5. None
6. Other

The next item, I anticipate there is a pretty fair chance we will get an internal candidate that will cause a commissioner to have to recuse themselves. This is a follow up question for the District Attorney's Office. There is an ethics commission opinion saying this internal candidate may apply and it will require recusal of the related board member. I think you have a policy on file that doesn't exactly align with that. That issue will need to be resolved. We are working with the District Attorney on this. I don't know if you have a comment on it yet or you still are taking time to review.

Wade Carner, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney. I still have to do some research on that.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. Ok. That will need to be resolved fairly quickly so we know what we will be screening on that applicant. If that is, and I believe it will be resolved to where that applicant can apply pursuant to the ethics board opinion, and we get a recusal and two board members will vote to make any action. You can think about this. I'm not sure if the District Attorney will have an issue with this, but you can have a third person on the interview panel. They will interview and score but will not vote. You can see their score, and they will act as though they're on the panel, but it still comes down to the two board members vote. I do think this is something to think about if there is a recusal. Are we just going to go straight with two people asking the questions and two people scoring the candidates? This doesn't really need to be resolved before the April meeting.

Offer and negotiation. I believe that the County Manager handled the negotiation with the new County Manager.

Chris Spross, County Manager. No, it was the District Attorney's Office.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. It doesn't have to be made today. A decision will have to be made on who will be negotiating once you offer somebody the position and the parameters of the offer. The main part of the parameter or offer is are we going to continue to peg our salary to the NTCA compensation report for revenue union region and median bonus and perks. Right now, every job is pegged that is not a union job to that scenario. We need to know that we will continue to peg those salaries to that. There is one for an Assistant General Manager and that is what it currently is. It was pegged to that.

We will have to establish a date no later than the end date. Do you think we have to have a firm date or does that come down to negotiations with the selected candidate.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. I think it's too early to give a firm date. I think you can almost to a firm date at the interview process.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. We have already approved where there's a PERS savings that goes into a 457 account. That will also be in a contract negotiation with them. A severance package in the event of termination without cause. I have that in my contract. I only have 90 days and that is in my new contract. I have no need to move in the event that you fire me without cause. Earlier in my career, I would have had to have picked up and moved to get a similar job. I had a whole year in my severance package, and I'll say frankly I wouldn't move across country for a job of this type, that if I am fired without cause, I get a year's salary. I think if we hire an internal candidate, we have to treat them exactly the same. I don't think we need to treat them differently. My recommendation is we go back to the one-year severance package. They get a vehicle allowance and cell phone or cell phone allowance. They have the choice exercise these options or not. The standard in the industry for moving expenses is you either get a one-time payment without receipts which is a taxable event for someone, or it's capped and they turn in receipts. Often times advanced and then capped. There is a limit on time between offer and acceptance. We don't want to drag that out. We want to negotiate a contract within a

couple of weeks of the offer being made. If we don't come to a conclusion we move onto the candidate. Are there any other considerations or concerns about any of those items?

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. I would like to go back to the screening committee. You may or may not know I have grief with screening committees.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. I have heard that somewhere.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. So, I won't explain it. I feel like we are capable of screening it with your assistance. I know if we appoint a screening committee that their actions become public record. Is there any reason, if we got say three to five candidates or less than eight candidates can we just be the screening committee. If there were twenty candidates, they would go through the first round of screening, and we would be the second round of screening to get to where our interview number is. If we want to do a interview number of three to five and you have twelve candidates, then he will get it down to a number of eight candidates and then we will pick out of those eight, with his comments.

Wade Carner, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney. The only thing I would add to that though is that screening would have to happen in a public meeting.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. I understand.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. We just need to make sure we are clear on this. If we have a screening committee of three people and we have ten applicants and we forward three, the remaining seven people no one will know they applied. The applicants that are not forwarded will not become public record.

