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Freedman: And announce when it started to the Chair, please.

Unknown: Recording is in progress, Chair Stoldal.

Stoldal: Great. Thank you very much. I’d like to call to order the Nevada State Board of Museums for September 24, 19--excuse me, 2021. Let me ask if this meeting has been properly posted.

Unknown: Yes, sir, it has.

Stoldal: Please call the roll, and determine if we have a quorum.

Unknown: Robert Stoldal?

Stoldal: Present.

Unknown: Michelle Schmitter? Courtney Mooney?

Mooney: Here.

Unknown: Sarah Cowie?

Cowie: Here.

Unknown: Doris Dwyer?

Dwyer: Here.

Unknown: Mercedes de la Garza?
De la Garza: Here.


Ostrovsky: Here.

Unknown: Janet Petersen?

Petersen: Here.

Unknown: Seth Schorr? Anthony Timmons? We do have a quorum.

Stoldal: Okay. Did you indicate that Dan Markoff is here?

Unknown: I didn’t get a response that Dan Markoff is here.

Stoldal: I see Dan on a video coming through.

Unknown: Okay. I will mark him off, sir.

Palmer: This is Rebecca Palmer. I notice that Michelle Schmitter is here.

Unknown: She is here? Michelle Schmitter?

Schmitter: Here.

Unknown: Okay. Yes. Okay.

Stoldal: We do in fact have a--have a quorum. A couple of--

Unknown: Yes, sir.

Stoldal: --a couple of board announcements. As indicated, this meeting is being recorded. And even though it’s being recorded, please identify yourself for the record, so it’s easy for the automatic transcription to (inaudible) who you are, as well as the rest of the board. And then secondly, the items that are indicated on your agenda with--for possible action, are the only items that we can in fact take action on. The others are reports or for discussion. And second, I would like to introduce our two newest members, and with the wonderful announcement that for the first time--

Recording: Recording in progress.

Stoldal: --for the first time in I think more than a year, we now have a full board, and please record that Anthony Timmons is on board with us now. I don’t think we got a note earlier. But we do have our two newest members, Courtney Mooney
and Michelle Schmitter. Courtney, welcome. It’s nice to see you again. Courtney and I spent a good deal of time together working in historic preservation in the City of Las Vegas, where she was the lead on the Historic Preservation Office for the city, and fought many successful battles to save different places in Las Vegas. Good morning, Courtney.

Mooney: Good morning. I’m not sure if you’ve all read my bio, so--I think you have. I’ll skip the boring stuff. I’m an architectural historian with North Wind Resource Consulting, and Bob mentioned our long sordid history at the city. And I just wanted to say that, you know, when I was nominated, I jumped at the chance to apply, because this is such an important board, and with an incredible, great group of people. And the board has such a lot of responsibility, and I felt that I could contribute too, and hopefully in a meaningful way to the board. And selfishly, I’m always looking for ways to learn more about the history of our state. Because just in looking through today’s agenda I saw several places and resources that I’ve never heard of, and I’m born and raised here. So that was super exciting to just kind of, you know, jump into that. So I’m looking forward to hopefully meeting everyone in person someday, and thanks for having me.

Stoldal: Great. Thank you, Courtney. Michelle?

Schmitter: Okay. Well, following Courtney here, hi, Courtney. I was very pleased to have been asked to serve on this board. I have my graduate degree in arts administration. I’m now working at the (inaudible) management and historic preservation. So this is perfectly suited for my qualifications. I’ve worked as an executive director of museums and historic sites for many years, and then I transitioned into healthcare philanthropy. So I have a lot of knowledge about gifts, restricted and unrestricted, and gift acceptance policies and fundraising. And then in 2016 I started my own firm. Many of you know who Mella Harmon is. When she left the state, she asked if I would take over her projects at Lake Tahoe doing historic determinations. And when they became too many projects, that’s when I started my firm. So I--right now I’m a historic building consultant, architectural historian, and I also do fundraising when asked and interpretation projects, which I really enjoy, because there’s so much history in this state. That’s been the funnest part for me, going out there and uncovering some great bit of history about a resource that we don’t know, and sharing it with the client. So thank you for asking me to be on the board.

Stoldal: Welcome. You are welcome. And with the two of you, a great deal of knowledge and experience come to the board. As far as board logistics, just a minor one. We’ll take a break probably about--right about 10:00, 9:45, 10:15, in that area, and then a lunch break of about 30 minutes somewhere between 11:45 and 12:30, depending on where we are in the agenda. We’ve got a lot of important--the agenda is always full of importance. I don’t want to say that this one’s any different, but a lot of interesting items on today’s agenda. Let’s move
on to public comment. Myron, is there anything else that you would like to announce at this point before we move forward?

Freedman: No, sir.

Stoldal: Okay. Thank you. Public comment. This is agenda item 4. Public comment is welcome by the board. A period of public comment will be allowed after the discussion of each action item on the agenda, but before voting on that item. Because of time consideration, a period for public comment by each speaker may be limited to three minutes, at the discretion of the chair, and the speaker is urged to avoid repetition of comments made by previous speakers. Pursuant to Governor Sisolak’s Declaration of Emergency Directive 006, Section 2, public comment options may include, without limitation, written public comment submitted to the public board via mail or email or telephone. Myron, is there anybody on the staff, or yourself or the staff, that has received any public comment that should be included at this time?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. I have not received any public comment. I’m checking my email now, and I see no public comment at this time.

Stoldal: As far as the members of the board, have you received any public comment that should be included in the public record at this time? Okay. Seeing--

Markoff: Dan Markoff, no, sir, I haven’t. Have you taken roll yet? ‘Cause I just got in on the meeting.

Stoldal: Well, we did, and we counted you as here.

Markoff: Okay. Thank you.

Stoldal: Myron, and the board members, if you receive any public comment regarding any action item on the--on today’s agenda, please bring that forward before we actually vote on that action item. Seeing and hearing none, we will move on to item number--

Williams: Mr. Chair?

Stoldal: I’m sorry. Please go ahead.

Williams: I’m sorry. This is Marla McDade Williams. I’m on your Zoom. I didn’t submit any public comment written, but I wanted to just, if I could, have a few minutes.

Stoldal: You--certainly.

Williams: Thank you very much. For the record, Marla McDade Williams with Strategies 360, and as many of you know, we are the contract lobbyists with the Reno-
Sparks Indian Colony. I just wanted to take an opportunity first to welcome the two new members. It’s a pleasure to see you on the board, and hopefully we’ll be able to continue to work with you as things move forward. There are two items that I wanted to comment on, on your agenda. One is from the State Office of Historic Preservation related to the inquiries for potential NRHP amendments to Bahsahwahbee swamp cedars traditional cultural property listing. If there could be an opportunity just to explain a little bit more during that presentation about what that means. I’m not exactly familiar with what an inquiry for a potential listing means. And then I just wanted to extend my appreciation to Anna Camp and to the Divisions of Museums and History for the report on the NAGPRA activities that are written and submitted in your packets. I appreciate being able to see that. And then finally, just, you know, I’ve talked with Anna quite a bit about it, but anybody who has the opportunity would encourage continued inquiry into the regulations related to the private property permits. It’s been an extensive amount of time. And I will also do my inquiries, but I think it’s way beyond time, and those regulations need to get moved forward. And I know it’s no delay on the part of Museums and History, but just wanted to say if you get an opportunity, ask, and encourage someone to keep moving those forward. Thank you very much.

Stoldal: Okay. Thank you. Let’s move on to agenda item number 5, which is the acceptance of the minutes. So there are three items there, all for possible action. 5a is the June 11, 2021 special board meeting. All of these have a transcription—a full transcription that is available on the—on our website. I look for a motion and a discussion on 5a, the June 11th meeting.

De la Garza: Mercedes, for the record. I move to accept minutes for June 11, 2021.

Stoldal: We have a motion. Do we have a second? Dan? We read your lips.

Markoff: Dan Markoff, I’ll second it.

Stoldal: We have a motion, I’m sorry, a second from Dan. Further discussion on this motion?

Ward: Mr. Chair, for the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general, and this is just for the two new members. They can vote as to form, but not as to content, because obviously they weren’t at these meetings. So if they do vote and decide to vote, they say they vote to form and not as to content in approving the minutes. Thank you, sir.

Stoldal: Without getting into a long discussion, what does that mean that they could vote for form?

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. Under the open meeting law we are--we, being the board, are supposed to approve minutes. So basically
they’re saying they would be voting, “I approve to the form that we have minutes for these minutes, and I approve that these minutes were done. I can’t,” this is them speaking, “I can’t approve to the content, because I was not here.” This happens a lot when we have small boards, and you have many people that are not on, not there, or interchanging, and if that ever happens, you would never be able to “approve” the minutes under the open meeting law. So it is permissible for board members to say “I approve” as to the form, but not as to the content. Like I said, that happens a lot when you have small boards, or else you’d never be able to have the quorum from the people that were at the meetings in previous meetings.

Stoldal: Okay.

Ward: That’s it in a nutshell.

Stoldal: That’s fine.

Ward: But if we do have a, you know, a quorum, they could just say, “I’m not gonna vote. I wasn’t here.”

Stoldal: Okay. Great. All right. Harry, thank you. See? I thought I just knew everything about our open meeting law. There you go. So we have a motion. We have a second. Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say, “Aye.”

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Seeing none, motion carries unanimously with the chair voting in favor and those in attendance. 5b, which is our June 18, 2021 board meeting. Again, transcription is available on the website. Any discussion? If not, we’ll look for a motion to approve.

Markoff: Dan Markoff, so moved.

Stoldal: Anybody--

Hees: Randy Hees, question for discussion.

Stoldal: Good.

Hees: Are we going to mention the fact that the transcription currently on the website is four pages shorter than the original one? The one that was posted in July and then removed.
Stoldal: The transcription there is a full transcription of the board meeting from the time that I called it into action to the time that it was officially adjourned. There is no--nothing missing from the board meeting.

Hees: Okay.

Stoldal: For a mo--we have a motion. Do we have a second?

Dwyer: This is Doris Dwyer. I second.

Stoldal: We have a motion and we have a second. Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say, “Aye.”

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously with the chair voting in favor again, also those in attendance. I didn’t do the count, actually. Do--how many--do we have 10 or 11 board members? One, two, three, four--

Schorr: Seth Schorr, for the record. Joined about 10 minutes late. Sorry, everybody.

Stoldal: You are welcome. We are just on item number 5, in the middle of that. So welcome. So with Seth joining us, does that mean we have 11?

Unknown: Yes, sir. That means we have 11.

Stoldal: Okay.

Schorr: And I--Seth Schorr, for the record. I have been sitting here quietly, so I did vote positively on the last couple of votes. Thank you.

Stoldal: Well, we felt that ESP. Item 5c, August 4, 2021, our special board meeting. Again, the transcription of the board meeting, and I’ll emphasize these are transcriptions of when the board meeting is called into session and when the board meeting officially adjourns. August 4, 2021. I’ll look for a motion to approve.

Markoff: Dan Markoff, so moved.

Stoldal: We have a motion to approve. Do we have a second?

Schorr: Seth Schorr--

De la Garza: Mercedes--

Schorr: --second.
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Stoldal: We now have a motion, and we have a second from Seth Schorr. Further discussion? Board? General public? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor say, “Aye.”

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Seeing none, motion carries unanimously with those in attendance and the chair voting in favor. Let’s move on to number 6, which is the calendar for our next meeting, which includes the--our last one of the year and our March and June 2022 meetings. We have a tentative date that we voted on, tentative date and location, December the 9th and 10th, 2021, Southern Nevada. Myron, is there anything you want to add at this point? Does it look like (inaudible) that we’ll be able to meet in person in December? I mean, have we focused that way?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. Well, I recommend we do focus on having an in-person meeting. Of course, I’ve done my best to control the pandemic, and have failed miserably. But nevertheless, we can plan on that and hope for the best.

Stoldal: Well, we do appreciate your effort, and you’ve had great success in many areas. So we will--is there any further board discussion? I’m assuming that--Sarah?

Cowie: Sarah Cowie, for the record. Yeah, I was just curious if it’s in person will there also be a Zoom option in addition to that? And I ask in part because I can’t attend at all on the Thursday, because I teach all day on Thursdays, but I could potentially join by Zoom on Friday or for part of Thursday.

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. In the past we always had a call-in component to the meetings.

Cowie: Okay.

Freedman: And I don’t see why we can’t maintain similarly with Zoom or something like that.

Cowie: Okay. Thank you.

Stoldal: I think Sarah makes a good point. There are going to be occasions where board members will not be able to attend in person once we get back to in-person meetings, and there are lots of hybrids out there. But conference calls have always been a last resort, and I would look that our first step would be to have at our in-person meeting at least the--an option of a Zoom or webinar. I know there’s two or three apps, Webex and so forth. So if we can kind of keep, Myron, that in mind as we move forward to ask to have that. So other than that,
that stands then, our dates. And several board members have requested that we do look out and potentially schedule dates, even if it’s like the third Wednesday of every quarter or something like that. Any discussion from the board as to when they would like to set the dates and locations? Generally if we have met in Southern Nevada, the first one would be in the north, Carson City, Reno. Hopefully we could go do Stewart. I think we, from my standpoint, put that back on the agenda. Board members? Jan?

Petersen: Jan Petersen, for the record. My only comment is December 9th and 10th will be the last days of the national finals rodeo, so we might want to meet in Boulder City or even Lost City. As much as I’d like to go to the State Museum in Las Vegas, rooms are gonna be tight and expensive.

Stoldal: I think that I won’t disagree with you. But I think that the challenge--didn’t we have an Internet challenge out in Boulder City? Has that changed?

Petersen: Well, yeah.

Schorr: Seth Schorr, for the record. I’m sorry. What was the date again?

Stoldal: The--December 9th and 10th.

Schorr: Okay. Thank you.

Freedman: Mr. Chair?

Stoldal: Yes.

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. Because of the pandemic, I think whatever location we choose, we should make sure there’s enough space in the room that people can sit, you know, a certain distance apart. That would be a consideration.

Stoldal: And I’d like to really meet in Lost City, but that initially provides some challenges, unless we’re able to meet outside. And in December that may be a challenge.

Schorr: Seth Schorr, for the record. So for Thur--for the night--so would we need to stay in a hotel Thursday or Wednesday? What do we--

Stoldal: Myron, were they--would the folks from the other parts of the state be coming in the night before?

Freedman: I’m gonna--Myron Freedman, for the record. Carrie, you have more experience with the meetings overnight. Can you get in on that?
Edlefsen: Hi. Carrie Edlefsen, for the record. In the past we’ve come in very early on the day of the first day of the board meeting, and stayed over the night before the second board--day of the board meeting, and then have flown out at the end of that day. So it’s generally just the one night. In this case, if it’s December 9th and 10th, the one room night would be December 9th.

Schorr: Yeah, Seth Schorr, for the record. December 9th I could get everybody rates for the Downtown Grand all in for about $40 a night. So if it’s easier to stay in Las Vegas, I could make that happen.

Stoldal: What about the night before though as well?

Schorr: Yeah, I don’t--Seth Schorr, for the record. Let me just check. I don’t think that will be any different. Bear with me one second. Yeah, same thing.

Stoldal: The reason I ask that, it makes for a very long day to get up early in Reno, or here in Carson, wherever you are, to--Myron, I would look and make it--working with Carrie and the members that are going to be coming down, to make it as convenient--we’ve had Zoom all year, so budget wise we should be okay to take this last--to take this meeting while we’re in the fiscal year. But if you’d take a look at that, and see the board members that are coming down from the north, and see what their feelings are, so they don’t have to get up at 2:30, 3:00 in the morning to get to the airport by 5:00 to get here by 9:00 to get to--that just makes for a challenge.

Freedman: Yes, I will do that, Mr. Chair. And I notice that Member Timmons has a question for you, a comment.

Stoldal: And where are you? I do not--did you go off camera, Anthony?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. I had my hand up, but I put it down. But the only thing I just wanted to really quickly add is Boulder City gets really cold where the trains are located, even though that’s the best to space out. It gets pretty chilly in there, especially in December. So I was going to say something about Lost Museum, but Lost Museum is a tight kind of area to do it. So I’m happy we’re at least pointed to Las Vegas, which is why I put my hand down. But thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Stoldal: Doris?

Dwyer: Yes, this is Doris Dwyer, for the record. You know, many of us have not had a chance to meet Hollis yet, so that might be a good reason to meet at the Las Vegas Museum.

Stoldal: Mary Beth?
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Timm: Good morning. Mary Beth Timm, for the record. I do not recommend Overton at the moment for a meeting. I don’t believe you’ll be comfortable with the amount of mask wearing that is not happening in the city. None of the restaurants or businesses are currently masking up except for our museum and the grocery store.

Stoldal: Well, it sounds like, Hollis, that we’re going to be visiting the site, and rather than downstairs, I think we have had board meetings upstairs in order to have been able to space out more. So if it’s okay with the board, I don’t know whether we need a motion or just administratively say we’re going to be meeting at the Las Vegas Museum. And unless I see an objection, that would be the plan. All right. So we can move forward. At least we know where and when. Just how are we going to get there, and then determine what time the board meeting is on that first day as well as the second day. Let’s move then to item 6b, set the dates and location for the March meeting. Again, I would encourage some discussion about meeting at Stewart for our March meeting. Any board members agree, disagree, or have another thought? Sarah? That was a thumbs up for yes?

Cowie: That was just a thumbs up, yeah. I’d love to meet at Stewart Indian School if we--if that’s possible, especially if by then maybe we could be in person a little easier. I don’t know. But yeah, that’d be great.

Stoldal: And I see Courtney’s shaking her head, and I see Tony’s got--please, Anthony.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. My question is logistics wise which are--do we have one day, two day? If you can, kind of define that for me, please. Thank you, sir.

Stoldal: That would--in March I think would be a one-day meeting. Carrie? Okay.

Edlefsen: Carrie Edlefsen, for the record. Yeah, March and September are historically one-day meetings, and then the June and December meetings are two-day to account for the additional agenda items that usually occur during those meetings.

Stoldal: And I would suggest again that--the same thing for the folks flying from the south to the north. Rather than getting up at 3:00 in the morning and then starting a meeting at 9:00, and not being able to take full advantage of Stewart, I’d recommend that we look at bringing the southern folks up the night before. So if we could, Myron and Carrie, if we could look at that. So I look for a motion that our meeting would be held--is there a date in March that starts off--let’s start off with that is not convenient.

Dwyer: This is Doris Dwyer.
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Stoldal: Yes.

Dwyer: For those people that are teaching classes, is spring break a consideration to avoid or to do it then?

Stoldal: Sarah, I see you’re looking at your calendar.

Cowie: I am, but I don’t have anything on here that lists when spring break is.

Stoldal: Okay.

Cowie: But if nobody has any problems, I have, I mean, you guys can choose anywhere from--well, does anybody know when Easter is this year or next year?

Unknown: It’s pretty late.

Stoldal: Okay. Sarah. And then Anthony. Sarah first.

Cowie: Sarah Cowie, for the record. Our spring break is March 12 through 20.

Stoldal: So is that good or bad?

Cowie: I might be traveling during spring break, depending on when (inaudible) school lines up. I don’t know.

Stoldal: Any challenges on the 4th, 11th, or the 25th?

De la Garza: Chair, this is Mercedes, for the record. Through the 25th is Washoe County’s spring break, and I would likely be traveling.

Stoldal: So that’s a no for you on the 25th?

De la Garza: That is correct.

Stoldal: Anthony, you had your hand raised.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, I was--Anthony Timmons, for the record. I was just gonna echo what Sarah said, ‘cause UNLV is kind of the same schedule. So no issue.

Stoldal: So the 18th, would that be okay?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, any date, and again, Anthony Timmons, for the record. Any date in March would be fine with me, ‘cause I don’t anticipate traveling at all in March.
Freedman: Mr. Chair, I heard the 18th is during the spring break, so perhaps we should look at the 11th.

Stoldal: Sarah, is that good for you, the 11th?

Cowie: Yeah, the 11th would work for me, thanks.

Stoldal: All right. Any other issues or questions regarding the March the 11th at Stewart? Seeing and hear--Anthony?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. I know it would be a departure from what we normally do, but I would like to maybe suggest that maybe we do March in the south, even though it’s south and south back to back. And I would actually, Mr. Chairman, like to recommend June in Ely.

Stoldal: What’s your--we’ve had Stewart on our list for quite a while. What’s your thinking on having another meeting in the south?

Timmons: Well, Mr. Chairman, I, you know, we could do--again, Anthony Timmons, for the record. We can do Stewart for March and then Ely in June and do north and north, if that’s what you want to do. But again, weather wise I was trying to find a date that would be good to go back to Ely, and that lends itself toward the June meeting.

Stoldal: Well, I think of Ely more as in the northeast. So let’s stay with our--with the first one is our March--or the meeting in March. We’re looking at the 11th in--I saw several hands for Stewart and one consideration for in the south. So I’d look for a motion.

