



**THE HERITAGE LIVES HERE.**

Nevada Board of Museum and History  
Thursday, December 8, 2022, 1:00 PM

**TRANSCRIPT**

Stoldal: Thank you. Item number 2, calling the meeting to order. It is still all for the record. Two notes: Dan Markoff called and is on his way. Just a little car trouble. And Mercedes de la Garza has an excused absence. But if staff would then call the roll, please.

Budo: Good morning, Debra Budo calling roll. Robert Stoldal, please?

Stoldal: Present.

Budo: Michelle Schmitter?

Schmitter: Here.

Budo:: Sarah Cowie?

Cowie: Here.

Budo: Doris Dwyer?

Dwyer: Present.

Budo: Mercedes de la Garza?

Stoldal: Excused.

Budo: Anthony Timmons?

Timmons: Here.

Budo: Daniel Markoff?

Stoldal: On his way.

Budo: Robert Ostrovsky?

Ostrovsky: Present.

Budo: Janet Petersen?

Petersen: Present.

Budo: Seth Schorr?

Schorr: Present.

Budo: Courtney Mooney?

Mooney: Here.

Budo: We have a quorum.

Stoldal: E'Sha Hoferer.

Budo: E'Sha Hoferer. Absent.

Stoldal: Absent. [Inaudible 00:01:16] on the agenda. Please. Myron, has this meeting been properly posted?

Freedman: Chair, Myron Freedman for the record. The meeting has been properly posted.

Stoldal: We actually had jumped to Item 4, which was the call for the roll call, but we have done that. And I think we have determined that there is a quorum so we'll move on to item number 5, and Myron, ask you to help with this. We're going to take a break about 10:00 o'clock somewhere there this morning. We'll also take a lunch break once [inaudible 00:02:06] will be here, and we'll take one, but then we'll also have a working lunch. [inaudible 00:02:12] We got a heavy and long and important agenda, so we'll probably take lunch 15, 20 minutes, and then resume. And we'll take a break this afternoon. And we got, of course, on the agenda, there's a schedule for a meeting tomorrow at 8:00 o'clock. This is our annual meeting where we deal with our board policy. We look at them. We simply renew them or we update them, and we also look at adding additional policy based on our responsibilities under the Nevada Revised Statutes. One of the things we want to initiate at this meeting and each of the following meetings is a tour of the museum, that we allocate time during

each of these meetings. It's a challenge with the 1-day meeting, but we will find a solution to that with the idea that maybe we will schedule a meeting the afternoon before the scheduled meeting or the morning after the meeting. But we will look to make sure that this board has an opportunity to visit and see each of the museums, see the opportunities and see the wonderful things that they're doing as well as the challenges. So Myron and Christopher, we're looking at - hopefully, we can get through this meeting by about 1:00 o'clock at the latest. And then we would adjourn the meeting and visit the site. Of course, with the [inaudible 00:03:56] asked that we don't talk about policy or any business during those meetings. But Myron and Christopher, can you give us a sense of what we'd like to accomplish [inaudible 00:04:07] afternoon?

Freedman: Chair, I just wanted to confirm, Myron Freedman for the record, that you are referring to tomorrow, Friday.

Stoldal: Friday, yeah.

Freedman: Yeah. Christopher, you want to outline what you have planned?

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. We're prepared to receive you as soon as the meeting adjourns tomorrow, whatever time that may be. We'll give you a tour, the maintenance facility and museum display area as well as talk a little bit about the area where the new building is supposed to be constructed. And then for those members that wish, we will take you on a train ride, if you wish to do that. If you have other pressing matters you need to attend to, we obviously understand but the locomotive's already been [inaudible00:04:45] up for a school tour. We'll keep it running [inaudible 00:04:47] do that if you so wish.

Stoldal: It will be ready, not necessarily [inaudible 00:04:52] Anyway, we will talk about it later on. Thank you. That's great. Any questions for the board?

Ostrovsky: This is Bob Ostrovsky. I have no questions, just another announcement. I have to leave this meeting between 10:00 and noon today. Then I'll come back on. And I will be present in person tomorrow. I have an obligation I couldn't get out of. My question to you, Mr. Chairman, is Morgan Stanley is on standby for tomorrow morning. I need a time certain to tell them to be on the link to make their report to us.

Stoldal: Well, let's say that our meeting starts at 8:00 o'clock. How about 9:00 a.m.?

Ostrovsky: That's fine. I will notify them of such.

Stoldal: I will make a note on the - while we're going to move your entire presentation, the policy and discussion as well as any board reports from the finance committee, and then the potential update on our fiscal policy, we'll move all of that to tomorrow morning.