Wade Carner, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney. They are public records, but they could be subject to confidentiality provisions that would limit disclosure of those records. It would just depend on the situation.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. Ok. I will say from an industry standard, this is the kind of thing we deal with as being the only county owned company. When most companies are co-operative and these things are not ever public in any manner. Private-owned and family-owned companies are the same. I will tell you from my experience that I would not apply to a company that would make me a public record unless I am guaranteed an interview. In fact, when I had applied for a job in the past, I put in my letter that this is confidential until I get an offer. I think it will have a chilling effect to have a screening that is public record.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. I understand that we have had this discussion before. If they want the job, then they want the job. Can't be scared (inaudible)

Mark Hyde, Commissioner. He isn't saying that if he gets an applicant from another rural community and they know that they've applied. They could not have a job when they get back. It's easy to say if you want the job then want the job.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. When someone is screened and we get down to three or five, it might become public? They will feel pretty good and think at least I'm getting an interview.

I'm in the game here. If they don't even know if they're in the game, I think that's where they might have a lack of comfort. It's whatever the board wants to do. That is also something that we can wait to see. We can create the screening committee, and we can wait to make the final decision on whether that screening committee is the only screening based on the number of applicants we receive. If the board wants.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. I think you're going to be hard pressed to have more than three or four qualified applicants to screen. At that point, it would be a big deal.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. The number of applicants makes your risk go down. I'm not concerned. That's the kind of person I am and maybe everybody is not that way. I understand where you are.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. There's a better than average chance that I won't be involved in this at all.

Myles Getto, Commissioner. I would like to lead with the one screening with the board of three screeners and whatever amount they bring us the top five candidates.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. I can live with that. Only because Commissioner Hyde let me know we have a limited candidate pool. There could be twenty applicants, but we know that some will instantly not be qualified. I just want to make sure that we are being as fair and honest as we can be. No judgment on you or your committee. At the end of the day, we have to put ourselves responsible for who we hire.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. This is one thing that I would like the legislation to change. The hiring process of such positions. It puts us in a bad spot.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. County Manager Spross will retire before we are done and here, we go again. I don't want that to hang us up. I'm sure we can work through that once we determine the number of applicants we have.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. We have had this in the past at the School District when we tried to move six forward and two dropped out because if the School District finds out they're looking to leave. I felt that they didn't feel very confident they could get the position. That was my theory. I'm good with what you two want.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. Can I get the District Attorney's opinion on using someone other than being a board member on the interview committee.

Wade Carner, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney. I am sorry. What is your question.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. If I have to recuse myself, how long before you know if we can put someone in this seat who can simply score and not vote.

Wade Carner, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney. For screening purposes prior to interviews? We couldn't replace you if that's what you're asking.

Matt Hyde, Commissioner. Even it's not to vote just to score the interview.

Wade Carner, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney. Correct, the interviews would be handled by this board. We couldn't be (inaudible) by someone else.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. I just wanted to make sure.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. I think a lot was talked about. I think where we are is, if I heard correctly, that we need a motion for approval of proposal one. Based on this discussion we have a lot of things that need to be refined. Should we go with proposal one timeline? We will post the position and get that portion started. We will come back to the April meeting with a summary of what was talked about here and that will get voted up and down as the process. Would that work?

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. That will give us time to rate our characteristics and skills and then we can hash all of that out at the meeting.

Wade Carner, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney. If the timeline is adopted, then you can do the posting. We can solidify the process at the next meeting.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. Ok. It's a motion to approve proposal number two timeline.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. At this time at this juncture should he be excluded from any action to any verbal comments any thoughts about this matter.

Mark Feest, CC Communications. No.

Wade Carner, Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney. At this point no, because there are no applicants to be considered.

Eric Blakey, Commissioner. I just want to make sure. I want everything as clean as possible.

Commissioner Myles Getto made a motion to approve proposal number two with noted modifications. Commissioner Matt Hyde seconded the motion, which carried by unanimous vote.