Markoff: Dan Markoff, so moved.

Stoldal: What are you moving?

Markoff: Acceptance of the dates and the place that’s set forth in the discussion.

Stoldal: Sarah?

Cowie: I would move to hold our next--our March meeting on the 11th at Stewart Indian School.

Stoldal: Okay. I think that that’s what Dan’s motion was exactly, so you’ll be the second. So the motion--

Markoff: That’s exactly right.
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Stoldal: So the motion is to have our March meeting on the 11th at Stewart. Further discussion? Hearing none, general public? All those in favor say, “Aye.”

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously with those in attendance and the chair voting in favor. Let’s move on to the June meeting. Anthony suggested that would be an appropriate time weather wise for a meeting in the northeast part of the--northeast central part of Nevada. Myron, let me kick that over to you, and talk about logistics for the staff. And although we (inaudible) report later on regarding Ely. What would be the situation with staffing and travel, and what’s going on at Ely by June at the depot or the freight building by June of next year?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. I may switch--kick this over to Sean to talk about the, you know, the weather and the transportation. But in terms of the project, I don’t think we’re in any danger of the project having advanced to the degree that we can’t utilize the freight building for a meeting. But Sean, if you would perhaps come in with some comments about the logistics of meeting at your site?

Pitts: Certainly. Sean Pitts, for the record. We have the freight building. June is a wonderful time to do a meeting in the freight building. There’s no air conditioning in that building, but in June you won’t need it. So we’ll be pleased to host the board anytime you can make it out here.

Stoldal: Great. Further discussion from--is there any staffing issue. Carrie, did you indicate or--I just see your lights on.

Edlefsen: Yeah, I just wanted to, you know, historically, it does require staff to be out of the Carson City office for approximately three days. That’s not necessarily a problem. We do anticipate being fully staffed, so there should be one staff member who will remain in the office during that time. I just wanted to bring that up. And I would also like to recommend or request of the board that the June meeting be done as early in June as possible, based on the requirement for the budget completion and approvals, so that we can try to get ahead of the governor’s finance office in establishing the budgets for the new fiscal year.

Stoldal: It does create a challenge and an opportunity for the folks in southern Nevada. There is not easy, simple way to fly up or take the train or bus. So it’s one of two options: Either flying--three options. Flying into (inaudible) or Salt Lake and driving down, or Reno and driving over, or just driving up from (inaudible) it means an additional, as you pointed out, Carrie, travel time involved for the folks in the southern part of the state (inaudible). So let’s look at that option in June, and see if there are any challenges with the schedule. And this would be a
one-day meeting. Are there any June issues, other than we should do it early in June. Was that the--Anthony?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. I think it’s a two-day meeting.

Stoldal: Is that right, Myron? Carrie?

Edlefsen: Carrie Edlefsen, yes, that is correct. It’s a two-day meeting, due to the approval of the budgets and several other items that are submitted on the agenda during that meeting.

Schorr: Seth Schorr, for the record. The second half of June, the 20th on, is tough for me.

Stoldal: Sean, are you still on the line? How is late August/early September for a meeting?

Pitts: Sean Pitts, for the record. Equally delightful. Maybe a little warmer in August, but early September would be nice.

Stoldal: I was gonna say that it’s a two-day--it’s our two-day budget meeting, and, I mean, I think the point of Anthony is that (inaudible) we do need to meet in Ely and schedule one, it could either be in June, or we could schedule a late August meeting. Board members, thoughts? I see Jan and Myron. Go ahead, please.

Freedman: Thank you, Chair. Myron Freedman, for the record. I would request maybe the board consider it being held in Carson City, just because of the nature of the meeting, budgets being reviewed, and our access to information. There’s going to be a lot of documentation to present to you, and it might just logistically assist us to have it in that location for your consideration.

Stoldal: And the budget we’re--we’ll be doing--

Unknown: Mr. Chairman?

Stoldal: --would be something after the Senate--the State, excuse me, not the Senate Finance Committee, after Chairman Ostrovsky’s finance subcommittee reviewed the budget and makes a presentation to us. And I suspect that this time around there are going to be a lot more questions about the budget and how we fund everything from the board funding to Boulder City. So it’s going to be an interesting couple of days. Dan?

Markoff: Yes, sir. I think it’s important that we hold this in Ely after what happened with the legislature the last session, and the efforts of the Nevada Northern to try to
take over our properties. I think it’s a great idea that we go out there and utilize that place. That’s my feeling on it.

Stoldal: Dan, do you have any issue with meeting in Ely in August rather than in June? You just feel we need to meet in Ely?

Markoff: You asking me?

Stoldal: Yes.

Markoff: Yeah, I don’t care.

Stoldal: Okay. So Jan?

Petersen: I have to agree with Dan. I think we as a board need to show support to--support and ongoing interest, and state--and ownership, if you want to call it that, of--Jan Petersen, for the record, of the facility over there and make a presence, a physical presence.

Stoldal: I agree. I agree with both Dan and Jan (inaudible).

Freedman: Mr. Chair, you’re having microphone issues, I think.

Stoldal: Can you hear me now?

Freedman: Yeah.

Stoldal: Okay. How’s that? Is that any better? Okay. Well, there’s a train that was going by the backyard there. That might be the issue. So it sounds like we’re talking about meeting in June in Carson City. I’m getting ahead of myself. In June in Carson City because of the budget, and then looking at an August, late August/early September date in Ely. Anthony?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. That’s gonna put us one whole entire year until we meet in the south again.

Stoldal: Well, we have--that’s assuming that we’re going to be meeting in person. I think you’re--obviously you’re correct. So then our--we have two other meetings in--so the December meeting, the last meeting of the year would be then, of course, in Las Vegas or potentially Boulder City or Lost City. So maybe we could go ahead and look at if that would be--and that’s allowing for--we’re only talking about dates for the March and June meeting as an action item. Well, let’s lock--I think you’re right, Anthony, but let’s deal with June, the June meeting. And I would look for a motion to meet--potentially we could an--Myron?
Freedman: Just to clarify, Myron Freedman, for the record. So in December we’re meeting in Las Vegas, correct?

Stoldal: Correct.

Freedman: Okay. And then in March we’re--

Stoldal: We’re meeting in March in Stewart.

Freedman: In Stewart, right. Okay.

Stoldal: And potentially in June in Carson City, because of the budgets, and potentially in August/September Ely, and then potentially December in Las Vegas. I mean, you know, there’s another way to do that, and that is to move the March meeting to--well, we could--there’s so many. So we have the March meeting set. We voted on that. And the next one is the June 2022. Those are the only two agenda items. So I would look for a motion from the board of where we would like to meet in June. And there is some leaning toward, because it being a budget meeting, that it be in Carson City, but what’s the board’s pleasure?

Markoff: Dan Markoff. I move that we meet in Carson City in June.

Petersen: I’ll second.

Stoldal: Second from who?

Petersen: Jan Petersen, for the record. Second.

Stoldal: Okay. Anthony, do you have your hand up? No? Okay. So we have a motion to meet in Carson City in June. We have a second. Further discussion? General public? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor say, “Aye.”

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed?

Timmons: Nay. Anthony Timmons, for the record.

Stoldal: Motion carries with one abst--with one no. And for the record, as the minutes will reflect, that the general board sentiment is that we meet in Ely next year at our August/September meeting. So if we can make sure that is on our next agenda, and then potentially in the south in December, and the site being either Lost City or Boulder City. So further discussion on the minutes, excuse me, on the calendar for next year? Seeing and hearing none, then let’s move from item 6 to item 7, which are agency reports. This is for information and discussion only. There are--there’s only one action item, and that’s C2, which has a couple
of different elements to it. So 7a, State Historic Preservation Office, Rebecca Palmer, the administrator. Rebecca, please join us.

Palmer: Good morning. This is Rebecca Palmer. You have my board report in front of you. I just wanted to highlight that we do have some additional hardcopies of the Nevada State Preservation Plan for 2020-2028. If anyone would like an additional hardcopy, please let me know. I’m hoping that you received your copies in the mail. I didn’t get any returned to me, so I’m hoping that they made it to you safely. If you didn’t receive one, just send me an email, and I’ll mail one out to--for you today. As well as, we are experiencing vacancies, or a vacancy, in our office, and are struggling to find qualified candidates to apply for the position. So if anyone knows of an architectural historian who might be interested in working for our office in the Review and Compliance Program, please don’t hesitate to let us know, or direct people to the SuccessFactors portal where they can apply. Unfortunately that is it’s--we’re not--Nevada is not unique. It has been difficult for western historic preservation offices to find qualified architectural historians. So at least we’re in the same boat with other states, but it is challenging, particularly when we know very soon there will be ARPA funds, or the Rescue funds, coming through in large quantities. And that is a ser--it’s going to pose a serious burden on my Review and Compliance staff. So with that, I have no further additions. I’d be happy to answer any questions you might have, and once we’ve done that, we’ll discuss the issue that was raised by--in public comment.

Stoldal: Board members? If you haven’t had a chance to read the report that Rebecca’s team produced, a lot of great information and opportunities, and a challenge. I understand that we are struggling to hire an architectural historian (inaudible). It’s a key point as to Rescue funding and using the word “large.” There’s real opportunities for us, and it’s safe to use that fund. So any other questions or comments? Seeing and hearing none, Rebecca, thank you very much.

Palmer: Then, sir, with your indulgence, we’d like to provide an update on our notes concerning the request made by Marla McDade Williams for additional information concerning our report. And I’d like to turn it over to Kristen Brown.

Stoldal: Kristen, welcome.

Brown: Hello, everyone. Good morning. You can hear me, correct?

Stoldal: Yes.

Brown: Okay, great. This is Kristen Brown with the SHPO. I’d like to first answer the question on what a National Register inquiry is. Basically, all that means is someone either let us know they were considering lifting or amending a nomination, or it means someone reached out to us for more information about a
property and how to go about listing or amending. So we either just got a notification of some manner, or we were asked for guidance of some kind. So that’s what an inquiry means. And regarding the inquiry about the swamp cedars possible amendment, I don’t, unfortunately, have a lot of information to provide. In June this year we did get sort of cc’d on an email from someone named Monty Stampard, who works closely with Chairman Rupert Steele of the Confederated Tribes of the Goshute Reservation. And according to the email, they are interested in potentially amending that existing listing to elevate the listing to a national level of significance based on some new information that they uncovered. We don’t know what that information is, and we don’t know if they’ve begun that process or not. The National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management was also on the email. And I have not heard any more information about that since early June.

Stoldal: Thank you. Marla, does that answer--

Williams: Yes, thank you. I appreciate that.

Brown: You’re welcome.

Stoldal: Okay. Rebecca, anything else other than that? And then we’ll move on to the next item on the agenda.

Palmer: This is Rebecca Palmer, for the record. Chairman, I have no further comment.

Stoldal: Great. Kristen, thank you very much. Rebecca, thank you very much. Let’s move on to 7b, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, Brenda Scolari, the director of the department. Brenda, are you with us?

Freedman: Mr. Chair, I don’t see her in the meeting. I have sent her a message in case she’s tied up and needs a reminder. So--

Stoldal: Okay. We’ll just hold that item and move on to 7c, which is the Division of Museums and History. Myron, that would be you as the administrator.

Freedman: Thank you. Myron Freedman, for the record. I’ve got a few items to go over with you. I hear some noise in the background. Perhaps you could mute if you’re not speaking at the moment. First, I wanted to go over sort of a legislation follow-up. AB460 from the legislative session provides $200,000 for the school bus reimbursement program for this coming biennium. This is available to public schools only. And after some delay, the authority for the funding was finally created, and the reimbursement forms are now available on the museum websites. AB492 provides funding for certain capital improvement projects. These are managed by State Public Works, and in all cases the initial site visits have been conducted on all these projects, so they are moving ahead through State Public Works. That includes the renovation of the HVAC system
at the Railroad Museum in Carson, the historic Pitt house and adobe pueblos repair at Lost City, and renovation of the HVAC system at the historical society in Reno, and the central plant replacement at the Nevada State Museum in Las Vegas. 492 also called for the issuance of general obligation bonds that includes funds for the Boulder City Railroad Museum’s expansion project and for the East Ely Depot Museum for upgrades to the freight building, with any remaining funds to benefit any museum facility in the division. The Department of Conservation and Natural Resources is in control of this bond sale process. They indicate the sale will take place in October or November. They didn’t have a firm date. And they also will indicate how the funds are to eventually be authorized, which they are not at the moment. In the meantime, DMH, the Division of Museums and History, has been working with State Public Works conducting analysis to create estimates and on drafts of agency agreements with State Public Works. It will be State Public Works that will develop the contracts that are necessary, and they will serve as the project managers through this process. Again, none of this can begin until authority is established. But to date, down in Boulder City on the expansion project, State Public Works coordinated meetings with the architectural firm, LGA. We have requested a new proposal from them for--two proposals, actually, one for interpretive planning and one for retail planning, and then eventually an updated proposal for the A&E construction planning phase. The goal is for the project to be shovel ready for the next legislative session. The interpretive planning phase is an opportunity for the stakeholders and the community, the board, to have input into the stories that will be told inside the center, the new visitors center. However, we are waiting to see the final cost for this proposed planning. In Ely State Public Works conducted a site visit, a fairly extensive site visit, to estimate the improvements that need to occur with the freight building, and these are specifically geared towards turning the building into a year-round event facility. And so they have been out there, spent some--a whole day with Sean and poking around the building, and they’re working on those numbers now. Regarding the, as long as we’re talking about Ely, regarding the Nevada Northern Railway Foundation, after the outcome of SV87 the Division of Museums and History with State Public Lands, we are reupping the agreement draft for the foundation’s use of space in the depot, along with a draft of a memorandum of understanding for payment of monies the state is owed. While preparing these documents, the lieutenant governor asked myself, DTCA director Brenda Scolari, and State Public Lands administrator Charlie Donahue to join a meeting, mediated by the lieutenant governor, with both parties to discuss the future, both parties being the division and the Nevada Northern Railway Foundation. For the division the outcome of the meeting is to proceed with the mentioned drafts, but be open to their input on a variety of issues and to work with them, which we agreed, including having the depot building condition reassessed, which I agreed to if done by State Public Works, and I made that request to them. I have a few more things to report on, but I wanted to see if there were any questions thus far.
Stoldal: The board have any questions specifically regarding Ely? Dan, or excuse me, Myron, is the funding for both the freight barn--I’ve got the train going through again (inaudible).

Freedman: I can hear you.

Stoldal: Okay. Is the funding for the freight barn and the depot--where is the funding to bring those up to speed? Because we don’t know about the depot yet, because it’s being reassessed as far as--and do we know a cost on that? When will it be reassessed, or in other words be done?

Freedman: Mr. Chair, Myron Freedman, for the record. The--so there’s really kind of two assessments going on at Ely right now. The first one was the one generated as a result of our expecting the conservation bond monies, and that is going to be geared towards the freight building. Now, I don’t think we will be surprised after kind of getting some preliminary information that the cost for getting the work done, you know, will be pretty high. So we may be looking for additional funding to make up for the rest of that project, but I have been told by State Public Works that they are still working on the final number. So I don’t know what they are--what it is at this point. Regarding the depot building, again, this came up as a result of the meeting that we had with the foundation through the lieutenant governor’s office, and they were expressing concerns about the condition of the depot building. Of course, we’re all interested in the long-term preservation of that beautiful structure, and so I reached out to State Public Works to see if we can’t get them to schedule an assessment of that building. And so I got positive feedback from them on that. I don’t have a date yet.

Markoff: Myron, this is Dan Markoff. Is there any indication that the foundation is going to do another attempt at an end run about getting the property from us?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. I really have no official indication of that. I think all I can say is that in my recent communication with them through the lieutenant governor’s office I can hear that their concerns, the ones that they voiced during the legislative session are still very present in their minds, and I’m not sure what steps exactly they’ll be taking. But our goal in all of this, as it has been since before the pandemic, is to work out agreements with them, to be a partner with them, and so that continues to be our approach.

Unknown: I had a call some time ago from Mark Bassett, and as I recall, he claimed that the foundation or the railroad doesn’t owe us anything. What’s your comment on that?

Stoldal: I’ve got two thoughts. Stoldal, for the record. First of all, where would the funding come from, either through the assessment by Public Works or whatever assessment, where would the funding for that come from?
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Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. Are you asking me about the renovation to the freight building? So the funding for the--Myron Freedman, for the record. The freight building, again, is part of the funding that comes through this conservation bond sale. We’re expecting $3 million in this sale, and that is split between both the Boulder City project and the freight building project. Now, the estimates that were used to come up with this formula were established years ago, and so that--those are the numbers that I have been working with. However, with State Public Works on board now, really on the ground doing the analysis, those numbers will get refreshed. So I’m sure there will be additional funding that is going to be required. If Director Scolari was here, she would speak to her efforts to secure EDA and the Rescue Plan funding amounts. Of course, you know, millions and millions of dollars have come into the state, and she’s working hard to secure some of those funds for these division projects as well. So a combination of that is what we’re looking at, but it doesn’t also mean we won’t be going back to the legislature requesting additional support, and entering into some kind of a fundraising phase for these as well.

Stoldal: Let’s get to Dan’s question then. It’s referenced on the second part of the notice for admission fees at the very bottom, and I’m not sure whether this needs to be in four point font, but at the very bottom it says, “Discussions concerning fee collection FY 2020 are ongoing.” Do you see any resolution? Is there any positive movement one way or the other?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. And we’re clarifying. You’re referring to fees that might be collected at the East Ely depot?

Stoldal: Yes, I am. Yes.

Freedman: Yes, sir. I have--we will have fees as part of the agreement, and so the calculus here will be to put together an agreement and an MOU that in my mind is very attractive to the foundation. We’re not looking to, you know, have ongoing disputes with them. We’re looking to resolve things. But going back to some of the original agreements that were in place, and the different perspectives about how those ended, we’re working with the DAJ on this. This is going to result in our presenting them with a couple of documents. They will be very generous in their conditions, because we’re trying to get to the point where we’re really focused on one thing, and that’s the visitor coming to this wonderful site and having a great experience. So that means to try to get these things behind us. But it will include some kind of fee collection, and again, that will be based on negotiating with them on some of the monies that we consider to be owed to the state, and how that works into the fee collection as well helping to pay back some of that.

Stoldal: Dan, I don’t know if that answered--did that answer your question?
Markoff: No, that didn’t. There was an amount that I recall was claimed that was owed to the state, and the foundation’s position was that they didn’t own anything—owe anything. And I was wondering where that is, that dispute?

Freedman: Yeah, Myron Freedman, for the record. Well, we continue to put some of these amounts into the MOU and into the special use agreement. Because at one time everybody agreed that there were fees that were to be collected, and then the monies were not turned over to the state. These are ticket funds that were collected on behalf of the state, so there is an outstanding balance on that. And if they have a dispute with that, then we’ll learn, again, officially where they are once they respond to the agreements that we send them. So we’re getting into territory that before we actually present them with something, I’m not—I’m reluctant to, you know, say here officially what’s going on. We need to have—give it to them first, and let them respond officially.

Markoff: How much—Dan Markoff here. How much do we think is owed to us approximately?

Freedman: Well, if you look at everything, it’s somewhere in the neighborhood of, you know, $70,000 to $90,000. But there is a ticket element there where the fees were collected for the state that’s around $26,000. But again, I’m looking to do something that is—that allows us to get past the tension and get onto a more productive relationship.

Markoff: Are we looking at a modification of that amount or forgiveness or what?

Freedman: I am looking at a modification of those amounts, yes.

Markoff: Okay. Thank you.

Stoldal: Further questions? Myron, do you have more on your report beyond Ely? Or should we move on to a couple of questions for you?

Freedman: I have some information on museum operations, unless there’s any other questions on the Boulder City project or the Ely project.

Stoldal: Well, Boulder City project you’re referring to the new visitors museum, the actual—the new building, as opposed to any other issues at Boulder City, which we could talk about later on?

Freedman: Yes, sir.

Stoldal: Okay. Any other questions?

Markoff: Mr. Chairman, Dan--
Stoldal: Go ahead.

Markoff: --yeah, Dan Markoff. Myron, I was wondering do we have any estimate as to when the museum facility at Boulder might be built or construction started?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. Well, the phase we’re working on right now, and the funds that will be coming in, will pay for what I call putting the project into a shovel ready state. So that will cost, you know, anywhere from $1.5 to $2 million. And once we’re in that state, then we’re in a great position at the next legislative session to go for the construction funds, the actual construction funds through, again, through this Conservation Bond Act. Don’t forget that this project was specifically spelled out by this division to build the new visitor center, and really, for that entire site, an amount of $25 million was indicated coming from—that would be part of this bond sale. So it’s an incremental process. We would like to get the new visitor center built through the next cycle, this coming cycle. I’m not sure what the exact cost of that is at this point, but we will have updated information as a result of this phase that we’re in now where we’re putting these construction documents together.

Markoff: Well--Dan Markoff here. You--you’re talking about the next legislative session that the building would start.