Ostrovsky: Alright. That's fine. I will be there. Thank you.

Stoldal: Any other of our Internet members or staff have any questions or comments at this point?

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:06:16] for the record. Quick question. Are we intentionally having the camera off? Is that a part of [inaudible 00:06:21]

Unknown: The camera's off on my computer, but I believe the cameras are on around the room. Isn't that right?

Unknown: Oh, they can see. Okay, great. Okay.

Stoldal: Is that correct, Bob Ostrovsky?

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, Deputy Attorney General. Through Zoom, we can turn on our camera or take it off. Likewise, we can mute or take it off mute. But we can see each other if we want to.

Stoldal: Do you see us?

Unknown: You can't see us.

Ward: No. All we see is Division. And now I see Myron.

Stoldal: Myron's magic just occurred. He just pressed it. [interposing]

Unknown: Lights, camera, action.

Stoldal: We can see Myron [inaudible 00:07:11]

Freedman: I don't care.

Stoldal: I can see Doris [inaudible 00:07:15]

Unknown: It was there before. Off the record.

Stoldal: Alright, Harry. Can you see us?

Ward: Yes, Sir, Mr. Chair. I can see everyone.

Stoldal: Great. Alright. So [interposing]

Ward: [Inaudible 00:07:32] figure out if it's that camera.

Unknown: I think it's this one.

Ward: Is it this one?

Unknown: I'm not sure.

Ward: Okay.

Stoldal: Alright.

Unknown: Actually, no, it's that one because I see your back.

Stoldal: Just to explain [inaudible 00:07:47] the Internet. We have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven - we have eight massive screens that have the panel so we can all see you at one point or your name. And we can hear you clear. So we are moving forward. This is one version of how to do a hybrid meeting. There are many out there. But this is one and we are moving forward in the modern world. Let's move on to the agenda. Item 6, this is a public comment [inaudible 00:08:27] Public comment is welcome by the Board of Museums and History. There are three periods of public comment during a board meeting. The first is at the beginning of the meeting at this point. Another public comment period will take place at the end of the meeting. During the meeting, which is public, public comment will be allowed after the board's discussion of each action item on the agenda but before the board votes on that item. Because of time considerations, the period for public comment by each speaker may be limited to 3 minutes after [inaudible 00:09:01] of the chair. And speakers are urged to avoid repetition of comments made by previous speakers. Public comment obviously may include without limitation written public comments submitted to the public via mail or email. Myron, you or the staff received any public comment request during [inaudible 00:09:21] board?

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. I received a request for the board packet in an email, and I responded with the [inaudible 00:09:34] packet online. And I sent that link to the inquirer.

Stoldal: Has any Board member received any message from the public that requested to have this be part of the board record?

Freedman: Mr. Chair, I'd like to correct the record on the announcement for the meeting. Apparently, the link that was on the posted agenda sent people to the team's meeting, and that was one of the reasons there was confusion today. I'm not sure how that happened. So I want to clarify that. This morning we've been working to get the Zoom link to everybody who was wanting to join the meeting, but in that posting, apparently it was the team's meeting. But there was other information there about what the dial in for the Zoom.

Stoldal: Are we able to tell if there's any members of the public that went to the link and are sort of stranded out there?

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. From an IT standpoint, I believe what happened is Myron sent out a [inaudible 00:10:52] as a reminder to all staff, and when you go to log off, that it automatically sent you the team because that's our internal video. But I believe that's where the issue happened.

Stoldal: Okay.

Ward: Mr. Chair. For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. I do believe we are in compliance. I think the teams went out to - let's say state employees, staff, etcetera, etcetera. So if you are of general public and you just typed in the Zoom link which is posted on the agenda, you would be here with us in Zoom. So I think we are in compliance.

Stoldal: Thank you for that. Then we will move on. We will go to item 7, public notification. Items on the public agenda may be taken out of order and the board may combine two or more agenda items for consideration enacted by the board. In addition, page 3 of 6, the board may remove an item from the agenda or delay it to a later point in the meeting. And I point to what was mentioned earlier, our report on our investments from Morgan Stanley. That may come up on the agenda today if we're able to work through it. But if we get to that point, I will move it to [inaudible 00:12:07] tomorrow morning. Let's move on to agenda item 8, acceptance of minutes for chair and staff. We have several items on the agenda. September 8th meeting, September 9th meeting. These are listed as independent, so we'll take them that way. There was also two meetings of the hardworking Museum Store Committee. This board received, in the last 24 hours, I think on [inaudible 00:12:41] Wednesday, we got the summary of one of the meetings of the store committee. They're all important, but specifically the store group is [inaudible 00:13:01] three or four time working hard to come up with a solution and the many challenges and questions of an online store. The summaries are fine, and Seth is going to deal with this later on. But the idea that the board should be able to have access to a full transcript and not just a staff summary is

important. Specifically, all the discussions that took place would be regarding went to the store committee. I mean, these were very focused meetings and lots of solid information to move this important project forward. Daphne, the transcripts of those committee meetings, are they going to be available soon?