**Reports: General Manager Report:**

1. Network Update
  - a. Transport
    - i. Phase II engineering consulting SoW (edge routers and core) project planning and resource allocation.
      1. Move routers to edge and Increase utilization of Neptune gear (resiliency)
      2. Implement NNI's and work on Colo agreements for partners in Nevada
      3. Increase redundancy
    - ii. Reviewing dark fiber lease options for statewide network
      1. Fibers owed to CC Communications under Switch Agreements
      2. NDOT Conduit Swap opportunities

- 3. New Build requirements
      - iii. Analyzing alternative Ribbon equipment metro overlay
  - b. Access
    - i. DHCP+ Server upgrades. This is a system by system cutover to a JSI product and support. This is intended to reduce address issues and reduce response time in the event we have an issue.
      - ii. C15
        - 1. Complete
        - 2. TNS Contract complete for new Sigtran to replace SS7
        - 3. Transitioning to Sigtran
        - 4. This requires professional services, which continues to be difficult to schedule.
        - 5. Training continues
- 2. Storey County
  - a. Virginia City and Gold Hill Construction is complete
    - i. Installations continue
  - b. Engineering on VC Highlands in progress
    - i. Working on VC Highlands schedule
    - ii. Coordinating marketing with Storey County PIO
- 3. YPT
  - a. Environmental complete. Ordering equipment
  - b. Working on lining up YPT, contractor, and internal resources to break ground
  - c. Working through issues with wireless contractor after the unexpected passing of original contractor.
- 4. FPST
  - a. Equipment ordering in process
  - b. Environmental in progress
  - c. Aligning schedules and anticipate starting within 3 weeks of environmental review being completed.
  - d. Working through issues with wireless contractor after the unexpected passing of original contractor.
- 5. Te Moak
  - a. With ITCN
- 6. WRPT
  - a. Requires re-engineering and resubmittal to NTIA [resubmitted]
  - b. Working through issues with wireless contractor after the unexpected passing of original contractor.
- 7. NTIA
  - a. On Schedule
- 8. HR
  - a. Continuing interviews for ISP positions
  - b. Working to schedule fly in for a candidate
  - c. Exploring contract services such as fractional CTO
  - d. Open Construction/OSP position

9. NTCA and Metro Connect Conferences Recap/Discussion
  - a. Commissioner Blakey, Jamie Hyde and one ISP Tech attended RTIME (NTCA)
  - b. I attended Metro Connect (Metro Ethernet, Access , and Competitive fiber conference)
  - c. Themes
    - i. Competition from Wireless and LEO X2
      1. Penetration rate impacts
      2. ARPU impacts
      3. CAPEX impacts
      4. Differentiation between FTTH and other technologies is important
    - ii. Supply chain issues x2
    - iii. Consolidation in the industry X2 / M&A activity, PE and inorganic business growth
    - iv. Regulatory/legislative threats
      1. April NTCA Hill visits?
    - v. Staffing X2
      1. GM/CEO
      2. Succession Planning
        - a. Long-term and Emergency (Commissioner Blakey's notes)
        - b. Board needs to be specific in what they are looking for in next GM/CEO (Commissioner Blakey's notes)
        - c. Selecting CEO is most important job of Board (Commissioner Blakey's notes)
      3. Biggest mistakes when hiring new CEO (Commissioner Blakey's Notes)
        - a. No plan if wrong person is hired
        - b. Waiting until CEO announces retirement
        - c. Failure to understand the development time needed to replace the CEO
        - d. Failing to plan for emergency situations
        - e. Poor communication with employees, creating uncertainty
        - f. Assume internal successor without objective assessment
        - g. Ignoring mistakes from the past

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

**Affidavit of Posting:**


**Public Comment:**

Chair Matt Hyde asked if there was any public comment, but there was none.

**Adjournment:**


The meeting was adjourned at 11:59 a.m.

APPROVED:   
Matt Hyde, Chairman

APPROVED:   
Eric Blakey, Vice Chairman

APPROVED:   
Myles Getto, Commissioner

  
Shelly Bunyard, Administrative Assistant

  
Mark Feest, General Manager/CEO