Freedman: Well, it coincides with the governor, you know, putting the bond money into his budget. So this year there was $20 million put into this new budget, and of that $20 million, $3 million is slated for the Division of Museums and History for these two projects. So the next cycle there will be another tranche put into the governor’s budget, and we’d like it to include the construction dollars for building the new visitors center.

Markoff: So--

Stoldal: That’s why it’s important--

Markoff: --I guess--

Stoldal: --the next step that we have--

Markoff: --where--

Stoldal: --as Myron says, a shovel ready plan. And so that’s ongoing right now, and we should have that plan. There are other people that are in line around the state that also wants a piece of that bond money, and they’re also getting their shovel ready plans so they can (inaudible). This next step is real important, because it will answer your question about when we’re going to see the first piece of dirt overturned. So the goal right now is get this shovel ready plan from the architects. Too, one minor point, and this is only in my head. I’m not
comfortable with the term, calling this a visitors center. That sounds like something you go get show tickets to, or go on the highway where you need a break. This is a museum facility. But that’s just in my head, so I keep calling it a museum expansion, as opposed to a visitors center. But Dan, I think we’re moving forward. I don’t mean to interrupt you, but I hope you’re getting an answer to your question.

Markoff: Well, if we’re talking the next legislative session, and there being movement on the actual building, I’m all for that. I just hope it comes to be.

Stoldal: We all need to call our friends in Carson City.

Markoff: Yep.

Stoldal: So--and Myron will keep us up to speed as to when the technical report, the architectural report, is completed next year, so that will give us something that we can physically have to go forward saying, “We’re ready for the next step.” Myron?

Freedman: Yes. Continuing on with my report on the museum operations, so the furlough ended at the end of June, so starting July 1 there are no longer any furloughs in place for staff. There is a continuing pandemic impact. We have mask wearing mandated for anyone inside museums, and of course occupation capacities are set by the counties. There was an impact to our volunteer ranks, which shrank during the pandemic and still have not recovered, a lot of elderly people in our volunteer ranks, and this of course impacts programs and operations. Volunteers are really critical to all of the museums. Some museum hours have expanded, and some still await new staffing to increase their schedule. Following now on replacing decimated staffing during the hiring freeze, we did hire. We had two hires in the spring for the Las Vegas museum, and recruitments since this last board meeting have been very robust. We’ve had two hires since then, and there are seven recruitments right now in their final stages, and there are six in the recruitment writing phase. And then just to keep in mind that the approval of recruitments is tied to the projected lodging tax disbursement, so they are not automatically approved when they are submitted. But let me do a little rundown of how thing--where things are with each of the museums. The Ely Museum is operating seven days a week. There have been no staff changes. And they’re actually in the process of hiring some temporary staffing, and this is to really help them in both custodial and in maintaining operating hours. So I know Sean can speak a little bit about some of his plans for that when you get into the agent--the museum reports. The Railroad Museum in Carson City is operating at their 2018 schedule level. That’s a Thursday through Monday 9:00 to 4:30 schedule. Recruitments for the custodial worker, which took place in the spring, ended with no candidates. And so that position and the facility supervisor have both been active in terms of recruiting, and they are in the final review stages right now. So we hope to have
both those positions hired fairly soon. And then recruitment documents are being prepared for the store manager. Lara Brown, who you all I’m sure remember, has been the store manager for quite some time. She recently vacated the position and is moving out of the state. The Historical Society is at two full-time employees, so all operations and activities there are impacted by the low staffing. However, really good news. The Librarian III position is in the final interview stage, so we expect a hire there within a few weeks. And then recruitment documents are being prepared for three positions, one or two in this remaining year, and one or two in the spring. She’s looking to--Catherine is looking to have a registrar, the education curator, and the admin assistant possibly within the next year. And then with each position refilled, the museum will be able to incrementally expand operations. Right now the staff is there Monday through Friday, the research library is by appointment only Wednesday through Friday from 12:00 to 4:00, and then the gallery is open to visitors Monday--Wednesdays from 10:00 to 4:00 and by appointment Thursdays and Fridays. In Las Vegas, Las Vegas of course is impacted by the Springs Preserve schedule. They’re currently open Fridays through Sundays 9:00 to 4:00. They expect to continue a schedule that aligns with the Springs Preserve schedule. The museum director and facilities supervisor were filled earlier in 2021, and a museum attendant was filled in August. They are currently recruiting for a Curator II. You may remember Crystal Van Dee, who also is now living in Massachusetts. And recruiting documents are being prepared for the Curator III, and that’s also--and they will also look for a maintenance worker. Lost City is operating Wednesdays through Sunday 8:30 to 4:30. They are down one part-time museum attendant, and they continue to evaluate when they might bring that person on based on their revenues. In Carson City at the State Museum we’re operating Wednesday through Saturday 8:30 to 4:30. We recently hired the facility supervisor in August, which created a vacancy in a security position. And the sales and promotion rep, which is a board funded position, is in the final interview stage right now. We expect to hire probably within a week. And recruiting docs are under way to recruit for the museum director and this open security officer, and once we have that additional security officer, the museum schedule will turn to a six-day operating schedule. In Boulder City the train platform is open Mondays through Fridays, and train programs are on the weekends. The maintenance repair specialist retired in early July, and the museum director retires in a few days. Both of these positions were recruited for and are in the candidate review phase. And then in the division office, of course, Carrie Edlefsen rejoined us as the ASO June 28th, and the recruitment for the second administrative assistant is also in final stages. And that concludes my report, and I will take questions.

Stoldal: Questions from the board? Comments? Thoughts? Using spring of next year as the guidepost, how close to getting back to, and I don’t use the phrase, but I will, normal staffing are we--will we be?
Freedman: I think by next spring we will be two-thirds of the way there. I think probably it will be--and Carrie might have a better idea that’s based on the lodging tax improvements. I think it’s going to be the end of ‘22 early ‘23 before we’re looking at full capacity and to get full staffing again. That’s going to be based on the return of our revenues.

Stoldal: And part of that question deals with Dan’s question, is when we’re building the museum in Boulder City, when are we going to be able to budget staffing for that? And of course the whole--Boulder City is the only museum that has to pay for itself in the entire system, which is ludicrous. But that’s a topic for another discussion. So appreciate the update. Any further questions on staffing from--for Myron? Any other issues or questions for the administrator before we move on? I have one. And this is really for Myron, and it’s really gonna be for Brenda. When are we going to clean up our websites?

Freedman: Mr. Chair, this is Myron Freedman, for the record. I know that Brenda is in the process of hiring several staff that are going to be detailed on the whole public facing part of the division and the department, and that includes websites. We did go through the websites to make sure that the visiting hours were updated, and the school bus information was updated. The websites are being used quite a bit now for quite a bit of social media types of programs that are online or available through online, or point you to the right platform, such as YouTube. Several of the museums have really worked quite hard at this kind of programming, and the websites are the portal for that. So this is something that we’ll continue to improve as Brenda brings on these new qualified staff members.

Stoldal: So I would encourage board members when they go on museum sites, state museum sites, if you see an opportunity for improving, send it to Myron so he’s aware of that. And I don’t mean this in the tone it’s going to be presented, but I realize that the board’s website is sort of at the bottom of the food chain. But Myron, you are still listed as the acting administrator on that site. Mitch Varner is still listed on that site, and the administrative assistant position is vacant. Also, there is--Hollis is not listed as joining us. I think that should be under the news items, because there is a news section of that. Secondly, the Board of Museums and History consists of 12 member, not the 11 listed on the site. And as much as we appreciate seeing Bryan Allison and Alicia Barber, they haven’t been with us for a good period of time, but they are still listed as board members. So it might be a real opportunity to put our new board members on the website to bring that up to date. But again, I was just going through it this morning looking at transcriptions and other board packets, and came across those things. So board members, if you see something where there’s an opportunity to either, as Myron pointed out, of the scheduling of the opening of museums was really important, or the exhibits, or any updates on what we’re presenting education wise, those are at the top of the list. But send that information to Myron as well. And then there’s a second part to that. We have
links. Sometimes they go to dead ends. Sometimes they go to other places. I’d encourage the board to be very active in going on the websites and clicking those links and seeing where they lead you to. Some of them go to dead ends, and so that’s also important information for Myron to have. So beyond that, Myron, if you have a question or thought.

Freedman: Thank you, Chair. No questions at this time or thoughts. I will be reaching out to the new board members for their bio information, so we can update that website. I did notice this morning on the counter that one person had visited the website. And thank you, Chair. I see now who it is.

Stoldal: Right. And I will be sending you my high school photo for that.

Freedman: Okay.

Stoldal: The next item on the agenda is the item 7c2, proposed FY admission fees. There are two elements to that. There’s the admission fees to the museum, and then there’s a second part to that, which is the train ride fees, and so we will take them in that order. The first one is--Myron, I don’t mean to really be a complainer, but this is really very small font.

Freedman: Yeah, I apologize for that, Chair. What happened there is it was printed out as a PDF, but from the--you know how you get them at first, and you’re supposed to download it and then open it up? And this--instead, this was printed right from--I don’t know how to explain it, but I agree. I apologize for that. I could walk you through this, if you like, Mr. Chair.

Stoldal: Let’s start with the admission and pre-admission days, and then we’ll go to questions from the board.

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. What we’re asking the board to consider here is to increase the admission fees. If you consider the long time we’ve been at the $8 and the $5 admission fees, given the tough times that we’ve been experiencing, and the resources that are needed to run these museums, we’re asking for--to increase the $8 to $10 and the $5 to $6. So that’s what’s being requested there. It’s really just, again, it seems like it’s a long time coming. I can’t remember when that $8 was established. Carrie might be able to add some history to this so you have some context.

Stoldal: I don’t know what you can get for $8, but $10 sounds really like an inexpensive--I mean, I could even support $12 or $15. But board members? questions regarding the admission fees and free admission days? I don’t see any hands. I would make a note. To the right of the box it says, “Museums are open a minimum of five days per week.” I don’t think that’s correct, is it?
Freedman: You are correct on that. That needs to--of course that’s not our goal. We do want to get back to at least a minimum of five days a week, but I can fix that.

Stoldal: And then the other thing is in the box in the middle it says, “Nevada State Railroad Museum in Carson City, combination museums and train rides, members $10.” Is that all members of the state museum system or members of the friends groups or both?

Thielen: This is Dan Thielen, for the record. Thank you, Chair. We had--it was for members of the friends group and members of the museum. But in discussion, I think it would be wise to open that up to every museum member. We were in discussion with our staff and with our friends group that why don’t we just allow it for everybody? So--but that would be a decision based on what we feel would be a fair and equitable response, and the board would have to approve that. But we think it should be anyone in the museum system.

Stoldal: All right. Has the board, I mean, that sounds fair. The way it reads is that it just says “members,” and so it already would be inclusive of both friends and existing museum members around the system. Is that correct?

Thielen: That’s how we read it, and that’s how we would honor it if the board is good with that.

Stoldal: Any questions? Anthony?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. Are we at the discussion phase on this, or just simply asking questions?

Stoldal: Well, this--we are at the asking questions phase, discuss--well, I mean, both of them. So if you have a question, or however you want--what we’re looking for next would be a motion to approve the admission fees, admission free admission day. I would look for a motion.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. I don’t think this is a prudent time to raise our admission fees 25 percent at the State Museum in Carson City and 20 percent elsewhere, due to the economic conditions. I do like the behind the scenes tour, but I don’t think this is a great time to be doing this.

Stoldal: All right. Further questions, comments?

Ostrovy: Mr. Chairman, Bob Ostrovsky. I would move for--to approve the--I have to get it back in front of me. The admissions--it went away. It’s on my computer. The admissions and free day schedules as included in our board packet.

Stoldal: We have a motion. Do we have a second?
Cowie: Second, Sarah Cowie.

Stoldal: We have a motion and we have a second. Further discussion by the board? General public?

Dwyer: This is Doris Dwyer. I do think that these suggested fare increases are fair, and I think they are very reasonable compared to comparable museums that I have gone to. I mean, these are lower than most of the comparable museums that I’ve gone to in other states, so I think it’s pretty reasonable.

Stoldal: All right. Further discussion? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor say, “Aye.”

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed?

Timmons: Nay. Anthony Timmons, for the record.

Stoldal: The motion carries with one nay vote. Then that is for the admission fees and free admission days. And the members, as the motion was and the discussion was, the members are for both friends and statewide members of the museum system. The next item on this is 7-2, and this deals with board approved train rides and related fees. We have two train systems, one—and not counting Ely, one in Carson City and one in Boulder City. I open this up to the board for discussion. My discussion then would—Robert? Did I—my discussion would be that I don’t have a real concern beyond the general concerns of not having the legal document with either the Carson City friends or a legal document with the Boulder City friends to operate any excursion trains or—do anything on the sites including membership. That said, I have more concern in Boulder City with approving this, and that’s based in large part on what we heard from the Boulder City museum director at the last meeting, and also in the report that is contained in the agency item Nevada State Railroad Museum Boulder City. It’s agenda item 7, and on page seven of his report, which is in the board’s packet, it says, “Locomotive and rolling stock maintenance issues. Maintaining antique railroad equipment continues to be a challenge. On two occasions we have not had an operable locomotive Union Pacific 844. Locomotive 855 is out of service pending rebuilding and scavenging of blower geared driven supercharger. And Locomotive L3 has blown head gaskets. Parts for its obsolete engine are nearly impossible to find.” And the director there raises the question, “Are we consuming the historic fabric of our railroad equipment?” And the answer is clearly yes. But what bothers me also is the report. Again, this is on page seven of the Nevada State Railroad Museum in Boulder city, its agency report, which is in section 7. The report says, “Since the June board meeting staff has revised and updated our equipment roster, including condition
Mr. Chair, Myron Freedman, for the record. In reviewing the report, and Dan Thielen reviewing the report, the consideration was that it still needed a little bit more work before it was included in the packet. I missed the fact that Randy had included that comment in his report. Otherwise, that report is not included in this packet. It is being worked on. Dan, do you have any other further comments on that?

Dan Thielen, for the record. Chairman, we wanted the opportunity for both Wendell Huffman and Chris DeWitt to have an opportunity to share their comments on that document. Both were overwhelmed with issues in getting the Glenbrook to Colorado and back. We promised that we would be able to address it in September and October. They’re currently reviewing those as the packet was submitted. They did not have an opportunity to include their comments. That’s why I decided to pull it from the packet. I did not realize there was a comment in there alluding to it. Any other questions I can answer?

Well, I’m looking at the--with the exception of it appears--I’m looking at the changes. Dan, could you go over quickly the changes that are proposed for Southern Nevada?

There are two, and one of them, in the last board meeting, we had discussed having an opportunity to increase fares for premium rides and things like that. And we had discussed doing it under the auspices of the friends group, and the friends would make these premium train rides either during Santa Claus or pajama train ride or an Independence Day ride. But there are some premium rides in which they would capture the funds. I don’t know if it was a throwaway comment by you or someone else on the board, but the question was, “Well, why can’t the museum itself increase the price to capture what the market will bear?” And we walked away from that meeting going, “Well, there’s only one thing keeping us from doing that, and that’s the board approving it.” So we put both these not to exceed prices. Because we’ve always assumed that ticket prices were fixed, can’t go up nor go down without board approval, and I think that’s a pretty safe place to be. Although the board maybe have interpreted it as you can’t sell it for less than this or you--I don’t know. One way or the other. However, we’ve asked if we could have a not to exceed price for determining what the market will bear. We are a little more modest up in Carson City for what the market will bear, because, you know, we’re a little more--it’s just kind of tough for me to ask for more money. And so we’re a little more conservative. We’re convinced that Las Vegas is a little bit more available or able to pay for a more premium experience. That’s why it’s $25 and $50. Perhaps it should just be straight $50. It’s a discussion I’m willing to have, especially with this not to exceed price. But that’s why we arrived at those prices for not to exceed.
Stoldal: Price is one thing, and I think that we would take your advice for Carson City, and I think the board will listen to the advice of--in Boulder City as far as the prices. But the bigger question, and since this board does not have the report, the biggest question is, is running old trains into the ground, and I make a difference between historic and old, although I think that in state law anything older than 50 is historic, but that’s aside. There are--between one piece of old equipment and historic, I think there can be a definition clearly. But that still is old equipment they’re no longer making with parts--making parts for. It seems to me that before we move forward in Boulder City, the board needs to have information on the condition of the rolling stock that’s down there. But even more important, we are operating under a 15-year-old business plan, a business plan that was created in 2006 with all good intentions, but in all reality is not working. The business process, the business plan in Boulder City is not working. We can approve these numbers, but the reality is do we have the--we’re running equipment into the ground that we can’t find parts for. Are we operating four, five, six days a week or just on weekends? Where are we--what are we doing today regarding the operation of the so-called Nevada Southern Railway?

Thielen: Thank you for the question, Chair. There’s a lot of things to unpack in that. And so the report that we anticipate giving you will sort the collection into what look like to me three different silos. One, artifacts to be used in the museum collection, second, things that are consumable materials that are--don’t have historic significance, and then other things that we probably need to shuffle off in the landfill. And we plan on sorting those things in depth, so it’s clear to look at these are the things that we intend to put in the museum’s permanent collection, and these are the things that we intend on using. Hard to get parts. Some of the equipment that we’re running down there are still in operation throughout railroads across the country, and sometimes the difficulty to get parts is finding them, sometimes it’s finding the funding for them, and sometimes it’s getting that funding through the state purchasing system, which with a small vendor, sometimes they have some difficulty becoming state vendors and getting those parts. So there’s a variety of reasons that parts are a little bit tough to get our hands on, but they’re not all that--because the parts are not there. They’re--for one of the locomotives down there the parts are on hand pretty easily, and some of them were--we acknowledge that the parts are very tough to get. And so having said that, so that addresses one of the issues on maintaining old or elderly rolling stock or middle age rolling stock. Secondly would be the--how many days a week are we operating? We were operating a combination of probably about six days a week, sometimes seven days a week down there, in support of our vendor on the property, Rail Explorers. And we generate some income because we sell tickets down there. It’s our plan moving forward that the museum’s programs will be run with the museum’s rolling stock on the weekends only, and then with Rail Explorers during the week when we are not typically running programs. We do run some programs for the museum during the week, which are, you know, meaning school tours, and scheduled tours, and
your hand on the throttle experiences, and things that are solid, interpretive museum programs that we want to do. And that’s what’s got to take premiere action at the museum is our interpretive plan. Secondarily, there’s a lot of time when the railroad is not being operated, and we expect to be able to generate some revenue through Rail Explorers during those times. But that fits when the museum’s program is not currently being executed. That’s the plan we’re developing with them. And it is our plan that the Rail Explorers will use battery sources to both get down the track and return to the track, so we are not relying on our rolling stock to operate. We’re not relying on anyone bringing in additional locomotives so we end up having a third, or a fourth, or a fifth entity on the property down there. The museum is supreme. The museum controls the acreage and the rolling stock, and it is our charge to maintain the items in perpetuity that belong in the collection. And then if we can have an operation that meets some of the other public demands--I met somebody at the museum here today, and they were so excited to be here and so excited that we were opening--open. They were from Las Vegas. And I mentioned, you know, that we have another group down in Boulder City, and they said, “Yeah, we went out there. We rode the bikes. It was so cool.” And it--we’re reaching a different demographic, because these were, you know, 25-year-old people with a two- or three-year-old kid who found yet another reason to go to a railroad to have an experience, and then when they were in Carson City wanted to go to another museum. And as a result, I liked the idea that they were coming to see us, but man, I can’t discount the idea that they came to see us because they had a great experience in Boulder City. And that’s what we want to have is we want people to learn the history, but if they want to enjoy the railroad independent of history, because it has some sort of other thing, I’m not sure I want to turn those guests away. And that’s sort of what Randy has been developing down there, and taking advantage of the five days we’re not doing anything on the railroad. And I think we’ve got a pretty solid plan moving forward. We’re getting through the legal nuances and all the other things to ensure that we are clean and right with every detail. But that’s where we’re at.

Stoldal: All right. Two quick--just two last things. One is the Rail Explorers is not part of this agenda item, so we can talk about that a little bit later when--

Thielen: There is one thing. If going forward we--if you look above special events there’s one line there that we would like to charge a per person fee for the use of railroads underneath a rail bike contract, and that would be $6 per person.

Stoldal: So point that out again.

Thielen: Go to special events, where you saw the 25 and 50. Hanging out to the right side under State Fiscal Year, the column of State Fiscal Year ‘22 is rail bike per person fee for use of railroad, $6.
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Stoldal: I’m—that makes me—that’s an awkward situation. This is like we’re approving Rail Explorers, and I--

Thielen: I--so I can see why you would feel that way. This is Dan Thielen, for the record. As we move forward in negotiations we’re not calling it Rail Explorers, because it’s not, but we are looking at if not the Rail Explorers, we would like to put an RFP out for similar experience, because we think this would benefit the museum.