DeLeon: We have them. For the record, Daphne DeLeon. We have the transcripts for those two meetings. We elected to put the board summaries out as well as what we did at the whole board meeting. [Inaudible 00:14:04] send the transcripts out after this meeting.

Stoldal: Let me try and just be positive. I'm not sure if I understand. We decided not to put the transcript but why would we not put the transcripts out to the board?

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. Because we put board summaries out for the full board meeting, we thought we would follow the same process for the store meeting. And if someone were to ask for the full transcript, we would send out the full transcript.

Stoldal: Myron?

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. The order for the transcripts went out late for those meetings. And we got them in - was last week, and so we summarized them for this meeting. They are available, though, the full transcripts.

Stoldal: Online?

Freedman: Yeah. [Inaudible 00:14:59] post those yet? Okay. During this meeting, I can get them posted.

Stoldal: I'm not sure why I need to say this, but the board appreciates a summary, but the board doesn't have to request each time that transcripts [inaudible 00:15:22] If we do, there's a standing request that as soon as available, that the transcript - the whole transcript unedited - are put on the website so the board has access to them immediately, not 3 days before a board meeting. So if there was some confusion that the board didn't want transcripts, I'd like to unconfuse that and make sure that - the summaries are very helpful, but what to me is more important is the full transcript gets put up as soon as possible. I look for those, other members as well. We may not read every element of it, but we will focus in on key elements of that. And I know Seth is going to come up with some discussion a little bit later on. So let's take what we have. Let's take the first item, which is 8a, which is a summary, which is available online, the Board meeting for September the 8th. I would look for a motion.

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer for the record. I moved to approve the minutes from the September 8 Board meeting. We're doing the 2-day [inaudible 00:16:38] September 8.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. I'll second.

Stoldal: Any discussion?

Cowie: Sarah Cowie for the record. I noticed that, not to be picky about my position or anything, but I'm listed under "others present" rather than under "board members present." So I would ask to have that corrected.

Stoldal: Right. We have approved your title from "others" to "board members." With that change, is that acceptable to the motion maker and the second? Further discussion? General public? All those in favor say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carried unanimously with the chair voting with those [inaudible 00:17:36] unanimous. So let's move on to item 8b, September 9.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general, unanimous with those in our present.

Stoldal: In our presence. That's what's the phrase I was looking for, which include both here and there. September 9th, which is 8b, September 9th meeting, we'll look for a motion.

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer for the record. I move to approve the minutes from the September 9th board meeting.

Stoldal: We have a second.

Unknown: Mr. Chair, I have a point of order on that. E'Sha is not listed as present or absent.

Stoldal: That's important that he is listed and it's an excused absence. And with those, you accept those changes?

Unknown: Yes. But we need a second.

Ostrovsky: This is Bob Ostrovsky. I second.



Stoldal: We have a motion and we have a second. You know, the challenge is I don't see the screen in front of me, so I need to see the screen. I need to look to the screen to my right or left to see. So for those board members that are on the Internet, we'll change the process just a little bit. You can make some noise, but you want to speak in case I don't make the head turn to the right or to the left. So we have a motion and we have a second. Further discussion, general public. All those in favor say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carried unanimously with the chair voting with those that are present. Item agenda 8d, a summary of the November 16 [interposing]

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:19:56]

Unknown: Yeah. [Inaudible 00:19:59]

Stoldal: And let's see. Item 8c which is the acceptance of the minutes of October 11, 2022 of the Museum Store Committee. We received a summary. Daphne, I believe that was for the October 11th meeting, or was it for the November 16 meeting?

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. Your receipt of the summaries for the October 11th meeting and you also received summaries for the November 16th meeting.

Stoldal: Did the board receive those [inaudible 00:20:58] has a chance to review. Then let's go to 8c which is October 11, 2022, the Museum Store Committee meeting. It's a summary. Look for a motion.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. [Inaudible 00:21:16] move.

Stoldal: Again, this is an area I keep forgetting. I predicted the vote of the committee that was there for the [inaudible 00:21:24]

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. This is from the full board. Let's say the committee could have at their November meeting approved their October minutes, but no, as listed, this is an approval of the minutes by the full board. Thank you, Sir.

Stoldal: Alright. We have a motion. Did we have a second?

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer. I second the motion.

Stoldal: We have motion. We have a second. Further discussion? General public? [Inaudible 00:21:58] all those in favor, say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carried unanimously with the chair voting in favor of those that are present. Let's move on to 8d which is the November 16, 2002 [ph 00:22:19] museum store meeting. This is a summary. Any discussion or comments? If not, I would look for a motion.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. So move.

Stoldal: Second?

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer for the record. I second the motion.

Stoldal: We have a motion. We have a second. Further discussion? All those in favor, please say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carried unanimously with the chair voting with those that are present.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. Just for the record, so the record is clear, that the approval by the board is as to the form and not to the content because the whole board was not there at those subcommittee meetings but per the open meeting law, we're supposed to approve minutes, which we did. So the board members that voted on this and approved it were approving as to form and not as to the exact content of what was in those minutes. And that's for the record. Thank you. Harry Ward.

Stoldal: And I think we all understood that with the motion that was made by the chair of the store committee. So that's where the motion started, so thank you, Harry. Let's move on to agenda item 9. This is the calendar for our meetings for next year. Myron, I'm going to turn this over to you [inaudible 00:23:55] dates and then we will look at our calendar and see how we can move forward.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Before we get into this, I just wanted to check with Director Scolari, if you're still on the line here, if you have heard about the legislature social calendar. Okay, Myron Freedman for the record. We want to set a date in March that coincides with a day of advocacy with the state legislature. I had submitted a date a little bit ago, a couple of weeks ago, and I have not heard back so we were trying to get

confirmation on that. That date in March would be the 16th of March, and my recommendation would be the meeting would take place either the day before or the day after so that you have time to spend in the legislature. Again, I haven't gotten that confirmed, but that is the date yet. So we may need to wait a little bit until I can do that.

Stoldal: Let's just wait for that date. Let's start with - my screen has Sarah to the left [inaudible 00:25:30], then Michelle [inaudible 00:25:32]. Sarah, is there any issue with you on the 15th or 16th? Would that be the 14th?

Freedman: The 16th is a Thursday [interposing]

Unknown: Thursday. You mean the 17th maybe?

Freedman: 17th is St. Patrick's Day. It's a Friday.

Unknown: Bad day.

Stoldal: Any challenges at this point with any of those days?

Freedman: So it would be that week?

Stoldal: Yeah.

Freedman: [Inaudible 00:25:57] on the big calendar.

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:25:59]

Unknown: 13th, yeah. What's the 12th? Daylight saving time starts. [interposing]

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:26:07] for the record. I won't be able to be there. It's spring break.

Stoldal: Anybody else?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman.

Stoldal: Yes, please.

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. Is March kind of late in the legislative session?

Freedman: So Myron Freedman for the record. We're concerned about that too, but the calendar in February was completely booked up. We are looking at joining with the Arts Council to do a Culture Day, and I'll have to get more information on when that takes place. That would be in February. And so

the question would be whether you would want to move the board meeting up that early or if you want to invite people up to do the legislature day and then have the board meeting sometime in March as per usual.

Stoldal: Well, our March meeting - Stoldal for the record. Our March meeting also has the benefit of being the time that we look at our coming fiscal year. So things like train tickets and other elements that would go into the budget that we presented [inaudible 00:27:33] come before us in March. So March has several elements to it beyond the legislative session. We would have a [inaudible 00:27:47] which is not [inaudible 00:27:49] There's no issue with February that I can think of as far as the board. We just want to make sure we have as many people attending as possible, especially in Carson City. Looking around, everybody has legislators that we know. It's always nice to go and shake hands and look at them and say "how you doing?" So do we want to leave the first meeting there open at this juncture? Myron, when do you think you could be back with a date [inaudible 00:28:22]?

Freedman: See Brenda Scolari. Myron Freedman for the record [inaudible 00:28:26] has joined us again. Can you weigh in on this, Brenda, regarding the possible dates for legislative advocacy?

Scolari: For the record, Brenda Scolari, director of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. I did request March 10th. We're having some difficulty getting confirmation for what we're calling a Nevada Culture Day, so we would share some advocacy resources with the Nevada Arts Council. I got confirmation for March 10th. Division of Tourism has February 13th and has also reserved room 3100 in the legislature. It's been a little difficult to get calendar confirmations from LCB for whatever reason, but I do have a confirmation for March 10th, which may align more closely with museum's board meeting. Is that helpful? More helpful that date than - the problem is the legislative calendar is, of course, filling out quickly.