Stoldal: Again, this is really directed to Myron as well, I think that this board has some real great deal of angst, because the Rail Explorer contract did not come through this board. This board was circumvented, despite the fact that it’s clear under 381 that this board sets policy for charges, the use, the rental, the lease of state property. And I’m not sure how this board, under what guidelines or what opinion, it was bypassed. Yes, we all understand the (inaudible) examiner’s role in this state, but we also understand this board’s role as far as dealing with the (inaudible) statute responsibilities. I’m not prepared at this point to slip this in until we see a full proposal from the Rail Explorers. So I--this item has to include the rail bike. Unless we can pull that out, I would have to vote no on this item. I think it’s just not an appropriate time to put rail bikes in without a full explanation of what we’re doing. So Myron, I’d ask for your guidance.

Freedman: Thank you, Chair. Myron Freedman, for the record. Well, this is a sticky situation. I agree with that. The statutes also lines out in 381.006 part 9 the ability of the division to contract with any persons to provide concessions on the grounds of the property. I assume it was in that spirit that this was originally set out. What I would like to advise, and I realize this goes against, particularly, Chair Stoldal, your inclinations, the revenue from the rail bikes and their service, it’s--it is a vendor, has a couple of impacts, and I think they’re important that we keep these in mind before discounting them. One is, of course, the revenue that’s generated by rail bikes supports the museum. And we need those revenues because, as you pointed out, Chair Stoldal, this museum is set up in such a way that the revenues earned on the site is what pays for the personnel. And given these times lately with the pandemic and everything, it’s a revenue that is important. So by limiting this revenue, we are in a situation where we may have to cut back on certain things down there at an already slim operation. The second thing I would bring to your attention is how much the Boulder City is part of the community down there. We’ve had lots of discussions in the last couple of months with stakeholders--

Stoldal: Are we going to go into a whole discussion of Rail Explorers? Because there’s a lot to unpack here. And if that’s what we’re going to do, then fine, but I was thinking we would do that through the board report. But if we need to go through it here--
Freedman: Right. I understand, Chair. Let me cut to the chase. I’d like the board to approve the $6 per rider fee. We will go on a month-to-month basis with Rail Explorers with the pur--sole intention of working out the final agreement with them that will come through the board.

Stoldal: Well, my final point is the reason why Rail Explorers is funding the positions, the staffing in Boulder City, and why that funding is important, is not a statutory responsibility. It’s not based on state law. It is simply based on the decision by the museum administration, as well as the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, a decision to keep this archaic process in place. There is no legal reason why this--why the administration of the museum and the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs can simply say, “We are not going to do it this way. We are going to fund like every other museum in this state. We’re going to fund Boulder City through the general fund and through the tourism dollars.” There is no reason why this has to take place, and I’m gonna move forward and push that when the (inaudible) fund budget comes up, as well as the roles in the park and the general fund, which there is going to be a role, that we stop this process of putting this orphan child of Boulder City Museum differently than every other facility. So if you feel that the $6 is--well, let me back up, Myron. Are you suggesting that the Rail Explorer contract, the new contract, is not going to come before this board?

Freedman: No, sir, I’m not. But--Myron Freedman, for the record. This service has been in place for a while. The revenues are important. And while we work on that new agreement that will be reviewed by the board, in the interim I’d like to see the board approve the $6 per ride fee, so we can continue to work on collecting this revenue, again, to support the museum.

Stoldal: Further questions, comments from the board? Anthony, and then Robert.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. I’m confused. Mr. Administrator, you mentioned that we’re going to continue collecting the $6, so we are already collecting the $6? And if so, was that presented before the board?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. No. The situation, the wa--the arrangement that has been in place, again, since before my time, was a fee of $130 per tour, if you will, every time they took the engine out. This proposes that we switch from that fee to a per rider fee, which will increase the revenues by roughly 6 percent or 8 percent, 10 percent. Dan has those figures. So it will boost the revenues to the museum by going to the per rider as opposed to the way it has been for several years now.

Stoldal: Okay.

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman--
Timmons: Mr. Chairman--

Ostrovsky: --Bob Ostrov--

Timmons: I’m sorry.

Ostrovsky: Oh, I’m sorry, Anthony. You go ahead.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. I just want to clarify something. Mr. Administrator, I don’t see the $130 on the report you presented under fee schedule, so I just wanted to throw that out as well, sir.

Freedman: I’m going to ask Dan, do you mind speaking on the $130 and its--where it resides, and the fee collection?

Thielen: When this con--Dan Thielen, for the record. When this contract was created with Rail Explorers, between the state and Rail Explorers, it was a vendor contract. And the agreement was to cover the cost of running the railroad in support of that. The contract itself, I cannot speak to when that contract was approved or how it was run, but it was approved by the Board of Examiners, and it was--and that fee was paid to the state for the duration of the contract, which--and since then we’ve been running on a month-to-month revenue schedule. The contract, previous contract, had some things in there that were probably not beneficial to the state, and we see some of the maintenance issues arise from those things. It was not covering the cost. And so it was given a substantial revenue boost when we absolutely needed it during COVID, but the $6 will reflect a more realistic coverage of our cost in support of the museum.

Freedman: It also--Myron Freedman, for the record. Dan, if you could, talk a little bit about the changes that are coming as a result of how they’re going to operate the rail bikes.

Thielen: So one of the big concerns of the previous--Dan Thielen, for the record. Excuse me. One of the big concerns that the administration of the Museums and History had previously was the way that we’re operating our locomotives in support of the rail bikes. There’s a lot of concerns between large locomotives and little, teeny vendor rail bikes. And so working with Rail Explorers, and we’ve talked to four other rail vendors and several museums that are doing this activity on their railroad, and we’re also talking about and exploring other revenue generations for times that the railroad is not being used. We determined that--at the last board meeting we talked about buying another locomotive, or the friends buying a locomotive, or Rail Explorers buying another locomotive, or leasing a locomotive, or having a company come in and put a locomotive on the tracks to pull the rail bikes back. At that time Rail Explorers said, “You know, we could just battery pack them.” A lot of places do that. They’re doing
that here in Carson City. And that removes the rolling stock and locomotive from the equation. So the wear and tear on equipment is gone. We don’t have to find staff to run a locomotive crew. We’re not keeping people out in the heat, and we’re not having a locomotive on the tracks when the Rail Explorers are there. So there were many upsides to that, but capturing revenue based on that model didn’t work with the old contract of $135 per train run down the track and back. And so we found a fee. We initially said, “You know, you just buy a ticket at $10 a ticket,” and they weren’t buying that, and they just wouldn’t support it in their business plan. Talking with the chairman of Board of Museums and History, we recognized there’s a lot of things we have to do to get in order to work with these guys and to bring a package to the Board of Museums and History and— for approval. And one of those is a business plan, and we’re penciling that out. We’re probably going to hire somebody to do that and then get some fees. But we’d at least negotiated with Rail Explorers to manage their own railroad, or to manage their own down the track and back the track without using equipment, and to pay the museum $6 a head for how many. If a million go down, we’re gonna get $6 a head. If 50 go down, we’re gonna get $6 a head. There’s no cap to what the revenue generation can be, except for when we’re telling them we can’t run because we have programs to run.

Stoldal: And there’s a question on changing up. I think it makes good sense to go from the $130 to the $6, and I’d be inclined to support it based on that fact alone. But moving from the gas power where we would pull them back, to they’re now going to go to battery power, that creates a whole other issue of where’s the charging stations? And when is this going to take place? So I—again, I’ll go back to my other point. I’m not sure now is the time for us to get involved in a discussion of Rail Explorers, because there’s a whole variety of issues, including setting up this illegal store. But this agenda item is strictly on the train ride fees. We approve admission and free. This is the second part that we’re to, the train ride fees, and I’d like to get our focus back on this. And if the board approves this $6, it is not approving any part of an agreement or future contract with Rail Explorers. It could be (inaudible), but we’re not approving a Rail Explorer contract. That’s still in negotiations, correct?

Thielen: Dan Thielen, for the record. You are absolutely correct. And we understand that the NRS requires the board’s approval of a contract. This is— we expect that by December we can bring you that contract. It would be lovely if we had a board member or two, or a committee, assigned to us, so that it’s not a surprise to the board, and that we can have the three entities, the museum administration, the board, and Rail Explorers all discussing on the same thing, so we don’t have to wait. The reason I put it in there is because you approve these fees once a year, and I didn’t want to get to December and have to go for another approval. This is in anticipation of an agreement.

Stoldal: Dan, there may be an--
Thielen: It’s not the agreement.

Stoldal: There may be an opportunity later on where we talk about revising board policy where the addition of a new committee could come into play. Again, we get back to the idea that the agenda on this is train rides and related fees. Further discussion on that particular topic? If there are none, I would look for a motion.

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman--

Markoff: Mr. Chairman, this is Dan Markoff. Bob, I have three questions for Dan Thielen.

Stoldal: Okay. Let me just--Robert Ostrovsky had his hand up before you jumped in, so Bob Ostrovsky, please go ahead.

Ostrovsky: Oh, I’m just not--I need them to clear this up in my mind. This $6, you don’t actually collect it at the time of the ride. The Rail Explorers collect it and pass it back to us, is that correct, or am I confused?

Thielen: Dan Thielen, for the record. They remunerate those fees on a month--we’re proposing they remunerate those fees monthly to us.

Ostrovsky: So if--this is Bob Ostrovsky again. So if $6 is the number that you’re proposing, is that what you’re negotiating with these folks? I mean, could we negotiate $7 or $10 or--I mean, I don’t have any idea about their business plan, or I have no idea what they charge for a ride, so--

Thielen: We could, and perhaps somebody who’s--this is Dan Thielen, for the record. We could. We--initially they had offered $1.25 per ticket, or per person, when I wanted to go to a per person fee. And we penciled out what that did over time, and that barely, barely helped us. And so we went hard at a substantially higher cost, and I don’t know what would happen if I said $8 or $10 or whatever it was. But because of wanting to have a successful program, and not, you know, killing the goose that’s laying a golden egg for us--and I hate to be a slave to any revenue stream based on, you know, I’ve got to lay people off if I don’t get it. It seems that it’s an opportunity for us to do this on a--for time. And we can write it in the contract that if it’s not covering our costs, and if it’s not buying--I don’t ever want to get into a position where we’re losing money on anything, and we’re essentially subsidizing an enterprise activity on state land. We want to make sure that this is very beneficial to the state, and at this fee structure it looks like it’s a very beneficial arrangement at this time.

Stoldal: Dan, to answer Bob’s question in a sense, this is not locked. If we approve this today, this is not locked in stone. You are still negotiating all the elements as we go forward, and we--potentially $6.50, $7, $8, whatever the number may be as you move forward.
Thielen: Dan Thielen, for the record. That is correct. We’re getting the discussions of the store. If such an activity will arrive, we’re getting into discussions of who spins the meter and pays the meter to recharge vehicles. If they want to have some, we’ll discuss the meets and the bounds of where they can place a piece of equipment in support of their activity, and all of those other details. And if it doesn’t work out for us, we made it very clear we’re just gonna walk away. We’ll put a RFP out there, and we’ll see what the best—the market will bear as far as that goes. And they’re aware of that. I haven’t—we’re not married to them. And we want it to work for the state, but we also want to make sure it fits in the museum’s programming elements and moves forward that, you know, we’re not in the business of allowing people to make a pile of money. We’re not opposed to that, but that’s not what our focus is. Our focus is running a museum. And if this can support the museum, we want to be part of it.

Stoldal: Dan, I’m gonna switch over to the other Dan. Dan Markoff, you had a thought or comment?

Markoff: Yeah, I did. First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to agree with you 100 percent that we’ve got to figure out a better way to be financing the Nevada State Railroad Museum at Boulder City. I think it’s long overdue. Secondly, I have three areas I want to ask Dan about that he raised in his opening comments. First of all, Dan, you mentioned that some locomotives are capable of being fixed easier than others. Which ones did you have in mind that were easier to fix?

Thielen: Well, comparatively easier. 844, there’s, like, 50 of them still in operation through the United States. My chief mechanical officer is pretty confident that most of the parts are off the shelf for a great deal of that locomotive. And easy to fix is a very, very comparative statement. But when you compare it to any of that equipment that came out of the test site that was almost a one off, those parts you just—they’re just not there. But 844--

Markoff: What about the 1,000?

Thielen: The 1,000? Those are a little bit tough to find, but I would—that locomotive to me is part of the collection, and not part of the equipment bed that we would use. It’s kind of rare, and it’s an important piece nationally, maybe not so much to Nevada. But yeah, those parts are a little bit more difficult to get.

Stoldal: Dan, I don’t--

Markoff: But they’re available?

Thielen: Yes.
Stoldal: (Inaudible), but I’m going to do that. Dan Thielen, when do you think the board, including Dan Markoff, is going to be able to get this report that your team in Carson City is working on, on the condition and the recommendation for each of the rolling stock? Is that close?

Thielen: Dan Thielen, for the record. You’ll have it for December.

Stoldal: Okay.

Markoff: Okay. The second aspect that you wrote--made is the difficulty in getting parts for some of these things even if they are available. Is that a result of vendors having to be approved or vendor restrictions?

Thielen: It’s--Dan Thielen, for the record. Sometimes for individuals that will only do business with the State of Nevada, they do not want to go through the vendor registration process. It can be complex, and it can take some time. It can take several months to get people through. Sometimes if they’ve got a very nimble business office they can get through in a week, but if it’s one person running a shop, and has to go through the challenges that the state requires in order for somebody to become a registered vendor, it can take them some time, and a lot of phone calls, and a lot of emails back and forth. It can be difficult. It’s not impossible, but it can be difficult.

Markoff: Is there any way--when I worked with the federal government we had a process where we could get three bids on something and then go with the lowest bid. Do you have anything like that in the state system?

Thielen: Dan Thielen, for the record. We absolutely do, and for most things we do that.

Markoff: But they all have to be registered vendors?

Thielen: Yes.

Markoff: Why does--why do you need a registered vendor?

Stoldal: Well, I’m not sure that’s a question for Dan. I mean, that’s a question--

Thielen: Well, I can answer it. I have no problem answering that. A registered vendor is--the primary thing is to make sure they’re licensed to do business in the State of Nevada, and the secondary thing is you’ve got to be a registered vendor in order for the state to pay them. The state doesn’t cut a check. They’ve got to electronically move cash around. In addition, there’s a couple of other things at the governor’s office. They don’t want people who are socially unacceptable to do business in the state. So there’s some processes there.

Stoldal: Dan--
Freedman: I suggest Carrie jump in.

Stoldal: Go ahead and jump in here, because we’re getting way off the issue that’s before us, which is the approval of train rides and related fees. We can have this discussion--

Markoff: Mr. Chairman, I realize it. These are items that were raised by Dan in his opening comments, and I just had questions about them. And I have one more, and that’s it, and it’s very short.

Stoldal: All right. Go ahead.

Markoff: Okay. Dan, in talking about maintenance of those trains out there, and particularly the locomotive, the cars are in pretty good shape, but the paint looks like hell. Is there any talk of getting those things repainted so they look decent, the exteriors?

Thielen: Yes, there’s talk about that, and as soon as funding becomes available, we’ll look for somebody to paint them. You’re--and you’re dead right. Acknowledged.

Stoldal: Okay.

Markoff: And where would that funding come from?

Thielen: Possibly when funds are generated through Rail Explorers or through our train rides on the weekends. Those are generally our funding source. We have to generate funds, and then we can spend those funds.

Stoldal: Although there are, Dan, there are some other current existing sources that could take care of that.

Thielen: Dan Thielen, for the record. Yeah, there are some donated funds, but there are restrictions on those.

Stoldal: There are also some federal--some state license plate funds that could be tapped. So our question is--

Markoff: Mr. Chairman, thank you.

Stoldal: I look for a motion regarding the item 7b, which is the train ride and related fees.

Markoff: Mr. Chairman, Dan Markoff. I move that we approve those.
Stoldal: We have a motion to approve. Do we have a second? Jan Petersen indicates a second. Further discussion?

Cowie: Quick question. Sarah Cowie, for the record. We started out this conversation with some concern about statutes and all of that. And Chair Stoldal, I just want to check and make sure that—are your concerns alleviated at this point that we’re potentially just approving the $6 fee and not approving larger contracts or relationships, longer term relationships, with this particular vendor? That that will be determined later in the future? Does that make things okay in your opinion?

Stoldal: As far as the narrow frame of reference with the $6 fee that is being asked here, yes, in the short term. But the bigger question for me that impacts it, there are a lot of other questions that need to be answered in this contract with Rail Explorers. This is just one of them. And as I think that the chair of the Finance Committee, Bob Ostrovsky, indicated, that the $6 fee is not something that we are locked to in the contract negotiation. We are not telling Dan in the negotiations, and Myron in their negotiations with Rail Explorers, that, “Okay. This part of the contract is set. Board approves the $6 fee.” We’re just doing this as a temporary thing pending a full--if I’m not mistaken. Dan, is that correct? Okay. So I’m alleviated at least at this point in the short term. Anthony?

Cowie: Thank you.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons, for the record. I hate to muddle things more, but I would like to request the DAG to provide a professional opinion on whether or not this implies the contract with that organization by approving the $6 fee.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. Should you do that, yes, that’s no problem. Put it in writing. But I warn you. It could take up to two months to get a quote/unquote “legal professional opinion” by the AG’s office. One, I would not be doing that. It would go through the system per this request. But I will, for the record, just suggest to you what this board is doing does have the authority, from my understanding, from changing which was already agreed upon, a $135 fee schedule, to now just modifying it to a $6 per head temporarily until a contract can be negotiated and brought back and approved by this board. But should this board wish to do that, yes. Draw it to my attention, specifically ask what you want, and I will have it forwarded to the deputy attorney general, or senior deputy attorney general, or solicitor general, whoever does the AG opinions. Thank you.

Stoldal: Thank you, Anthony, and thank you. And I’m gonna, Harry, take your word. With the word temporary, that’s what I’m hanging my hat on. So we have a
motion. We have a second. Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say, “Aye.”

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed?

Timmons: Three times in a row. Anthony Timmons, for the record. Nay.

Stoldal: The motion carries and with the chair voting in favor. Thank you all. I--it feels like we are getting weighed down in the weeds in a couple of these things, but with the issue of the vendors, and that’s how we run some of the railroads in Boulder City, I think we need to--that the board really needs to know these kinds of details. There is a tremendous opportunity for improvement in the whole operation in Boulder City through the pandemic and through all of this as we look forward. It’s a great facility, and the idea of the riders, whether it’s Rail Explorers or whatever, they bring in not only revenue, but they bring an experience in, and they also bring visitors to Carson City and visitors to Boulder City. So those--there’s just lots of elements to that. With that, with the power vested in me, it is now 10:20. We are going to take a break until 10:30. So Myron, if you will, stop the recording of this meeting, please.

Unknown: How long of a break?

Stoldal: Twenty minutes, until 10:30.

Freedman: Recording has resumed, chair.

Stoldal: Thank you. I’d like to resume the Nevada Board of Museums and History’s meeting for Friday, September 24, 2021. And we have started the recording. We are agenda item 8, committee reports for possible action. The first report up is item 8a, Finance Committee, Chair Robert Ostrovsky. A presentation of the Morgan Stanley quarter investment report, and this is an action item. Robert?

Ostrovsky: Yes. Included in the board packet are the months of April, May, and June. If you look back all the way to March we had in our investment account, our managed account, on March 31st, $1,533,744.20. We closed our this quarter, that investment account, at $1,655,761.49, a net gain after cash flows in and out of $122,017.29. The total fund grew quite a bit more than that, actually. March 31st the total fund, including the funds in the treasurer’s office, was $4,562,201.49. And the closeout on June 30th, the total of both accounts were $5,397--excuse me, $5,397,646.61. Quite a bit of growth in there too. That net gain in our investment account for all revenues in, including earnings, was about 8 percent for the quarter. Year to date the Dow Jones is up 13.6 percent, the NASDAQ 16.8 percent, the S&P 500 18.45 percent for the year. As you can see, our returns are quite good. Remember, we only harvest about 50 percent of
market value because of our concern of investments. We have a considerable amount invested in bonds, so you’ll never see the yield of the entire market in our accounts. And that’s a decision we make on an annual basis, looking at how much investment risk we want to take. So there’s quite a bit of growth in our investment account. That’s a good thing. The downside is that there’s also quite a bit of inflation going on in the nation. So if you don’t have some growth, the real value of those dollars are falling, not as much as the growth, but we should understand inflation is a factor that’s going to affect all of our operations, as well as the availability of support. I know we talked a little about vendors earlier. I have noticed as chairman of the Cultural Commission our grantees are having a hard time finding contractors and buying materials. That will apply to us as well. I mean, the cost of fuel, the cost of replacement value of any products or services we buy are going to be touched by inflation. But I’m pleased that, you know, we’ve had good market returns. Mr. Chairman, we will get at the end of the year an annual report, which will give us directly from Morgan Stanley that will talk about the exact returns for the year. But I don’t see anything unusual in these reports. I’m glad to say we’ve had significant gains.