Stoldal: But you have locked in March 10th, though [interposing]

Scolari: I did get confirmation on that date. Yes.

Stoldal: For Culture.

Scolari: Correct.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 00:29:41] look at that date.

Freedman: Yeah. Thank you, Brenda. Myron Freedman for the record. That's a Friday. And so, Brenda, one of the things we would want to look at is the timing for when we would be focused on museums in the halls of the

legislature or in the room. And then see what's left of the day for the board business and whether that's sufficient.

Stoldal: Or we could meet on March the 9th. And those that are able to attend [inaudible 00:30:11] for the next day, which wouldn't be a board meeting, would just be part of and would have more of an opportunity than just a few hours in the afternoon to meet with their favorite legislator, if we met on March the 9th. And then the 10th would be a time that we would focus on joining with the other cultural elements as well as make the appointment with our legislative friends.

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, Bob Ostrovsky. Yeah, the 9th is Library Day at the legislature. The problem the LCB is having is the legislature has not adopted a calendar. Normally they would by this time. They know what day they're opening, but they have not adopted the legislative calendar. So we just have to work around that problem.

Stoldal: Historically, the libraries get their own day.

Ostrovsky: Yeah.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 00:31:05] for a long time [inaudible 00:31:08] So we want to look at a meeting then on the 9th? Why don't we pencil in the 9th as part of this because we have three other dates that year, so let's put the 9th in Carson City. And then normally we would come to the south or we would go to another facility. We could go to Lost City.

Unknown: We need to go to Ely too.

Stoldal: Ely? Lost City, Ely -

Dwyer: Can I - this is Doris Dwyer for the record. We had previously scheduled a March meeting. Is this the same weekend that we've already or is it a change?

Stoldal: If we approve the 9th, it would be a change.

Dwyer: It's a change. Because it was the following weekend [interposing]

Stoldal: Right.

Dwyer: Okay. Alright.

Stoldal: So and that would be in June. That's a 2-day meeting because it's our budget meeting. And normally with our 2-day meetings, we tend to meet either in Las Vegas or in Carson City or Reno. And otherwise, the 2-day

meetings turn out to be weeklong meetings because of travel. June, and then the next one would be in September, then December. So I look for some input on - let's start with the June meeting. It's a 2-day meeting and our December meeting is also a 2-day meeting. And there's nothing that prohibits any - we can meet any time we want, legislative says, at least 4 times a year. And there's nothing that says we need 1 day, 2 days, or 3 days. So even though June, we always want to meet for 2 days just because it's a budget process. Any thoughts on June?

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:33:17] the record. I do see we have the 15th and 16th held. Is it possible to do the next week? If not, I'll do my best to Zoom in, but I'm in Philadelphia.

Stoldal: And what city is that?

Unknown: I think we held the 15th and 16th [inaudible 00:33:31] And if it's possible to do the 22nd and 23rd [inaudible 00:33:36]

Stoldal: I don't know. I'm just asking you and Daphne if the 22nd and the 23rd, which is awfully close to July 1st, [inaudible 00:33:46] the budget is approved, and if there's any changes, and there usually are changes [interposing]

Unknown: Or the 8th and 9th [inaudible 00:33:54]

Stoldal: Or the 8th and 9th. And generally, we lean more towards earlier to give staff time to [interposing]

DeLeon: This is Daphne DeLeon for the record. We would prefer earlier in the month, 8th and 9th, to ensure that we - to leave that July 1st opening [inaudible 00:34:11]

Stoldal: So let's look at July the 8th and 9th [inaudible 00:34:14] I'm sorry, June, yeah. [Inaudible 00:34:20] 8th and 9th. Any challenges? Anybody that's online? Anybody here that shows a challenge for those dates? You do?

Timmons: I do. Anthony Timmons for the record. I get back from London on the 7th.

Stoldal: Could you Zoom in?

Timmons: Potentially, yeah.

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:34:44] bound to happen. Keep it original date.

Stoldal: No, no. It's not on there. The idea is for staff [interposing]

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:34:51]

Unknown: You want it earlier. Okay.

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. I could Zoom in, if possible, if it's available.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 00:34:58] Go ahead, please.

Unknown: I'm saying I'm fine for those dates, Bob. No problem.

Stoldal: Alright, then let's [inaudible 00:35:11] someone, June 8th and 9th. And then let's look in September. Have we had a tentative date in September yet? Right now September is a 1-day meeting.

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:35:25] record. 14th and 15th is what we [inaudible 00:35:28]

Stoldal: Anybody have an online, first of all, challenge with September 14th and 15th? I'm seeing some shaking heads but no challenge. Anybody here with a challenge? How about staff? Is there a frame of reference here that's -

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:35:47] for the record. Where would this be?

Stoldal: Well, if we're going to the June meeting in the south generically or Ely, and then the meeting in the north would be Reno, Carson City, or Ely, although - I'm hesitating back to the June 8th and 9th. Put that in Ely only because there would be - 8th and 9th are what days of the week?

Unknown: Thursday and Friday.

Stoldal: Thursday and Friday. And if they're full meeting, that means the staff comes back on Saturday.

Unknown: It's only 2 hours [inaudible 00:36:38]

DeLeon: Chair, this is Daphne DeLeon for the record. Staff would come back after the meeting [inaudible 00:36:43]

Stoldal: Not on [inaudible 00:36:47]

DeLeon: [Inaudible 00:36:48] because Brenda allows us to [inaudible 00:36:52]

Stoldal: Well, but it also goes for the board.

DeLeon: Yeah. Well, that's true.

Stoldal: So [interposing]

Unknown: That's for me.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 00:37:05] [Laughing] Alright, well, [inaudible 00:37:11] back date in December. Let's try in December. Meet again early. I think those are the [inaudible 00:37:19] the first Thursday and Friday in December.

Unknown: 7th, 8th.

Stoldal: 7th and 8th? Again?

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:37:30]

Stoldal: Well, we can always meet on the 30th and the 1st of December. And for the record, let's have Dan Markoff - has joined us. I mean, there's nothing that says we have to meet in December. So we could meet Thursday the 30th and Friday the 1st. Anybody have an issue with that? The 30th of November, the 1st of December.

DeLeon: Yeah, this is Daphne DeLeon. Just a consideration for staff. If we are meeting November 30th, December 1st, we'll try to get [inaudible 00:38:19] before. And that's really close to Thanksgiving. So that's going to be difficult for us.

Stoldal: I'm sorry [inaudible 00:38:28]

Unknown: We can't hear you.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. If we meet November 30 to December 1st, that is difficult for staff because we put packets together 2 weeks before to try to send them out the week before. And that is close to Christmas week. [interposing]

Stoldal: Okay, but Hanukkah begins on the night of the 7th.

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:38:54] Thanksgiving.

Stoldal: Oh -

DeLeon: Thanksgiving. Apologies.

Timmons: That's right. Hanukkah. Anthony Timmons for the record. Hanukkah starts the 7th, which would be our meeting day.



Unknown: It would also be a day in infamy.

Unknown: We gave away a car yesterday in honor of it. Yep, in Colorado.

Stoldal: Let me formally announce on December the 7th, the city of Las Vegas named yours truly as the citizen of the month. So it's a day that will [inaudible 00:39:27] So the Thursday, the 30th of November, or the 1st, that's still doable, though, right? No, we got Thanksgiving 2 weeks before. So how about December the 7th and the 8th? Is that an issue? Is there challenge?

Cowie: Sarah Cowie for the record. I can't go on the 7th. But you might still have quorum, so that could be fine.

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:39:58]

Unknown: When did she [inaudible 00:40:00] semester?

Stoldal: When would you be done with the semester?

Unknown: It's the week after.

Stoldal: The week after?

Unknown: Finals are the week after.

Stoldal: Yeah, but then we get into the - let's go ahead and look at the 7th and the 8th. Any other objection? Alright. So now we have in the June meeting, it's a Tuesday meeting. First of all, the meeting on March the 9th, a 1-day meeting in Carson City; our budget meeting in June, June the 8th and the 9th. We have to determine whether to meet in Southern Nevada or potentially Ely.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. Can we move Ely to September?

Stoldal: It's a little chillier, but yes, we can.

Unknown: It will be hot.

Stoldal: It will be hot. Okay. So why don't we meet in Southern Nevada. We can either meet at Lost City or the Las Vegas Museum, if staff have a choice.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Given the amount of information we have to present at that meeting, it might be best to be at the Las Vegas State Museum just for access to the person [inaudible 00:41:21]

Stoldal: And I think that they have a -

Freedman: They have a meeting room and -

Stoldal: Electronic meeting room.

Freedman: Yes, although it had the old Polycom system, but we could work at getting-

Stoldal: Alright. So let's tentatively put June for 8th and 9th in Las Vegas. Then September, we're looking at potentially Ely. And then December, [inaudible 00:41:57]

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Perhaps the Historical Society.