Stoldal: Questions from the board? This is listed as an action item. So I think the only action is to accept the report?

Markoff: Dan Markoff, I move that we accept Bob’s report.

Stoldal: Look for a second.

Cowie: Second, Sarah Cowie.


Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously, with those in attendance and the chair voting in favor. Bob, thank you. Look forward to December, and that he will--the person will be here live or Zoom?

Ostrovsky: Yeah, either live or Zoom, whatever we prefer.

Stoldal: All right. Let’s move on to the next report. This is committee report agenda item B, Marketing and Technology, Seth Schorr. Seth?

Schorr: I’m here. I’m here. Seth Schorr, for the record. So I do not have a formal report today. That is not to say that there hasn’t been a lot of thought and discussion since our last board meeting. Jan Petersen, Bob Stoldal and I have met on a few occasions, as did our Technology and Marketing Committee at
some point about two months ago. The long and short of it is we have in our pursuit of an online store being the priority for the Marketing and Technology Committee, we have engaged the individual directors to get their opinions and feedback on their thoughts around the store, you know, challenges, concerns, and of course any positive things as well. We received quite a bit of feedback over the last week. Unfortunately, not enough time to aggregate the comments to bring to the board. And Jan and I felt it would be most productive if we had another committee meeting with the directors, really discussing their specific feedback, with the hope and anticipation of having a formal board update, you know, potentially something for approval at our next meeting. I hate to kick it down the road, but I think that is the best process. I do want to at least plant a seed for those board members that have not had much (inaudible) that, you know, the type of feedback that I continue to receive, and have since discussing this over the past year, is quite clearly that, you know, the current museum staff, you know, simply doesn’t have the resources needed to do, you know, anything extra, let alone what it might take to spin up a store, nor necessarily, you know, I mean this in all due respect, the necessary experience to really run a store. And quite frankly, there is a level of complication added. And I don’t think this is anybody’s fault. It’s just the structure of the museum. The fact that we do have, you know, seven independent museums and seven independent stores does add an extra layer of complication. I do have some potential solutions. I look forward to discussing that with the committee, and hope to bring it back to the board next meeting. That being said, happy to discuss anything with the board at this point, take any comments, feedback, questions or concerns.

Stoldal:  Well, Seth, I think let’s move over to Jan. I know she has likely similar comments or observations that we were just starting to get the information flowing in now, but it is valuable information. Jan, we’re gonna--okay. We’re going to move on to the next item, which is the museum store, which is 8c. Jan Petersen is the chair. Jan?

Petersen:  Jan Petersen, for the record. Well, as Seth wrapped it almost all up totally, the primary concern was just how much more work is this going to involve for museum personnel, who are shorthanded? And as I am on the end of a one-horse show myself, I can totally understand and relate to the concerns of having one more thing to do. And I know that when stuff has to be nailed out here, I wind up doing it on my own time. And that was really my main concern, is these guys are all short staffed, and are willing to participate in an online sale. It’s just that I think we need to meet via Zoom of maybe not necessarily a museum store manager, although that would be the best, but to have a Zoom meeting of whoever is involved in the store committee, as well as a representative from each museum to have a Zoom face-to-face meeting of how they truly feel about this, and get it going down the road. Like Seth said, we’re kind of kicking it over to the December meeting. But I think we need to have a meeting with all of the board--not the board, the store managers or store representatives, to see what they truly feel about all of this.
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Stoldal: Fine. Questions from the board? All right. Maybe it was just that Jan and Seth (inaudible) like what Dan is working on in Boulder City with the Rail Explorers, and Myron’s report that we’re looking at 2024 before we’re going to get back to any sense of normality with staffing and so forth. So I think we need to look at every opportunity where there’s a revenue stream possible, whether it’s in rail rides or the museum stores. Yes, all these are part of an experience, but if we can’t provide an overall experience because we don’t have the staff or the money, I think it’s real important that we move forward with aggressively pushing our stores, both in person and online. So I look forward to the next--to a store committee meeting, a public meeting to do all the things, Jan, that you’re suggesting. And then have a 27-page report from you and Seth on what we need to do next.

Schorr: We’ve already started it. Seth Schorr, for the record. No problem.

Petersen: And I echo what Seth says, and I think we can move forward on this. You know, part of the museum experience is taking home something that gives you a memory of a museum, or entices you to want to learn more about where you visited and what you saw. And this can lead to memberships and repeat visitors and repeat sales.

Stoldal: Yeah, there’s all kinds of opportunities beyond just the initial purchase of something in the store.

Petersen: It’s--oh, Jan Petersen, for the record. And yeah, if you can establish a relationship with these visitors, then they refer other people, and they refer other people for sales as well as visitorship. So--and even down the road it leads to endowments, if you wow them enough.

Stoldal: All right. Let’s move on then to item 8d, Membership. Anthony, any report at this point?

Timmons: Yes, Mr. Chairman. Anthony Timmons, for the record. On behalf of the Membership Committee, I would like to pull the membership group, the members of the committee, for an early October meeting. Those of you who are on the committee, you can send me a quick email as to what days would work for you, maybe first or second week of October. Because what I want to do is I want to get us to some sort of a system wide card similar to this. If you haven’t seen this before, this is an annual pass of the National Park System, and I want to get us to something like that. Now, if you look at the memberships that are being sold system wide, they basically consist of three: individual, family and sustained or sustainable. I forgot exactly what the term is. But so there’s really only three, and there’s one offs on the rest of them. So my focus would be concentrating or getting the numbers down to three memberships if possible, and working out some other things that have to be worked out. I’ve also sent
the chair some mock designs of potential cards based on this sort of idea that I think would be good designs to pursue, and we would have a system wide card color coded based upon the level of membership that the person has. So these are some things that I’d like to propose at our membership meeting. Again, I would like to pull the members. If you can, send me either a message or a s--let me know what date in October would work best for you, so we can get this stuff on the calendar for the board to consider in December.

Stoldal:  Great. Questions of Anthony? We need to move forward on this. This has been floating around for the better part of two years. And, you know, we lay a lot of things on the back of the pandemic, and it deserves that, but we need to move forward, and there’s no reason not to make some decisions. Anthony, thank you very much for your team’s work. East Ely. This is 8e, East Ely Depot Museum. Doris?

Dwyer:  Yes. This is Doris Dwyer, for the record. Myron already gave the report in his division report, because I wasn’t present at those meetings, and I preferred that he do that. But there’s some sentiment on our committee to have a meeting, which we haven’t had--well, probably never had, because for a long time this was a committee of one, and that was me. But now we have more members, and there’s some sentiment among the members to have a committee meeting before the Ely meeting. So I will be talking to--Myron, I want to talk to you about that. So Myron has been providing me with periodic updates of the meetings that he’s attended. I haven’t been aware of most of those meetings. So I’ll be talking to Myron about setting a committee meeting to maybe have more direct contact with the committee itself and Myron before we meet in Ely. So that’s all I have.

Stoldal:  All right. I think that the opportunity to reflect a little bit of what Anthony was talking about earlier, a visit to Ely. Of course, we’ve been there before, and we should go again. And I think a very active East Ely board committee is also important. And while there’s some negotiations in the background that Myron and his team is doing, as well as decisions by through the bond issue and other places, it would be good to get the East Ely board committee up and running, especially (inaudible) not legally contracted and so forth. So Doris, look forward with you working with Myron on--

Dwyer:  Yes.

Stoldal:  --that priority. All right. Let’s move on to item number 9, which are museum reports. The first one is 9a, the Nevada Historical Society. And Catherine, did I see you? Are you still with us? There you are.

Magee:  I’m here.

Stoldal:  Okay.
Magee: So this is Catherine Magee, for the record. I am happy to report that on Monday we do have our final candidates for the librarian position coming to interview, and we have continued our programming online through Zoom and other aspects. And I’m happy to take any questions that you have.

Stoldal: The Historical Society report, Catherine, report is here. It reflects a lot of the challenges that are faced--are echoed in other board reports. Are there any questions from the board? Catherine, on page two you talked about you’ve done more sale in the museum store with limited on-site foot traffic. You know, the challenge you face with being sort of tucked away there at the UNR, is most of your store sales, do they come from special events that you have, book signings and other events, or is there in fact a significant number of--a member of the family has lost their phone. So is it foot traffic or is it special events? Where do you see most of your revenue coming in as far as the store goes?

Magee: This is Catherine Magee, for the record. That’s a great question, Bob. Prior to the pandemic, when we were--had normal operating hours, I would say that it was a combination of special events as well as foot traffic. Mainly what we found during special events, if it were a book signing, we would sell books, but we were also really good at selling memberships, and memberships increased during our on-site events. We do have people that specifically come to the Nevada Historical Society for the store, and we have had that even during the pandemic, specifically for our books. But I would say that probably a majority of our museum store sales really are tied to our events. This is Catherine Magee, for the record. Bob, you are on mute.

Stoldal: Which--Catherine, on the last page, seven, of your report, what are filming school tours? So the docents film the school tours, and those are--what’s the purpose of filming?

Magee: So--Catherine Magee, for the record. So when schools were shut down for the pandemic, Washoe County school district asked what we could do to help provide educational materials for their schools. So instead of having the in-person school tours, because they couldn’t have them, we worked with our docents and volunteers to film what would’ve been the typical tours that the schools take here to make them available online. So they are still available for teachers to use.

Stoldal: I apologize. For a moment I had to leave for a lost phone. The last one is Michelle Turk has accepted an associate editor position for the quarterly. Is that a paid position?

Magee: Catherine Magee, for the record. No, that is not a paid position.
Further questions for the historical society? Catherine, thank you. Hearing none, there is an action item, and this is to approve the $500. It’s item number 9a, one acceptance of $500 for the dona--unless there’s some deep discussion on this, I look for a motion to approve. Jan? Was that a motion?

Dan Markoff, so moved.

I so move.

Okay. Dan. And were you going to second?

I’ll second. I--

Okay.

--couldn’t get my mute off fast enough to first it.

So Dan has now made a motion to approve, and it was seconded by Jan. Further discussion of the board? Hearing none, all those in favor say, “Aye.”

Aye.

Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously, with those in attendance and the chair voting in favor. Item 9a2, Nevada Historical Society quarterly publication reconciliation report. And there is a document in fact in your board report. Catherine, if you would, walk us through this, please.

This is Catherine Magee, for the record. I did not put that in, so I’m going to bat it over to Carrie.

Perfect. Hi, Carrie Edlefsen, for the record. As you all know, I left for a short period of time. And when I returned at the end of June, I was going through the previous meeting minutes of board meetings while I was gone, and found that a request had been made for--to be able to see how much of the money that was in Category 48 that actually belonged to the quarterly revenues to date. It was also requested that this be put into the budgets moving forward, and I could see that that had not happened. But with that information, I did want to provide this information to the board, so that they could make a determination moving forward as to how much money the quarterly publications were actually earning as opposed to what the expenditures were. Prior to my actually joining the Division of Museums and History in state fiscal year 2012, this information was not tracked individually. It was considered a non-restricted revenue, and was passed through the budget to support all non-restricted activities within the dedicated trust funds. So that’s why the information starts in state fiscal year 2012. When I started, we started actually tracking those funds individually, so that we could, you know, keep record actually the way that we have this way.
So right now what you see in the amount of Category 48, which if you’re reviewing it, you know, a good review would be to see on Catherine’s board report on that first page there’s approximately $340,000 in Category 48. Of that $340,000, based on my calculations, that $58,256 is the revenue balance of--that relates directly to the quarterly publication. In the meeting minutes that I read it was expressed that that dollar amount be placed specifically within the quarterly publication. So with this information, if it’s the desire of the board, we can prepare for this year a work program. Well, I can submit to the board a budget change document in December to be able to prepare a work program to place that into the quarterly category of the budget. Otherwise we just can maintain the reconciliation as we move forward, and know that these funds are sitting there in the Category 48 to be withdrawn as needed if expenditures exceed what has been budgeted annually.

Stoldal: Thank you. Really helpful. A lot of great detail, as we look forward to the future of the quarterly. Questions from the board? Comments? Carrie, just on the last item of 2021, I was looking through the years and all the way back to 2014 we had 22,700, 15,700, 14,300, 6700, 9400, 6800, 6500, and then we pop up to 27,000. Help understand what the actual expenditures--do you know why that jumped like that?

Edlefsen: I have to apologize. I did not investigate why there was such a change. I do know that in past years budgeting had been low with authority for the, well, for the fact that requests weren’t made, or it was based on previous year or the base year budgeting. And in state fiscal year ‘21 it was requested that the authority be raised up to $30,000 to expand, and so with that amount I believe Catherine was able to use those funds to hire the contracted editors and whatever other contracts now she needed to produce the quarterlies. I also believe that in the previous years the quarterlies were being produced two a year, as opposed to four a year. And I believe that in fiscal year ‘21 there were--Catherine, help me out here. Did we--there were actually two years produced in that one year to get--for her to get caught up on those quarterlies.

Magee: Hi, this is Catherine Magee, for the record. Yeah, so for--our goal was to start producing four quarters for this year, so we did have some expenditure to produce quarterlies that we hadn’t had in the past.

Stoldal: Here’s where my question is going to, Carrie or Catherine. Is 27 a more realistic number than the previous? Of course, there was no pandemic in 2018 or 2017, where the numbers are 67, 94, 68. What’s a reasonable estimate of what the quarterly is going to cost as we move forward into 2022, 2023, etcetera?

McGee: This is Catherine McGee, for the record. I think that right now, we are looking at not producing the Quarterly four times a year through sending it out in the mail. So there’s some discussion about what, again, digital versus mail because
the mail, that's quite an expenditure there. So that's something that we will be discussing and I'm curious if there will be a new board member who's appointed to the Quarterly Committee because that was Alicia. So I'd love to meet with that person and talk ideas.

Stoldal: Well, that's a nice piece of information to come floating up to the top of the Quarterly is going to be a quarterly only printed twice a year and twice digitally is at least the plan or the thinking here moving forward?

McGee: Catherine McGee, for the record. There is nothing set in stone. There's a lot of discussions that need to happen, especially looking at the financial realities of the Quarterly.

Stoldal: Okay (inaudible) thank you very much. This is a great piece of information and helps build the foundation for where we go with the Quarterly. Further questions from the Board? This is not an action item. This was strictly an informational item.

Let's move on then to the next one, is the Agenda Item 9, Museum Reports. The Nevada State Railroad Museum in Carson City and we'll bring up somebody we haven't seen before. Dan, you want to walk us through this, please?

Thielen: Hi. Dan Thielen, for the record. If our museum--god, I hate to lead with the bad news. But our museum store really did not do well in this fiscal year. We're down in the hole 33 percent overall. Our visitation to the museum has been flatter. You'll notice we have increased our gate revenue so that it doesn't appear that we're doing that bad but the people walking in the front door and them, as a result, getting in the store, we recognize some problems. Laura has penciled out some ideas to get more of the museum's stock on hand and visible. She contended that it was our layout that prevented having a huge amount of material available for the public to peruse. Our COVID restrictions kept the store--sometimes you'll get six, eight, ten people in that store and they will be jammed together but because of COVID, we had to limit that. So store visitation, the time people spent browsing was down. There's a lot of reasons that it bled out this year.

Having said that, we got some ideas for moving forward. Laura has moved on, the position is vacant. I expect to fill it but we are tossing around some ideas in order to perhaps maybe go part time, to lessen the negative revenue stream of the store. We have some issues. I mean, having a full-time person there is always nice to back up the museum attendant in case the museum attendant has to drop out and go to the bathroom or attend something in the back side of the museum, it's always good to have a staff member up front. This year, it would be problematic. It's hard right now going without a store manager. I've spent a lot of time up front and in support of the museum and our museum attendant is
taking care of inventory and that's taken her attention off other things. So we miss her badly.

Having said that, there's some good things that happened. I'm going to try and share an image. It's not--Myron, if you could allow me to show something, I just want to--with that scan--

Freedman: If I make you a co-host, you can share the screen.

Thielen: Okay. Let's just see if we can. I don’t want to waste a lot of time on it. It says you disabled participant sharing.

Freedman: I did?

Thielen: Let's not worry about it. I wanted to show you a picture and I'll have it for the December meeting. We took the Glenbrook Locomotive down to the (inaudible) mentioned we were going to do that and it was an exceptional event. But it's this quarter, it's not last quarter so I just wanted to show you that but let's move on from that.

Last quarter, we had a thing called Iron Horse Rail Camp, which is becoming one of our premier events. We have a program that we invite eight or ten people to come to Nevada and learn how to run a locomotive. And we run them through the motorcar, we run them through the safety test. They get to learn how they did it in, you know, 1930 and it's very well received. It's very well attended. And we're going to use that model for a lot of different things like youth. It's been my goal and my desire and want to have a steam--I mean, science, technology, electronics program to augment K-12. And I really, really, really, really want to have a camp that fosters this amazing equipment or use the amazing equipment to generate some wonderful activities in people's brains. I think K-12 maybe, you know, third grade on up, we can do some wonderful things and have an experience for them.

We've got some hiring challenges here. We have put out our custodian position three times and next week, we'll be interviewing a single person for that position. That position's been vacant since late winter and it has been a challenge. We're hoping to see some tremendous candidates for our buildings and grounds supervisor. That's been vacant since a year and a half ago and we finally have got that (inaudible) it closed today and so next week, we should see some candidates. Hopefully, there are people out there that want to work.

We are, I think, about 90 percent complete with our MOU with our Friends in the state and the Board. We've got some language in there that we're wrestling out. We want to make sure we're only including the things that are necessary to put in that. We work very closely with the Chair and have really cut through a lot of the stuff and I think we're going to have a document that we will use more
broadly and as soon as we get it done and nailed down in Carson City, I expect it right out of the gate for Boulder City and codify the relationship between our volunteer organization and the museum. And I think that we're very close to that. When we started going through (inaudible) review, we just started asking some other questions. But our Friends are okay, I think we've got support from the chair of the board and we like where we're heading with this. Everyone knows it needs to be done and we're all moving and pushing in the same direction and it's kind of refreshing to be close.

We, in Carson City, I know it's the capitol of the state, but we're still in 1991 on our computer systems and our IT department has found a way for us to get connected to the world in 2021. And after pushing and pushing hard, we're right there. It's so stinking cool that we will have a data connection that will support Zoom. It's really cool to us. Anyway, we're very close to that, as well, so thanks to Ron and thanks to Karen and thanks to Myron for helping us out with that.

That's my report pending your questions.

Stoldal: Dan is working well--of course he's working well. But is working well in Carson City, as well as Boulder City and as part of a team that is working in Ely but has moved via the MOUs through (inaudible) I think it's been close to two years that we've been working on that. I'd just like to echo what Dan said, we're all on the same page and just crossing some "T"s," and dotting some "I"s," and hopefully we'll have something, maybe even a special board meeting to get this thing moving forward. Questions from the Board? Doris?

Dwyer: Yes. This is Doris Dwyer for the record. First of all, we've got Laura's recent retirement. I wanted to commend the work that she's done there. I've stopped in to that museum store probably three or four times the last fiscal year and it's always really, really well stocked. I mean, I really thought she did a great job with the merchandise, the selections that she chose. So were you saying before, Dan, that the people coming to the museum were not coming into the museum or they just were going in the museum but not going into the store?

Thielen: Dan Thielen, for the record. So during the COVID pandemic when they would come in and sometimes they couldn’t get in the store because there were already three people in there and that was about the amount of people that we could fit in there and have the six-foot spread between them. The other problem is the movement through the store is a very linear movement, that you start on one side and you snake around in one spot. So when people would glance into the store, they would look and see another person in there and realize they’d have to almost, you know, rub butt cheeks to get by each other in order to be there. And so sometimes people would just look in and dip out or feel when somebody was coming in behind them, that they had to move rapidly through the store in order to give somebody else a chance to look at things. And so the moments that they
spent in the store were dramatically reduced because of our layout. So I hope that answers your question.

Dwyer: Okay. Okay. I have one more question on the membership page, I guess page four of your report, the narrative says that the current memberships (inaudible) but the totals don't reflect that, so am I reading it wrong?

Thielen: Dan for the record--

Dwyer: The totals reflect, like, 348 for '21, for FY21.

Thielen: You know, when I'm trying to answer questions and look--good grief. I think it should've been 553, so the total memberships.

Dwyer: But that's not--but the totals for FY21 don't reflect that number. I mean, am I reading it wrong?

Thielen: You know, I don't know. I think there is a--

Dwyer: 'Cause it says 348.

Thielen: --I think there is a calculating error in that line.

Dwyer: Okay. Because I noticed when--

Thielen: Let me look into that. You're dead right, it's very confusing.

Dwyer: And I've noticed that on a couple of other museum reports, that the totals aren't always matching the figures and the charts. So anyway--

Thielen: You know what, I'll look into that. I'm not an Excel expert but I will look into that to make sure that that number--yeah, you're right.

Dwyer: Is it possible they just didn't update the narrative, they updated the chart but not the narrative?