Stoldal: Then the following meeting in January 24, potentially at Lost City. I don't know [inaudible 00:42:14] Lost City. So let me propose that and look for a motion that March 9, 2023, we meet in Carson City. For June 8th and 9th meeting, we meet in Las Vegas. For our September 14th and 15th meeting, we meet in Ely. And for our last meeting of the year, the 7th and the 8th, we meet at the Nevada Historical Society in Reno, although we haven't heard from Catherine whether she wants to invite us.

Unknown: We're self-invited. [Laughing]

Freedman: And Chair, Myron Freedman for the record. Just to clarify, the September meeting would be a 1-day meeting, correct?

Stoldal: Yes. Yes, [inaudible 00:43:01] wrote 14th - maybe that's [inaudible 00:43:03] Friday there. Oh, you want to make it a Thursday? Would that be easier?

Unknown: Sorry. [Inaudible 00:43:11] Where is it in?

Stoldal: Ely.

Unknown: Thursday would be better.

Stoldal: Okay. Let's make it Thursday, the 14th, in Ely.

Dwyer: Bob, this is Doris Dwyer for the record. On March 9, is that a 1-day meeting?

Stoldal: Yes.

Dwyer: And is the [inaudible 00:43:33] the next day or not? [Inaudible 00:43:35]

Stoldal: [Inaudible 00:43:36] Yes.

Dwyer: Oh, okay.

Stoldal: That's the time that [interposing]

Unknown: So block in both days.

Dwyer: Thank you.

Stoldal: Brenda Scolari has - but March 9th will be the official meeting. We will adjourn and then we -

Dwyer: Okay.

Stoldal: So again, it's March 9th, 1-day meeting in Carson City with Cultural Day at the legislature on the 10th. Our 2-day budget meeting, 8th and 9th of June would be at Las Vegas. Our 1-day meeting in Ely would be a Thursday on September the 14th. And our 2-day policy, etcetera meeting at the Nevada Historical Society in Reno on the 7th and 8th. Further discussion? If not, I will look for somebody to make a motion on what I just said.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. [Inaudible 00:44:30] It's your turn to second it.

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. I second.

Stoldal: Anthony was the only one that didn't have his mouth full.

Timmons: Jeez. I'm getting poked. I have to get approval from the [inaudible 00:44:49] I'm getting poked for a second. Is that legal? Okay. [Laughing]

Stoldal: I have a motion and we have a fully involved second. Further discussion? General public? And then all those in favor, please say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. Yes, being poked and having your foot stepped on is all okay in a meeting.

Unknown: Can I get the NRS reference on that, please? [Laughing]

Stoldal: [Inaudible 00:45:23] We are at the question, are those - anybody opposed? Should I call for a vote? All those in favor, say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously with the chair voting with those that are present. And thank you all. I know it took a year long, but I think there's a benefit of setting these dates as far in advance that we can to make everybody's plans. And we know that these are important. Each one of these has its own special importance, whether it's budget or policy, and then there's travel plans that needed to be made for all of us. So thank you for your indulgence in that area. Let's move on [interposing]

Palmer: Chair.

Stoldal: Yes, please.

Palmer: Chair Stoldal, this is Rebecca Palmer. May I ask that these dates be posted somewhere so that we have them available for planning purposes?

Stoldal: We will post these as quickly as we can, as soon as the staff gets back to Carson City. That's one thing we can easily quickly put online. But thank you. Good point. And helpful point. Let's move on to item 10, which is the State Historic Preservation Office. As we're looking at all of our board policies or many of the [inaudible 00:46:56] at our last meeting, it's also a time to - that I think it's important that we - I think we all know this but let's reaffirm that we, in fact, are two boards. Made editorial comment [inaudible 00:47:15] Nevada Board of History and the Nevada Board Museum [inaudible 00:47:21] Nevada Board of History. We're within two departments. We're within the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs but we're also within the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, specifically, that department's State Historic Preservation Office. And this board plays several key roles with the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Office. We review and approve national and state nominations for the historic register. We fulfill the role both of Nevada's comprehensive statewide historic plan, our input into that, as well as our role with the Commission on Cultural Affairs and Historic Places. That allocates millions of dollars to preserve and turn historic facility to bring life back into them. That's a key responsibility. We also provide advice and guidance to the Historic Preservation Office. And under NRS 383.121, the Museum and History Board as well as other boards [inaudible 00:48:34] and the word is "shall." "Shall cooperate with the State Historic Preservation Office in order to preserve historic, prehistoric evidence related to Native Indian human remains and [inaudible 00:48:47] That's it, NRS [inaudible 00:48:49] There are several other duties that this board fulfills including acting as the

appeals court for the Comstock Historic District. And we have only met once in that appeals process about 15 years ago. But statutorily, there is that appeals process within the Comstock Historic District. If there's an issue, challenge, they appeal to this [inaudible 00:49:18] A full set of the duties of this board as it relates to the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and the State Historic Preservation Office is part but will be part of the board's operational manual, which we are working on and Myron and myself are working on and planning to get that online. There's lots of elements, a lot of responsibilities and [inaudible 00:49:45] in the board manual or online. Any [inaudible 00:49:51] or questions about our role? Dan Markoff, welcome.