Thielen: It could be that.

Dwyer: It looks kind of--okay.

Thielen: Okay.

Stoldal: Doris (inaudible) two things that I look at is because they're Nevada revised statutes responsibility to the board are memberships and stores. And when look at that as there's (inaudible) some questions, Dan, with the other numbers there. For example, when you have the total being new and renewed, do you combine
those two to come up with the total number? So it's not really clear to me where--for FY20, you've got 40 new and 553 renewed, so that would (inaudible) to think that we've got 593 members. So I think if you could take a look at that and maybe just go with Myron and send out an updated version of that, it would be really helpful.

Thielen: Yeah, that's a fair point. It is awkward and not easy to understand.

Stoldal: Go to page six and the top one, Fundraising Activities. Just intrigued by a word you used. The museum and Friends of the Nevada State Railroad Museum are preparing, quote, an aggressive fundraising campaign. Help me understand what you mean by aggressive. Why?

Thielen: The Friends would love to get into the position where they have generated hundreds of thousands of dollars to repair a locomotive. And before the Board even asked, they started doing audits, so that when they applied for grants or they applied for corporate support for an event, they wanted to make sure that they had audited annual audited statements and were financially stable enough to receive those funds and execute them in the manner that the donor or the grantor intended. And so we have used that in the hopes of getting the Locomotive Reno to Nevada and then rapidly, in state time, I mean, we wouldn't do anything slip shot. But usually, restoration can take decades. The Glenbrook took 30 years. And what they wanted to do is be able to do a feasibility study, start work, get the contracts out that needed to be out and get restoration done in about two or three years. And that was what the hope was. So they prepared themselves in the hopes of getting the Locomotive Reno up here, and within about three or four years, have that go through restoration process.

We keep that on the hook because we know we need motive power that is not artifact-based. We would love it if our standard operating piece of equipment was not an artifact native to Nevada our to our collection and that's where that aggressive fundraising campaign has been focused on.

Stoldal: Thank you. That's great news from the beginning of having an audited (inaudible) apply for grants. That's great. Questions from the Board? If not, there are no action items. We accept--

Peterson: Mr. Chairman, I do have a comment. It's not regarding all of this back but I had to call the train museum in August with questions about activity in northern Nevada in the past and whoever answered the phone was the most helpful--two different times. Helpful, informative, didn't make me feel like I was asking stupid questions and I did not identify who I was. I just can't compliment them highly enough on their response to my questions and reassurance that I was not asking stupid questions. They were questions about steam engines and when they went out of service and it was just great to be able to call a museum, not
have to punch 8 million different buttons and get an actual human on the line to answer my questions at the moment. It was a great experience.

Thielen: Dan Thielen, for the record. Well, I'll take full credit for that. Actually, I am just so fortunate that the people that work here at the museum, both volunteers and staff, they are just so exceptional. It is the best part of this job.

Peterson: Jan Peterson, for the record. It's great to be able to call some place and get an answer on the spot instead of somebody saying, "Well, I don't know, I'll have to get back to you," and you never hear back again. So thank you, good job.

Stoldal: And with that note, we will move onto Museum Reports, Agenda Item 9, to the Nevada State Railroad Museum in Boulder City. Randy, I think I see you still there. Is there anything you want to make sure that you highlight that the Board sees?

Randy: So the report, starting kind of where Dan did, we have effectively not reopened our store. Our store is under 200 square feet in basically a high-end garden shed and we have not been able to do it safely. You can't put people in there. On the other hand, John Walker will open it up when the trains are running on weekends, so there's some little sales showing up. We're also finding it reflects both the store and it reflects our part-time janitorial. We're finding it very, very, very challenging to hire people.

Through our manpower state contract, we're paying not quite half of what McDonald's will start somebody at, so that's a challenge. Other than that, we are starting to operate more trains, particularly using the rail explorers. They're actually having a grand time operating. They were at 35,000-plus guests last year.

Attendance is spotty, you know. People want to be out but they get kind of nervous in public, so we've been operating under federal masking guidelines on the trains, so at one point, we were fully masking outdoors, on the platform and on the train. That has now been relaxed to 100 percent masking if it's an enclosed car and we do not have to mask if it's an open car.

We continue to work on rolling stock that continues to give us problems and I did write a report, which I submitted that's now in being reviewed. We're seeing some activity around working on a business card (inaudible) that we were given. She's 1899, we have documented that Teddy Roosevelt rode on her and so that is kind of a positive. And I'm happy to answer any questions.

Stoldal: (Inaudible) question to you and, Randy, if you can feel necessary to jump in. You talked about (inaudible) a second store. When I went down there and visited not too long ago, there was a second door operating on (inaudible) rail explorers and (inaudible) back by the fact that almost that the store appears on museum grounds, the matter didn't come before the board. I don't know what
the legalities of it is, the rail explorer facility. The owner of the rail explorers invited me in to the container-like store. I was very surprised that that's operating. Is that still operating and under what authority? Is that in the rail explorer contract and how does that--anyway, can you give us a review of that, Dan, where we stand, the history and briefly where we stand today?

Randy: So that store is not in their contract. That store essentially began--initially, they basically worked off of a folding table outside and then from that, they built a small little ticket booth type structure. And they've always been selling Christmas ornaments and t-shirts. All of the items are logo'd, with the exception of they do occasionally sell water. That store is currently not open under orders from Myron. They cannot sell things.

During the contract negotiations, there has been a discussion of the state receiving a percentage of the profits from that store. So in the contract, we have the new contract proposals, we have at least acknowledged its existence.

Stoldal: Randy, did they just unilaterally set up this--we went from a (inaudible).

Randy: From day one, they had always offered t-shirts and a few things. When they went to do the ticket booth--the blue ticket booth facility, which is a temporary building, it can be picked up with a forklift and taken away. They continued to do it there and we have never had a question before this about their ability to sell t-shirts and hats and such.

Stoldal: Well, I don't want to say that I was shocked to see a store that wasn't approved by the museum board on that site, whether it was a folding table or a container or whatever. They were selling a lot more than just little doodads. There were lots of stuff in that facility. I think we need to be very, very, very careful about letting anybody sell anything on the museum property, the state property unless it's been approved (inaudible) state administration, administrator's office or, to me, letting them operate like that is terrible, oppressive and (inaudible) but let's move forward.

With your report on the rolling stock on page seven, locomotive and rolling stock, what's the status as we speak, how many pieces are rolling as far as the engines right now?

Randy: Right now, we have two engines in operable condition, number 1,000 and number 844. And we have all of the equipment we use for passenger service operable except the dining car and it has a bad wheel set. The Friends have purchased wheel sets for that car and they're on hand. We don't have staff to install them.

Stoldal: Questions from the Commission? At this moment, it seems like there is a bit of a dark cloud over the Bolder City Museum but I don't think that that's--I see
plenty of sunshine coming through that. And (inaudible) I think, Randy, this will be the last meeting that you will be appearing before the Board? Is that correct, Myron?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. That is correct. And let me be the first to say how much I appreciate Randy's service these past few years and his intents and in-depth knowledge about the history of southern railroading and those trains on that site. He's quite the curatorial resource.

Stoldal: Well, and second, I think that Randy was given an operational (inaudible) that was filled with holes and he has tried to patch that as best he could and has kept the place afloat. And so while I don't want to speak for the Board but I will speak for the Board, Randy, thank you for all your dedication, hard work and (inaudible) your wonderful relationship that you have developed with the folks in Boulder City. They're just very supportive of you and your efforts, so thank you for your service and we look forward to taking what you have done so far and building upon that effort and making Boulder City Museum an even better place. We wish you were here when they started construction or finished construction but we'll make sure you're invited out or at least get you some images of some of the work that you've started. I know you're still working with the architecture, so Randy, thank you so much.

Randy: Well, thank you. Yes. I retire next Thursday, so I am sitting at four days and, what time is it, and about four hours.

Stoldal: Yeah, counting those days, are you?

Randy: No, not at all. Thank you, it's been a pleasure working with the Board.

Stoldal: Okay. Thank you very much, Randy. We have a couple more (inaudible) getting close, whether or not we need to take a break but we're making some progress. Let's move on to Ely Railroad. Shawn, you're with us and Myron and Dan. Is there anything that we haven't covered that we need to cover with East Ely at this point?

Pitts: Shawn Pitts, for the record. I have just some good news. We're bringing on a manpower, a temporary staffing position that's going to assist us about 16 hours a week. When you're sitting at two and a half employees, 16 hours a week of an additional employee is extraordinary help. And appreciate Myron and Kerry and everybody for helping to make that happen.

Exhibits have arrived. I sent in the email, the ADA-accessible exhibit that's--the film that's available to you to watch. I'm very pleased with how that turned out and we're preparing to install the exhibit panels now.
And a late-breaking piece of news. I reported that we had the Lego people in the freight building as a highly-successful event. They not only want to come back, they want to come give some assistance to the museum and we'll look forward to that and I'll report on that next month. So available for any questions that anyone has.

Stoldal: Look for a question. I see Anthony's hand up.

Timmons: Hey, Shawn, Anthony Timmons, for the record. I got a quick question for you. Regarding the stuff that's in the vault, are you comfortable that that stuff is adequately preserved?

Pitts: Regarding the collection that's in the vault, I will tell you that the majority of the usable and necessary stuff that's in the vault has already been hydrated and moved into the depot. The stuff that is in the vault, my biggest concern is access to that. It doesn't matter how good your facility is, if you can't control the access to your collection, you don't have anything. And so we're concerned about that, obviously and working to mitigate that.

Stoldal: Great, thank you. Further question from Shawn, Dan or Myron? I think we've got a pretty good update on Ely throughout the board meeting on the different levels that are taking place. If there's no further questions from the Board--

Seeing none, let's move on then to Item 9(e), Nevada State Museum, Carson City. Myron.

Freedman: Thank you, Chair. Myron Freedman for the record. And have a couple of staff standing by to help answer questions on this report. It has been a tough year, as everybody has reported.

Stoldal: Myron, one just quick second. I think there's a couple of mics that (inaudible) dogs in the background. Is there any way you could check there on their muting? Thank you.

Freedman: Thank you, Chair. But give--all in all, the numbers are not too bad for the State Museum in Carson City. We have had some even during the pandemic. Some aggressive programming and some promotions and, of course, the coin press is running. So the museum store totals, while they are down, are not at record lows or anything like that and the museum store profit is up for the period of this report, so we're pleased about that. The membership figures have suffered and that is, I think, a direct impact from the pandemic period but also because we had to lay off the membership manager during the period. Now, we're poised now to rehire that position, probably within two weeks the person will be on staff again. A person will be on staff again. But you can see that, you know, we went from a high of a few years ago of about 750 members in 2019 and we closed out this year around 420, so that's a significant drop in membership. And
so one of our goals will be to see that number to be increased again.
Attendance, of course, is way down, as is expected through the closures and the
shortened schedule.

Any questions on the numbers?

Stoldal: Doris?

Dwyer: Yes. This is Doris Dwyer for the record, yeah. So this is another example of,
like, with the museum attendance records and the attendance receipts. The year-
to-date comparison numbers, percentages, don't match this. You know,
somebody's, you know, they're updating the figures but they're not updating the
percentages at the bottom, apparently, because they're not matching. So I just
ask people to maybe--all the museums to kind of pay more attention to that next
time. On pages five and six, the figures are correct, I think. The yearly--the
monthly figures are correct but the year-to-date comparisons and the
percentages are all wrong. Probably they haven't been updated from a previous
year but I don't know.

Ellison: Kerry Ellison for the record. Those numbers are updated within the division
office. I would have to take blame for this as I came in at the end of the year. I
did not take the time to review the percentages as they should've been built at
the beginning of the fiscal year.

Dwyer: Yeah, and it happens, so, yeah, so just next time, you know, next time.

Ellison: Well, right, so with the report that you guys will see in December, you'll see that
will be updated for Fiscal Year '22 and all of the formulas will be updated fresh.

Dwyer: Thanks, Kerry. I know you came in kind of at the last minute, yeah.

Stoldal: Kerry (inaudible) go over to the previous page on page four on membership
figures, I guess it's obvious to everybody but there is no total. It says total at the
top but then there--it just listed new and renewed. So I assume that for FY21,
the total is 327 and 91, for--

Ellison: That should be what that is. The total should be new members for Fiscal Year
'21 should be 91 and renewed should be 327.

Stoldal: Okay. So total of the membership, per se, in this chart?

Ellison: Yes.

Stoldal: Okay. So I would just (inaudible) for the board member to add up the two
numbers, the new and the renewed to come up with the total membership.
Great, okay.
Ellison: Yeah, we can make that modification on here. This particular table kind of morphed its way into this after a board meeting several years ago where the Board had requested the separation between new and renewed memberships, so we can certainly add a grand total of both the membership numbers together for the Board's review.

Stoldal: For those of us who are math challenged, I think that that would be helpful. But the idea of having new and renewed separated, getting that information, that's also very important. But we can get into all that (inaudible).

Ellison: Absolutely.

Stoldal: Any responses by the Board? Hearing none, thank you for that detailed report. Let's move on then. Now, we have Item 9(e)(1), acceptance of a $5,000 donation. Myron, I'm going to let you talk us through that.

Freedman: Yes, thank you, chair. Before we leave my general report, I just wanted to also report on a wonderful event that was held Monday at the Governor's mansion. First Lady Presents. This was a program that grew out of the museums territorial Curator's Corner program, turned into an art exhibit that was done in partnership with a private curator and the First Lady, working with her office, we developed a program for inside the Governor's mansion. We had a wonderful reception on Monday. A couple of the board members attended and it's just a great partnership and I'm looking forward to seeing that continue in the years to come, even with successive administrations, is my hope.

The request before you is to receive $5,000 from the Nauman Foundation and this is to be used specifically for the purpose of museum cabinets. We've received this type of cabinetry in the past. These are high-quality metal cabinets and, yeah, the funds will be available to curators who are looking to upgrade the storage of some of their collection items.

Stoldal: Now, I'm assuming, and as you're presenting, this is--they're talking not generic (inaudible) they're talking specifically the one in Carson City?

Freedman: Correct.

Stoldal: All right. Further questions, comments? Look for a motion to accept.

Markoff: Dan Markoff. So moved.

Stoldal: We have a motion from Dan. A second?

Mooney: I'll second.
Stoldal: (Inaudible) second the motion. Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.

Chorus: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously with the Chair's vote in favor. Myron, thank you very much. Let’s move on to Item 9(f), Lost City Museum. And Mary Beth, there you are. You have moved over to the left side of the screen. Anything that you want to make sure that the Board does not miss in this report?

Timm: Good morning. Mary Beth Timm, for the record. So we had an increase in visitation in March and April and which we started purchasing merchandise for the museum store, anticipating that we would still have high levels. Unfortunately, though in June and July, we had drops in visitation, so our store just squeaked by. It's not currently earning enough revenue to support a second museum attendant position, as Myron Freedman reported earlier this morning. In terms of programming, we did serve over 100 children at a local livestock show, a 4H livestock show. The Clark County Fair was canceled this past spring but they did a local fair instead for just the high school students and middle school students. And so we attended there and had an outdoor activity for families and children.

We did have our Hot and Dusty Fine Art Invitational in August, which is past the reporting portion of this report. The report is from April to June of last year and our Hot and Dusty Fine Art Invitational was in August. We had to cancel our closing reception but we're getting ready to put together the silent auction online. The holdup has been our docent council trying to get together a PayPal and an online payment mechanism, so that we can then have the silent auction online.

Stoldal: Okay. Questions from the Board? Mary Beth, thank you for the great job that you're currently doing with a challenging situation. I notice on page seven under your Buildings and Grounds, the irrigation, which has been a challenge for a long time, the proposal was submitted through the CIP process. It was unclear if funded. Myron, do we have an answer, do we know one way or the other then what we need to do?

Freedman: I don't have an immediate answer on that project. We were meeting with the various public works and the local irrigation company and there was a lot of discussion about who actually controls access to this and back and forth. I'll need to get back with public works to see where they are with all of that and if this can get back on track with some sort of mitigating measure. Mary Beth, am I leaving out anything in that?

Timm: Mary Beth Timm, for the record. I don't think the CIP was funded in the last legislative session. I'm not sure if that information was available at the time that
I submitted the report. I’m not sure. I d--I don't know exactly. This project has been a little bit unclear on where it ended up. We had some public works representatives come out for the 2019 legislative session that funded the sanitary sewer and upgrading our restaurants. That project hasn't started yet, other than architects are coming to create plans. And so we looked at that a little bit in terms of where the water access is to the building, which is quite close to the irrigation canal and so we had to revisit a little bit of where exactly the ownership would be or the easement would be for that irrigation canal. So it's still kind of unclear and I think that we keep getting started and then getting distracted, so we'll have to come up with a better solution for our next meeting.

Stoldal: Mr. Ostrovsky?

Ostrovsky: No. I had no questions.

Stoldal: Okay. And this is, you know, we talk about the climate crisis. This is one that has caused problems over the years and needs to be resolved. I mean, this has a negative impact on our museum. Mary Beth, there are two other items. Can you address those? Replace the sanitary sewer as well as--I thought we had funding for the Pueblos repair?

Timm: That is correct. Mary Beth Timm, for the record. The restoration of the Pueblos was recommended for funding during the 2021 biennium. My understanding of public works projects is that they have up to four years to fund the project. I have talked to the coordinator with this project in particular and they have started movement on it. But I'm not sure at what point work would actually get started. They first have to do an assessment of the Pueblos, so they would have to do a bid for an assessment and then there would be a repair.

Stoldal: Myron, you want to add something?

Timm: If they are needed.

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. Well, it's just that the state public works really took the lead on this during the legislative session and that's now we ended up getting the estimates into the bill. So we're looking forward to working with them on the next steps and as Mary Beth pointed out, they didn’t start that already but we're not sure of what their timetable's going to be. We'll keep with them to find out to get more detail.

Stoldal: Okay. And the sewer, it says Sanitary Sewer System. Mary Beth.

Timm: We had architects out in the beginning of September to look at our water access to the building because they are looking to install a water treatment--some sort of water treatment to soften the water that goes into the building. We've been having difficulties with our toilets with the sediments in the water building up
and corroding copper parts within the toilets themselves. So this project would hopefully replace the hardware within the bathrooms. And so they were looking for a water treatment where they could construct that on the building or near the building.

Stoldal: Myron, would you (inaudible) keep us up to speed on these three critical issues for Lost City? I hope there's some progress between now and our next board meeting. Any other questions for Mary Beth? Thank you for your report.

Move on them to 9(g), which is the Nevada State Museum in Las Vegas.

Timm: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, Mary Beth Timm, for the record. I did submit a memo for possible action--

Stoldal: Yes.

Timm: --for free admission during the Native American Day Festival.


Timmons: Yes. Anthony Timmons for the record. Mary Beth, I see that Native American Day is today. When is the festival?

Timm: The Native American Heritage Month is in November and so the festival will be some time in November. We're looking at November 20 for when our Native American Day would be. I have submitted a grant request to Nevada Humanities to help fund the honorariums and per diems of performers, so that would be in November. I apologize. I don't know exactly what you saw for the date. Maybe it's the approval on the memo or is there something else?

Stoldal: Anthony?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman and Mary Beth, Anthony Timmons, for the record. It's a recognized day by in the State of California and Nevada that Native American Day is today. It was recognized by the governor back in 2020. I did not see a '21 proclamation but it's not really an official state holiday but a day that's set aside.

Stoldal: Okay. It's likely that there are different times and different days. I think Columbus Day is now also Indigenous Population Day, as well. And so there's multiple times, which is great throughout the year to celebrate the indigenous population. So Lost City will be in November with a request for a free admission day for that. We'd look for a motion.
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Cowie: Sarah Cowie. I move to approve the free admission day for Native American Day Festival.

Stoldal: Do we have a second?

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer. I second the motion.

Stoldal: We have a motion and we have a second. Further discussion?

Mooney: I'll second.

Stoldal: All right. We have an additional (inaudible) all those in favor, say aye.

Chorus: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously with those in attendance and the Chair voting in favor. Look forward to a great deal of success and the funding for those honorariums. So which kind of total dollar figure are you looking at?

Timm: Mary Beth Timm, for the record. The grant that I submitted for close to $7500.

Stoldal: Great.

Timm: We had the event in 2019, the Air Force brought about $6500 which helped make the festival incredibly successful. We had a full day's worth of programming. We had about ten vendors that were on site. Over 50 Native American individuals who attended the event, not just as performers but as also members of the public and then we had 360 attendees in total.

Stoldal: Mary Beth, thank you again. What's next up is the Las Vegas Nevada State Museum in Las Vegas. Hollis, is there anything that you want to make sure we don't miss?

Gillespie: Good morning, Hollis Gillespie for the record. Thank you very much Chair and Board. First of all, I'd like to day I'm delighted that you'll be coming in December to Nevada State Museum Las Vegas for your next board meeting. I think you have my report and it's a good reflections of how thing were going towards the end of the fiscal year. I faced the same challenges everybody else has, however I feel really encouraged by the trends that have started to go up, both in terms of our store revenue. Our membership, I think we'll see a better reflection of where we're going to be going, uh, over the next calendar year this next quarter.

I really feel happy that even though we have a trim staff, that they're a great combination of creativity, self-directed and problem solvers, so I'm, you know, we're doing a lot of great things and pivoting to a lot of online platforms when
that makes more sense for our current situation. And as everybody probably
here already knows well that we're very positively correlated with attendance at
Springs Preserve. And they were really--they had really moved their operations
to skeletal staff and skeletal offerings, so things have been fairly flat for us. But
as of this fall, they are going to resume their Day of the Dead and Haunted
Harvest over a couple of weekends. And they also, just last week, opened a new
exhibition. We saw a large increase in our attendance for Saturday and Sunday,
a little bit less so for Monday. But we think that this bump in attendance, we're
going to see a continuing growth that may put us back on a closer track to where
we were in 2019. I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

Stoldal: Questions from the Board? Just a quick question. Monday has never been a
great day for visitation. Why are we open on that day?

Gillespie: I did it, one, because I actually proposed to be open on a Thursday because I
thought that was going to help more with some school activity but the Springs
was really insistent, at least until next February, that they wanted to be open on
Mondays to capture holiday traffic. Monday holiday traffic. And so if they
would not have been able to--we would not have been able to be open on
Thursday with their support, so I wanted to make sure that we could be open
four out of seven days and to do that, we needed to do it on a Monday. And I
don't have it in this last report but I can start to separate out some of that
attendance for Monday, so that we can see it. It's not one that I would've wanted
but in the spirit of, neighborliness and to make sure that we do have a common
operating platform--because it does help with our combined marketing to have
the same operating schedule.

Stoldal: All right. Questions from the Board (inaudible) glad to hear that you're feeling
we're moving in a positive direction, so that's--

Gillespie: I am, thank you.

Dwyer: I have a question, Bob, about the report. This is Doris Dwyer for the record.
Hollis, there's a statement in here where the pages aren't numbered. Under
Sources and Demographics. We no longer receive detailed reservation or
attendance information from Springs Preserve, which was the pre-pandemic
practice. Is that changed because of the pandemic or for some other reason?

Gillespie: I don't think that--I think the pandemic was immaterial. I think they just lost a
number of people that were doing some of those regular reporting and so I had
gone back to Andy and Bruno at the Springs and asked for a continuation of
that, so we've started to get some of that. You know, it's tough. We're not able
to capture a lot of that really useful data at our point of entry and so we're
resuming it. But I think the pandemic was just a timing issue.

Dwyer: Okay. Thank you.
Stoldal:  (Inaudible) I know you'll stay on top of that. And this really a minor point but I really like the font and your printing jumps out so maybe, Myron, as this was the last document, maybe there's (inaudible) but maybe it's just the font that you're using that is really easier for me to read. And maybe it's just the great photos, the color photos that are in there. But a great presentation. And my point, if possible, could you paginate it next time around?

Gillespie:  Absolutely. Be happy to do so.

Stoldal:  Further questions from the Board, comments? If not, I'm looking at the atomic clock that says 11:59. Why don't we go ahead and take a break until 12:30 and we will pick up with the Board policies. So everybody can take a nice, restful break (inaudible).

Markoff:  Mr. Chairman, Dan Markoff here.

Stoldal:  Go ahead, Dan.

Markoff:  Thank you. I have to leave. I have a medical appointment today I have to be at one o'clock. And so if you'll excuse me for the rest of the meeting, I'd appreciate it.

Stoldal:  I think that that certainly takes precedent, Dan and have a good medical appointment.

Markoff:  Okay. Listen, there's one other thing I'd like to mention. I did hear all of Dan Thielen's report but if you recall, the Board approved a contract for moving the Glenbrook to the (inaudible) Railroad for the Victorian Iron Horse Reunion.

Stoldal:  Yes.

Markoff:  The Victorian Iron Horse Reunion was a smashing success. It was attended by people from all over the world and all over the United States and the Glenbrook and Eureka were the stars of the show.

Stoldal:  Great.

Markoff:  You know, I've seen a number of comments posted about it and everybody loved those two Victorian-period locomotives out running through the Rocky Mountains. It was a hell of an experience and the Glenbrook ran beautifully. So just wanted everybody to know that the money--

Stoldal:  Can you do the Board a favor? I know you shared a piece of video with me of part of that event. I think the Board would love to see that piece of video. And Mr. Thielen, you want to add any closing comments before we take a lunch
break? But it sounds like it was, in-fact, a great success on many levels including promoting the State Museum and the State of Nevada.

Markoff: It was phenomenal. I'm so anxious to report that and show you the impact it had. You'll see a bump in our store sales. We sold out of everything we took with us and it was just exceptional. The restoration of the Glenbrook was proven there and it just never missed a beat and it was asked to do things that were just a little out of its reach and we gently ran that locomotive and found out the limits of its design engineering but it came back uninjured and just--our volunteers, when that locomotive stopped, eight people appeared out of nowhere to clean that locomotive and polish it up. It looked beautiful every step of the way. And paired with the Eureka, it just did Nevada good. It should be something that the Department of Tourism should support and use as a tool to bring to Nevada.

Stoldal: Both Dan's. And part of this was funded by through the Board but hopefully, you put together a nice presentation for our December meeting. And, Mr. Markoff, if could just send out that nice piece of areal footage of the train, it would be great.

Markoff: Oh, I'll be happy to. And I'll tell you what, there's videos all over YouTube with it, so I'll see what I can do.

Stoldal: Okay. All right.

Markoff: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Stoldal: All right. With that, we are at 2:02, so why don't we give ourselves a couple of extra minutes. We're way ahead on our agenda and only one or two items. So if it's all right with the Board, we'll come back at 12:45. A lot of nodding.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, Deputy Attorney General. Just to remind, we'll do a pause on the recording too, sir.

Stoldal: Yes. And Myron, we're going to take a break until 12:45. Please stop the official recording.

Thielen: The recording has resumed, Chair.

Stoldal: Thank you. I'd like to call the meeting of the Nevada State Board of Museums and History for the September 24, 2021 back in session. And a reminder, this meeting is in-fact being recorded. We left off at Agenda Item Number 10, Private Fund Budget Adjustments for the Current Year and there are none.

We'll move on to Board Policies, which is Agenda Item 11. This is an action item. We looked at each year at the end of the year, we review the six board
policies. We're going to review three of the six today. In each case, there may be proposed updates that are sent to the Board in advance, in addition, suggestions, changes can be made during the meeting. And, of course, the, uh, the policy can be adopted as it stands.

The first one, 11A, is the policy governing the preparation, dissemination and recording of minutes of the Board. To the Committee--Commission, you know, one thing we should always do, and I think, Myron, is make sure that we, in-fact, have a quorum. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Maybe we need to make that a policy following the lunch break. We do a roll call again.

But today, we are on the item, as far as the minutes. I hope all of the members have a copy of the current board. By the way, this is Board policy and we need to change the heading on all of these. This is the Board policy. The Division of Museums can certainly have its policy but this is specifically the policy of the Board of Museums and History. So my recommendation is we would change this right off the top. Also note the upper right-hand corner, this policy has not been changed since December of 2019. Are there any suggested changes by Board members to this policy?

I sent around some suggested changes that are basically, in large part, going from where we were recording (inaudible) recorder at the meetings and staff would hand-type out the minutes and that would take (inaudible) more amount of time and then we move to where the Board had hired a firm to do transcriptions and now we have a second firm that is doing transcriptions. And the information as provided by staff that this a company mandated by the State of Nevada. And so the benefit of that is, of course, the transcriptions of the minutes are made available almost immediately 'cause they're being done as we speak. So if you have these--does everybody have a copy of the proposed changes that I suggested? Looking around, Jan? Anthony? Michelle? Sarah? Robert? Mercedes? Courtney, are you back with us? Doris? Yes, looks like Courtney is back with us. Doris?

Dwyer: This is Doris Dwyer. I couldn't print them out last night but I'm trying to access them by my phone.

Stoldal: Okay.

Dwyer: So give me a minute here.

Stoldal: And then Seth. But basically, the first change and one of the things I think that we need to do with all our Board polices is when we are quoting the Nevada Revised Statute, we should put that in quotes and source it, so the Board understands this policy is based on state law. So if there any questions, I'll look for questions regarding the proposed changes.
Mooney: Bob, this Courtney Mooney, for the record. I hope this isn't a stupid question but when I was reviewing some of this--and I can't find it again, I thought that it said that there was a 45-day period for the preparation of meeting minutes. And then I see on here there's 30 working days. So I wasn't sure if I just--I just wanted to ask if maybe I misread that.

Stoldal: The state law requires some form of minutes. And when you look at the state law, I think that it was updated last--in 2019. It's 30 days. And under our first policy, that would give staff 30 days to prepare a summary.

Mooney: I'm going to keep looking for it because if I saw it on the website, maybe that's something that needs to be corrected.

Stoldal: Right. The Nevada Revised Statutes 241-035 specifically reflects--no, I'm sorry. Here, look at--I think, Courtney, what you're referring to is that the minutes need to be approved within 45 days.

Mooney: I just found that, Chair Stoldal. Thank you.

Stoldal: Okay. Forty-five days or the next line is, "or at the next meeting, the public body," which would fit us since we generally meet quarterly.

Mooney: Okay. My apologies. Thank you.

Stoldal: So I'll look for--look for any questions or, if not, a motion to approve the changes? I do not see any motion. Jan?

Ostrovsky: Bob Ostrovsky. I would move for approval of the revised record keeping policy, if that's what it's called, I guess, as distributed in your Board packets.

Stoldal: All right. Myron?

Freedman: Thank you, Chair. Myron Freedman for the record. Just following up on member Ostrovsky's comment, the Chair sent out another version with some edits on it, so I just want to make sure we're looking--you're looking at the one that you're approving, that's the one in the book and the one that Chair Stoldal sent out through email with a few edits.

Ostrovsky: This is Bob Ostrovsky. Is there some identifier on it, a date or a time or anything I could make reference to?

Stoldal: Well, I think the easiest way to deal with--there are three, maybe four sub pieces that are changed. The first one is the overview and that's changed to read, 3881-0002 establishes the Board of Museums and History and sets forth the duties and responsibilities for the Board. The Board meets regularly at least once per quarter in an open, public meeting. Subcommittee meetings of the Board meet
as needed. Minutes documenting the procedures of all such meetings are recorded and made public following each meeting. This policy described how meeting minutes are recorded, reviewed and distributed. Proposed changes to the overview paragraph are in red. So that's the overview and the first change is under the documenting the meeting proceedings. And the proposal is to say the Division of Museums and History staff shall be responsible for keeping the record of attendance and actions for all meetings of the Board and its subcommittees, including a record of the votes of the individual members. That's the suggested changes for that.

Then on the paragraph titled Preparation, and we're looking to change to that read Preparation of a Summary of the Minute Meetings. And the wording of that would be changed to read, "Within 30 working days of the meeting, the Division shall make available online a summary derived from the full transcript of the meeting. The summary shall be posted as draft on the Board's web page." And then under a link. And a question I had here is, is that the proper link? Is that still an active link? Museums dot Nevada culture dot org?

Freedman: Mr. Chair, Myron Freedman, for the record. The proper link is nv.museums.dot.org.

Stoldal: All right. Then I would include that in the motion to fix the link. Then the next change, it says, "Dissemination and recording of meeting minutes." And it states, "Once staff has received the meeting transcription from a state-approved transcription service, staff shall post the transcript on the Board or subcommittee meeting as draft on the Board's web page. Both the transcription and the staff-prepared summary are published for review and action at the next scheduled meeting of the Board, from which the minutes were derived. The Board or subcommittee shall officially review, modify and take action to approve the meeting record."

Then the last change is in the last paragraph of Dissemination and Recording of Minute Meetings. And it says, "Minutes from legal council approved closed meetings will not be posted on the Board's webpage. The Nevada Attorney General's office shall determine public dissemination of a private report or subcommittee meeting minutes." So that, in a nutshell, is--not a nutshell. Those are the exact recommended changes to update the Board's policy. Again, largely based on we're moving from hand-transcribed to a voice-recognition transcribed through a service. And then the posting of those.

Doris, do I see your hand raised?

Dwyer: Yes. This is Doris Dwyer. I think you still need a second, so that we can discuss this.

Stoldal: All right. We have a motion from Bob and a second Doris?
Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, I guess I need to modify my motion a bit to indicate that it's moved to approve the changes as read into the record of this meeting.

Stoldal: Thank you. Do we have a second?

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer. I'll second.

Stoldal: Okay. We have a motion and we have a second. Is there further discussion?

Dwyer: Well--

Stoldal: Doris, go ahead.

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer, for the record. As I was going through the transcripts from the last three meetings, I was asking myself why do we need to approve or disapprove a transcript that is an exact record of the meeting? I mean, I can understand approving the summary but it's an exact transcript, right? Are we just looking for mistakes or--

Stoldal: Well, I think it's just based on a reading of state law that we have to approve the minutes and this is one of the minutes. Unlike the congressional record, we're not going to go back and say, "I really didn't say that." But there may be an opportunity to where if a name is--the recording doesn't get the name or we fail to say who it is, we could add a name but any substantive changes I don’t think is what we're looking at.

Dwyer: Okay. So the fact that we did not get summaries for these meetings that we approved this time was just that won't happen again. We'll get a summary and the transcript from now on, if this is approved?

Stoldal: Yes. And I think that we're looking at the staff. I mean, the staff has been down substantively and the summaries have been not at the top of the list. But you're right, this clarifies it and we'll move ahead and I think the staff is at a point now to where there's 30 days to do the summary but the transcription can go on almost immediately.

Dwyer: Okay. Thank you.

Stoldal: So we have a motion, we have a second. Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye.

Chorus: Aye.
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Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously with the Chair voting in favor with those in attendance. Next item on the agenda is 11, Board Policy Review, 11(b), Policies (inaudible) the Open Meeting Law Compliance. This provides us with an opportunity to go through and (inaudible) board committees that are no longer operational and add board committees that may be operational on there, too, that came up. One was Catherine McGee, Director of the Nevada State Historical Society suggested with Alicia Barber gone, that we should have the Nevada Historical Society Board Committee. And then the second one was a request or at least a statement from Dan Thielen that we have a working group, a board committee, regarding the MOUs with the Friends of the Nevada State Railroad Museum both in Carson City and Las Vegas. So we can put that over to the side for one second.

Are there any changes that Board members see in the--and again, I will recommend we change the title to the Nevada Board of Museums and History's policy governing open meeting law compliance. Any thoughts, any comments? Jan?

Peterson: Mr. Chairman, Jan Peterson, for the record. On this list of committees, we've got the Historical Society Relocation Committee and are we still going to continue with the Nevada State Prison Committee?

Stoldal: Well, my recommendation would be, in essence, there are--the Board has two sets of committees. One I think we should call standing committees and those are based on the Nevada Revised Statute, direct responsibility for this board. For example, that would be the museum store, membership, finance and facility use. Both of those are charged to this board to have oversight. And so I would change this policy to have those listed as standing and so that would be one recommendation. The second one would be that Nevada State Historical Society Relocation, that's no longer an operational committee. That was moved downtown. You know, at some point, we could recreate that committee because there's still the wish, the dream, the concept, the idea to move the Historical Society to downtown Las Vegas and have a much larger presence. Another recommendation--the first one would be to change the title. Another one would be to list facilities, finance membership, museum store as a standing committee. And then the other committees I would recommend would be East Ely Railroad, marketing, technology, strategic planning. And Bob, as far as major donors, do you want to continue that? I mean, there will be a point where we need to bring some energy back into that but should we keep this on this list?

Ostrovsky: Yeah, I'd like to keep the major donors. That all started with the idea of, you know, the--this is Bob Ostrovsky, for the record--Boulder City and others trying to get private funds. We haven't been active but we should be. I would keep it there.
Stoldal: All right. So the--again, to review the change in the title, moving facility, finance, membership, museum stores to a title called Standing Board Committees. We move the Nevada State Prison. Myron, I would ask for your input on that. Is that something we should keep up or do we need to resurrect it at some point when there's some reason for it to be?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. My recommendation would be to resurrect it as necessary. I'm not sure when that activity will start up again. I'm sure there will be activity in the future but I can't say when.

Stoldal: All right. Well, we can keep it on the list. It doesn't hurt. So let's keep that on the list. Strategic planning, major donor, technology and marketing and East Ely we keep on the list. So the only one that we would remove from this list is the Nevada Historical Society Relocation. Is that what I understand? Doris?

Dwyer: This is Doris Dwyer for the record. Didn't we, a couple of meetings ago, eliminate some committees? Not the last meeting but two or three meetings ago and shouldn't this be consistent with that? I thought we eliminated the Collections Committee.

Stoldal: I think that you're correct. The reflection here is that only in 2017 did we last review this. That said, I think now's the time for us to--we can re-erase it. So, yes, suggest Collection Committee and Nevada Historical Society Relocation be taken off as part of any motion. And then the last thing would be the addition of the two committees, the two proposed board committees. One would be the MOU Friends of the Nevada Railroad Museums and the second one would be a committee on the Nevada Historical Society Quarterly. The small challenge we have here is we can take off or change or add committees to this list but there's not an action item to add members to them. Am I reading that right, Harry?

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, Deputy Attorney General. Yes, you have a policy with your listed committees but there would be nothing to prevent the Board from, let's say, adding a committee at any time. If you're asking under this agenda, can we now add a committee, I do not believe so because it's not listed and not properly agendized.

Stoldal: So we can take off but we can't add?

Ward: I think you can add now.

Stoldal: Okay.

Ward: But if you're going to go into detail, I would suggest that you would put it on the agenda. But let me clarify myself. You were here for the policy. I think you can add the policy, you can add a name of a committee, we just cannot, quote, unquote, create the committee with people. That's what I am trying to
emphasize. So you can add and subtract, you just can't add people or subtract people from those committees.

Stoldal: Correct. I'm with you. So we can add those committees and I would ask that we do that. The only other change--well, actually, it's in the next one. I don't know if everybody has a copy of the board policy but if you do, it's the Development and Posting of Meeting Notices. And I'd suggest a slight change in that and that it's the--this is a board policy rather than a division policy, therefore, I would just change--and this is minor, but change the reading to say the Board Chair and-or Appropriate Subcommittee Chair in consultation with the Division Administrator shall initiate the development of the meeting agenda. Once strapped to the agenda, it shall be (inaudible) etcetera. So change that.

And then going to the open meeting law, which is the second to last item, it says, "All members of the board shall be provided with a copy of the open meeting law and Nevada's opening meeting law manual at appointment." I was wondering if that has been done.

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. We're in the process of putting the manual online. It's all together. It's just we haven't had the time to actually put it online but Kerry, do you have a sense of when we're going to get that done?

Ellison: Kerry Ellison for the record. If you have reviewed it and are agreeable with it, then it is ready to post online.

Freedman: Okay, thank you.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, Deputy Attorney General. And just an FYI (inaudible) through the AG's website, we have Attorney General Ford's manual online also.

Stoldal: Just so we're clear, Harry, if you would send a link just to all the Board member and so then the new members would get that, as well. And I don't want to take offense but this is the board manual. This is the Division's manual and before it is posted, I think the Board would like to see at least what's on that and what's not on it. It may have recommendations of what should be in the board manual. So Myron, if you could send--I'm not sure how to do this but--

Freedman: Yeah.

Stoldal: --what I would suggest is possibly you send out just sort of the table of contents to the Board and then we could send you back notes rather than the Board meeting at some point and delaying the process. But if you can just send the table of contents out to the Board, then we could suggest some thoughts or maybe we feel the list you've already got is complete. But I think before we put a board policy manual up, the Board should contribute to its content.
Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. I will do that.

Stoldal: Thank you. All right. So does the Board have enough information on the record to make the changes in the open meeting law? If so, I'd look for a motion. Seeing and hearing none--

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, Bob Ostrovsky. I'd make a motion, I'm just concerned a little bit about the form here of what the motion should say.

Stoldal: Probably similar to your last motion, what we read into the record.

Ostrovsky: I would move for approval of the changes to the policy governing open meeting law compliance as read into the record today.

Stoldal: Do we have a second?

De la Garza: Mercedes, for the record. Second.

Stoldal: Okay. We have a motion, we have a second. Further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.

Chorus: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously with the Chair voting favor with those in attendance.

The third and last item on Agenda Item 11, Board Policy Review, is the private fund budget and the expenditure and general control policy. The Board members should have two proposed changes, one from the Chairman of the Finance Committee, Bob Ostrovsky, which covers the two potential options. And then some changes that I'm recommending. So Chairman Ostrovsky, if you'd go first.

Ostrovsky: Yeah, for the record, Bob Ostrovsky. These alternative methodologies of handling donated funds arose from a discussion at the last board meeting regarding whether or not we wanted to invest some of the dedicated money. Particularly for new members, there's two methods of managing the money under current rules or current Board policy. We have a dedicated fund at the treasurer's office. These are donations that are made for a specific reason where the donor has specified where those dollars are to be spent. The second fund is our regular investment account where general contributions to the museum system are housed, as well as where all the other revenues that we collected are housed and expended from. My interpretation of that is we have a prudent responsibility to manage the funds that are donated, that are for non-specific
purposes, and we do that by having a committee, having budgets and authorizing all expenditures.

The second half is where someone has made a specific request for a donation. That money is housed in the treasurer's office where there is little or no risk to the funds that have been donated. The problem is that as a result of that, we're unable to get really any investment return on the monies that are donated for a specific purpose. So it's really a risk-reward kind of question. To my opinion, there's three things we can do. Option one, as I've indicated, is to just eliminate the treasurer's office, combine all the funds into one investment account and manage the money there. There's a risk because that account is subject to market volatility. Option two is to put most of the money into the treasurer's account but smaller donations that are for a specific purpose. My suggestion was $100,000 or less be put into our investment account because the fluctuation in the investment account is not so great that we couldn't handle a short fall that might occur from an investment loss. The third option is to do nothing, to continue with the policy as it is now. Have two funds, one dedicated, one not in which there's no risk for those funds.

One of the questions I had, Mr. Chairman, is for staff, maybe Kerry can respond to this. Am I creating a difficult situation for staff in terms of managing the money if we were to move small donations to the investment fund? Because the money that's in the dedicated fund now really doesn't flow directly back to the Board for expenditures, as long as it's expended for what the donor gave money for. If they gave $50,000 specifically to Glenbrook restoration, that money was paid out as those bills came in and were approved by staff. As long as they were for the Glenbrook. Am I making things more difficult by doing this, trying to get a little better return? So I kind of ask Kerry because she's got to keep track of these dollars.

Ellison:  Kerry Ellison for the record. It would create additional steps, you know, really right now, we pull the funds when they're received and deposited, then we monitor each of the restricted accounts individually, so that we know what amount of money belongs to which restricted account. I believe that if it were put into the investment account, obviously, it would create the extra step to expend the dollars into the investment account but also, if we needed to pull that money, it would create the extra steps of having to request the money out of the investment account and to prepare work programs to increase the authority to allow for the expenditure of those additional funds. Because not knowing if they would be needed or not would keep us from building that additional authority into the budgets. Does that make sense?

Ostrovsky:  Yeah, it makes sense to me. So Mr. Chairman, I mean, it's really a decision of the Board. What we're doing is work. We've obviously left a little money on the table because we've not gotten returns from those dollars. But, you know, the additional staff work to support that change may really not be worth the
while to make the change. So I just want to put the option out there 'cause we discussed it at the last meeting.

Stoldal: First starting at the top, the risk of investments by the Board and the Board's investment policy, I think your report earlier indicated that at (inaudible) or the DOW was at about 16 and we were at about 8, so the Board has always had a very conservative investment policy over the years. And so I'm not worried about losing the money because of the investment policy. The concern that I have is--and now is not the time for it but the whole concept of what is being paid out of the private funds and what the Nevada Revised Statues say should be paid, to me, we are in some very thin ice. For example, the Nevada State Museum, this Board, its travel and all of its expenses comes out of the private fund. That money should be used for museums, for projects at museums, exhibits, etcetera, etcetera, rather than paying this board for travel and the 60 or whatever dollars we get per person per meeting. The general fund should pay for that. And there are other things in that. There's an administration budget. Why that is in the private funds--the private funds, in my take, should be funds for the museums and not for the operation of this Board. It's not a tremendous amount but why this Board and the private funds are paying for this Zoom meeting, I suspect we're the only state board that comes out of private funds and not general funds. And so I'm going to call for an examination of that, both at the administration level, both at the department level and both at the Governor's office to see if this can be resolved or at least funds are going for what they're designed for and that's back to the museums, not to pay us. That should come out of the general fund.

That said, let's get back to Mr. Ostrovsky's--are there any comments from the Board on Mr. Ostrovsky's recommendations, either option one, option two or, as he said, the third option, not to do anything. Anthony?

Timmons: Yes, Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. My question is, is this a question of control or really return? Because I'm not too sure what type of return we're getting at the treasurer's office anyway but we can write in the policy that maybe the funds that would be at the treasurer's office can only be invested in treasury bonds or treasury bills or something like that. The minimal risk, and really treasury bonds happen to be the most minimal risk possible, but if it's a question of control, that would be something that maybe we get a little bit more of a return but it's not really going to be substantial to really make a huge difference anyway.

Stoldal: Any other members? Mr. Ostrovsky, if you had to pick one of these three--

Ostrovsky: This is Bob Ostrovsky. I'll ask one more question of staff. I used the $100,000 threshold. Are there a lot of funds below 100,000 or are these really, I mean, we've had million dollar dedicated fun donations. Are we talk about a lot of
money or very little or is that a question you can't answer yet without some research?

**Ellison:** Kerry Ellison, for the record. I can answer that. There are several small funds. There are a lot of donors that donate $500, they donate $1,000. I think at last count, which was probably a year, maybe two years ago, I think we had upwards of just under 200 individual restricted accounts that we track between all of the museums. Many of them are small. There are a few that are very large, such as the (inaudible) Silverstein--well, that's kind of an odd one. There's the Magason Trust at Boulder City, the Pacino Trust at the Historical Society. So there are a few that are very large that, you know, we can put a thumb on but many of them are quite small. Many of them are under $5,000.

**Stoldal:** Bob, I'd ask you another question. It seems over the last few years, that less and less money has been put into the private fund and more and more goes to the treasury account because of the existing Board policy. The only money that is getting generated out of the private money is the investment money but the grant money is not going in there. It's being identified by the donor and by staff to have a specific cause and therefore, it goes into the treasurer's office. So I'm a bit concerned about the future of the private funds because of the existing policy. I'll just throw it back to you. If there's a change you think that would help us.

**Ostrovsky:** This is Bob Ostrovsky, for the record. I just think we're leaving a lot of money on the table. I mean, this money would be generated as income. Could that be used to support the museums? Because the dedicated portion would have to be expended on whatever the donor specified but the earnings could go back into the pot that serves the entire division of all the museums. So I'd still like to see us do this. Again, my only concern is creating a very difficult tracking problem for staff and I have to rely on Kerry there to tell me whether this is going to create so much work that it's not worth the $10,000 we might earn.

**Stoldal:** Well, the question for Kerry I think also is--and this is going to be a question that's hard to quantify. But will this change increase the workload by one percent? Or maybe ask it a different way. What percent of the current workload is the private fund? Is it 50 percent of your time, 75 percent, 25 percent? I mean, these are magic numbers with this cloud that I'm asking you to kind of--how much more work is it, if we approve the proposal?

**Ellison:** Well, I don't know that I can quantify it by a percentage. Clearly, there are times of the year where the dedicated trust funds do consume staff's time almost 100 percent. Clearly, that's when budgets are being built or we are preparing for the Board meetings to make sure that we have all of the Board packets prepared and ready to distribute.
As far as trying to monitor the additional work that would be created by taking the restricted funds and putting them in the investment account, I'll be honest with you, it takes a long time to prepare a work program. It's not a simple process and as much as I hate to say it, the Governor's finance office is not very reactive to turning these requests around, even though they have no control over these funds, except for the fact that they are the gatekeeper whether these are approved or not. We just experienced that with the beginning of the fiscal year when it took them five weeks to open the trust fund budgets where each of the museums were practically frozen. They couldn't spend, they couldn't receive any trust fund revenues because there was no place to put them. So it's more than a workload issue, it's also a timing issue, I believe. But I will be honest with you, I'm the only person in the office, my position, that can do work programs. So to add that additional step into the process could put a pretty decent increase of workload onto this position where the workload is already pretty significant on this position.

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, this is Bob Ostrovsky. My suggestion would be to hold this matter, at least this portion of the change, let me have an opportunity to meet with Kerry and discuss whether there's some better alternative before we go ahead and would recognize and vote on this. The other items you want to change, that's fine. We can always bring this one back and let me spend a little time with staff and figure out what the best recommendation for the Board is.

Stoldal: Okay. We don't need a motion on that. It's just a proposed change. Then let's go to the second potential changes and I'll read into the record. First the heading (inaudible) and this is Board of Museums and History policy and procedure for private fund budgeting expenditures and general control. This is Board policy. Second, where in the Board policy states the Nevada Revised Statute, as I mentioned before, the section should be cited as coming from NRS and it's a specific quote that should be listed as a specific quote.

Third, under the paragraph titled Definition, I think we should add the term "private money." That's left out of the definition.

Fourth, the recommended changes in paragraph titled Policy. And the second paragraph, it states that private funds are to be used primarily to support public programming and education (inaudible) museums and for personnel whose major duties are engage in the development of trust funds, i.e., retail shop keepers, etcetera. This is a really minor point and I don't think we need an i.e. and an etcetera, so I would just drop the etcetera out of that.

But what's clearly standard here is we're saying how this private money can be funded. And then it goes on, the very last sentence in the policy says, "These funds are to be utilized for public programming, education, outreach,"
collections, acquisition of those collections, improving exhibits and public relations. So we've got two different definitions throughout this. We need to combine those two definitions as to how the private funds are to be used. And looking into the Nevada Revised Statute guidance as to how the private funds are to be spent is really minimal. And that's really up to the Board, so this is a key policy. NRS 381 makes two statements calling for the Board to follow specific instructions to the donor, as Chair Ostrovsky was talking about as to how the funds should be spent. And after the funds should be spent, that would be at the sound discretion of the Board. So if we follow the donor's specific instructions and the rest is in the sound discretion of the Board. Beyond that sound discretion of the Board, there's nothing else. So there is a backwards way of saying there is one other piece of information and that is that if the Board has decided to use this money to hire somebody, then we need to follow all the rules and regulations regarding state law and policy with how we treat that person and so forth.

So the question for me is, how do we want to define how we spend this money? It's real important as we move forward. It doesn't mention anywhere in this policy, in the state law, that this private money is to be used for the Board, for the Board's travel, for the Board's pay, for the administration of the Board but yet, we're using a good portion of that money. So our policy doesn't even approve the Board's action, so I'd throw it out to the Board. I mean, I sent this copy around and if there's any thoughts or comments. Michelle?

Schmitter: Thank you. Michelle Schmitter, for the record. In the fundraising world, I mean, we look at money, it's restricted or unrestricted. Are we dealing with unrestricted? It sounds like we're dealing with restricted and unrestricted funds here. And then the third way that we try to figure out how they're spent is we call it donor intent. So if a donation comes in unrestricted but we have a relationship with the donor, then we kind of move to donor intent. Of course, not a lot of donors like to fund salaries, so I'm confused about this. Of course, I've come in in the middle of this. So are these funds restricted or unrestricted that we're talking about, in this what we're calling private funds? And are private funds only those funds coming from private individuals or private foundations, nonpublic. Is that how that's defined? And we might needs some definitions here, I guess.

Stoldal: Okay. So two things. One is here is the Nevada Revised Statute 381.0031, Private Money. And this is the exact quote. "All money and the proceeds from property received by the Division or any institution of the Division, through any grant, bequest or device and the proceeds from membership sales and interest and dividends from any sources are private money and not state money." So once again, "All money and the proceeds from property received by the Division or any institution of the Division through any grant, bequest or device and the proceeds from membership, sales, interest and dividends from any source are private money and not state money." That's the direct quote. What is left out,
what is not included in private money is a grant of federal money, appropriation by the legislature, admission charges and the sale of tickets for train rides. That does not come into the private funds. So it's very specific where the money comes from but it's not very specific on how the money should be spent. And we've been doing it this way for a while but it seems to be inappropriate that this money should be spent for Board salaries and for expenditures and all those things. That should come out of the general fund. And I'm suggesting that the museum—the money in the private fund should be more for the museums and the challenges that they're facing today and next year and the following year and so forth, that we need to find ways to clean this up and that includes Boulder City. But right now, we're dealing with this particular policy.

There's another way we can handle this and that is that although this agenized—we can simply accept the Board policy as it stands today and I can type up these in a detailed note with existing policy and suggested changes and we can take it up in December. Or we can make the changes now. I'll look for to get things done today rather than tomorrow. Look for Board input, thoughts, comments?

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, this is Bob Ostrovsky. Let me ask Myron a question. I don’t think he probably has been around to the budgeting process enough times to know. Does anyone know the last time or if ever this Board attempted to have all those other expenses paid out of the general fund and made such budget request to the Governor's finance office when they went to build a budget for the legislature to review? Or we have never done that? I don't know.

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. I think the person here who might have the history on this would be Kerry. Certainly not in my tenure. Kerry?

Ellison: Excuse me. Kerry Ellison, for the record. In the matter of time that I've been here and the little bit of research that I had done going back when I first started, I did not see that Board support was ever covered by the general fund short of payment for the Board meetings (inaudible) the Board attendance fees that you guys get paid. That's the only thing I can ever see that was ever built into the budget to be supported by non-private funds, by the general fund or currently the general fund (inaudible).

Stoldal: Okay. Well, let me kind of disagree with you a little bit. Remember over the years, we have been moving stuff out of the private money and into the state budget, whether it was toilet paper? Remember all those years that private money was being used for building maintenance, for just a variety of things and we kept moving some of those things. Bob, I don’t know if you remember that. There's just a lot of things are coming out of private funds that the state should've been paying for. So there has been moves.

Ellison: I'm sorry. Kerry Ellison for the record. I must not have understood the question. I thought you were asking if general fund supported any part of the
trust fund activities or any parts of the Board. I didn't realize you were asking the other direction.

Stoldal:  I think that the idea is what kind of money has the Board authorized over the year out of the private funds that we have been able to stop doing out of private funds and move into the general fund, and there's several things that have occurred as we've done that. So moving the Board's salary may be a bigger move than toilet paper but it has been done over the years and that comes out of the budget that was proposed by which ever agency the museum was under at that point.

Ellison:  Kerry Ellison, for the record. The most notable one that I am aware of was the several positions that were moved out of the trust fund that were under NSM and I think that was 2014. They were moved out of private funds because they didn’t really have any support of trust fund activities and we could justify that to the legislature to be able to move those to a general fund positions.

But as far as supplies and toilet paper, I understand that that was during the recession. I do know that when I came on, that that really was not occurring much anymore. I was just being informed of the past situations of how this had happened. And myself and the previous administrator, Peter Barton, worked to make sure that there was a definite line between trust fund expenditures and executive budget track expenditures.

Stoldal:  All right. So we're back to the changes in the private budget and expenditures and general policy. I'd like to suggest that we make the changes today and again, I'll do this very quickly. There's four changes. One is to propose we update the Board's title. This is private fund policy of the Board, rather than the department. Second, that when the Nevada Revised Statute is cited in our Board policy, it is cited as the Nevada Revised Statute, rather than just the writing of it. And then third, we add the definition to the title of paragraph of definitions to we use the term "private money" in there, as well. We've used that several times in this policy.

And then the question is--and I'm going to leave it at that is my recommendation, to make it simple for the changes today. The bigger change, of course, is our policy on spending money in the private funds and I think that takes a longer discussion, so I will just use those initial items to clean up more housekeeping issues than a significant policy change. So if we could look for a motion to clean those up, we can move forward.

Ostrovsky:  Mr. Chairman, Bob Ostrovsky. Just one comment, then I'll make a motion. That is if we want to pursue a change in the way the state funds, the Museum Board responsibilities, I guess we have to have a discussion with Myron, who has to then move it up the ladder to Tourism and then to the Governor's office for the next cycle, which will be proposed budgets next year. And it may take
some motion of this Board in the future to indicate to the Governor's office the reasons why we think the change ought to be made, etcetera.

But given that, I would move for approval of the changes to the private funds budgeting expenditure and general control policy and procedure as read into the record by the Chairman.

Stoldal: We have a motion, do we have a second?

De la Garza: Mercedes, for the record. I'll second.

Stoldal: We have a motion, we have a second. Further discussion? Seeing and hearing none, all those in favor, say aye.

Chorus: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously with the Chair voting in favor of the policy. Thank you all. And we will have at least three more policy reviews, including our investment policy, at our December meeting and we will effort to get any proposed changes in writing well in advance of those meetings, so you'll have a time to review and study those. Myron?

Freedman: Mr. Chair, thank you. Myron Freedman, for the record. I just want to check in with you at some point to make sure I'm clear on all of the changes that you want this particular time around.

Stoldal: Sure thing. I'll send you an email, as well.

Freedman: Okay, thank you.


Ostrovsky: Bob Ostrovsky. If we could ask the Attorney General's office to give us an update on the property in Las Vegas that was given to us. I forget the address. It's 777 7th Avenue, I think, or--

Stoldal: 711.

Ostrovsky: 711 7th. We haven't heard anything in a year, I don't think, about what's happened to that property. So I'd like to see that at the next meeting. Something.

Stoldal: That's the property for Board members that was given to the State of Nevada several years ago by a person in her will. She had one asterisk and that was her best friend could live there for the rest of her life. And I think her best friend was in her late '80s several years ago. I drive there on a regular basis. The
property is very, very valuable. It's Attorney Row and with an address 711 7th Street, just the address will generate revenue. But that said, so we look forward to getting that on the agenda and update on that item. Any other thoughts or comments? Actually, that could be an agenda item under number 13. Um, any other non-agendized items that the Board wants to comment on? Doris.

Dwyer: Yes. Doris Dwyer for the record. In terms of future Board meetings, I think you and I had talked about this, that, like, the next time we meet in Carson City— not the very next time because we're going to have a tourist steward, right? Which we need to do. But I think it's time and there's been enough of a Board turnover that at one of our Carson City meetings that we tour the textual center again.

Stoldal: Yes.

Dwyer: You know, when we're in Carson City, when it's convenient, yeah, because a lot of Board members have never been there.

Stoldal: Myron, if you could kind of keep that in the back of your head, that we would be able to do that.

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. That would be a pleasure.

Stoldal: Great, okay. All right, then. Let's move on to Item 13, which is Future Museum Board Agenda Items. I think Bob Ostrovsky indicated that we would like a report on the status of the 711 7th Street in Las Vegas. Any other Board agendized items that we want to put on the next agenda? Anthony.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, I have some proposed changes to membership that I would be bringing up at the Membership Committee but I assume maybe that's covered under the Membership Committee report?

Stoldal: Yes.

Timmons: Okay.

Stoldal: But you can also be very, I mean, if you had something specific, then Myron and I can work together to put it on the agenda, as well as the generalized report.

Timmons: Good, okay. Yeah, you know, I want to do the standard statewide membership card proposal and the consolidation of the membership levels to three as opposed to 68 or whatever we happen to have right now.

Stoldal: Okay. All right. Look forward to that. Anything else? Hearing none, we'll move on to Item 14, Public Comment and Discussion. Public comment is
welcome by the Board. Because of time considerations, a period of public comment by each speaker may be limited to three minutes at the discretion of the Chair. And speakers are urged to avoid repetition of comments made by previous speakers. Pursuant to Governor Sisolak's Declaration of Emergency Directive 006, Section 2, public comment options may include, without limitation, written public comments submitted by the Board, by mail or email. First, Myron, staff received any emails or other communications that need to be put in the public record at this time?

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. We have not received comment through mail or email.

Stoldal: There's one, the last one, it says, public comment, "Thanks for reading and considering my checked comments." Larry Hamilton. Are you seeing those in the chat?

Freedman: Mr. Chair, Myron Freedman, for the record. I do see them and I would leave it to the DAG to advise us on what constitutes public comment. When you actually state during the meeting a period of public comment and then you close that period and then reopen it at the end of the meeting, so I would ask the DAG which of these various areas of public comment should we be considering?

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, Deputy Attorney General. The chairperson has the authority to open up public comment like he did, and I think even the open meeting law specifically says you can have public comment either at the beginning and the end or any time, as long as you do have public comment or public comment opportunity to give the public to comment. The chat, which is a new, quote-unquote, variation of this open meeting law is not considered public comment but it can be made part of the record. Just to give you an FYI, I was involved in a meeting with my client and the chat was grossly, I guess, hacked with gross things and basically what the host did was they just eliminated the chat. We do not consider the chat form of Zoom as public comment. We can make it part of the record, especially when there is some sort of a hack or something of that nature, but the chat is not part of our public record. But it would not prevent anyone from recognizing someone during public comment, what some said in the chat portion. That probably muddies the water. But the chat is not public record.

Stoldal: Well, in front of me is public body via mail or email. Of course, we don't know if anybody sent any public comment in via U.S. Mail 'cause we wouldn't have received that. So Myron, if you get some public comment via U.S. Mail, it should be included in the record, according to this, or email. But currently, it doesn't include chat. Although I'm not sure why it doesn't. So has any Board member received any specific comment on any action item or item that should be included in the minutes? I am seeing a bunch of shaking heads. Well, then
by the power vested in me, we are adjourned. Thank you all for a very productive meeting.