Markoff: Well, thank you. I'm glad to be here. On our appeals capacity, are we governed by the administrative procedures there?

Stoldal: This board, I think, is fully under the administrative act, but again, I think we [interposing]

Markoff: The only reason I was asking is because I just had a matter with the Department of Motor Vehicles. And all of a sudden they - and certain things, I don't think they're governed by that, which surprised me. [Inaudible 00:50:29] What are we governed by?

Stoldal: Dan, the only time that has come up is the totality of your question. Once it's come up [inaudible 00:50:37] as the Comstock Appeals Board and we have [inaudible 00:50:42] follow all the rules of posting and meeting rules. And then second, there was only one other time that your specific question came up about the administrative, and that was not directly with Comstock but had to do with our role as a board, that we have to follow those rules. And so therefore, I would assume since we have followed them on the one time that we met and since there was a discussion about whether this board itself should follow those rules, I think those two elements, the answer would be yes, that we would be under those administrative rules. There's no reason not to. I mean, they're pretty straightforward. [Inaudible 00:51:26]

Markoff: Well, the reason I'm asking is basic things like timelines [inaudible 00:51:32] Maybe the attorney general [inaudible 00:51:36] maybe had something to say about this, but what are the timelines for filing the [inaudible 00:51:40]?

Stoldal: The question is do you have - give me some time to Google the question. Is there any specific that this board acting as the Comstock Historic District Appeals Board, whether or not we are required to follow the administrative rules within the state of Nevada?

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. I think that question was directed to me. I think all boards and entities and subcommittees have to follow the administrative code, if that was your question, in regards to open meeting laws and in regards to almost anything else. I don't know if that was on point answering your question, but I think that's what I heard you ask me.

Stoldal: I think that was the question from him and that was what Dan - so Dan, I think the [inaudible 00:52:45] Yes, we would be under that responsibility, but I don't know about the Department of Motor Vehicles.

Markoff: [Inaudible 00:52:52]

Stoldal: Alright then. Let's move on to the next agenda item, which is 10b, Nevada State Historic Preservation Office. Rebecca Palmer, the administrator. Rebecca? Please.

Palmer: Good morning, Chair Stoldal and members of the board. My name is Rebecca Palmer. I'm the State Historic Preservation Officer. This agenda item is somewhat unique, but I'm hoping it's the beginning of an advisory relationship that was intended by the statutes. And we are encouraging this oversight of activities undertaken by the state of Nevada. So in this particular regard, I'm requesting an action item under two different elements of the statutes. The first one is advising on matters related to the Historic Preservation Plan. When the plan was developed in consultation with the Board, it was clear that the public wanted the state to be the leader in preservation of historic buildings. And we have made every attempt to uphold that public request. In addition, the State Historic Preservation Office is requesting that the Board act on other matters related to historic preservation. What we have before you is a proposal for the freight building in the railway museum in Ely.

Stoldal: Rebecca, I'm going to ask you to hold on for a second while the members of the board actually pull up that so they have that in front of them while you're talking.

Palmer: Okay. Let me know when you're ready.

Stoldal: Alright. Rebecca, sorry for that, but thank you. Please go ahead.

Palmer: Oh, no. Thank you. Thank you, Chair Stoldal. Again, this is Rebecca Palmer. We are asking for an action item, and my deputy, historical architect, Robin Reed, will walk you through our letter. At the end of the discussion, Chair, at your discretion, if you would like me to outline what staff would think an action item might be, I would be happy to do so. With

that, I will turn it over to Robin Reed, historical architect, to walk through our letter.

Reed: Good morning, everyone. Good morning, Chair. For the record, this is Robin Reed with the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office. In your board packets, beginning on page 18 of the PDF, you'll see the first page of our letter. It would be easiest if everyone would turn to the photographs, which begin on page 24 of that PDF. So just scroll through our letter until you get to the first page, and you'll see the Ely Freight Barn as well as the proposed floor plan for this project. At this time, our office received this project for review from State Public Works pursuant to NRS 383.121, which the Chair has explained briefly. This project involves the rehabilitation of the freight barn to turn this building into an events exhibit and archival space. At the present time, we are at a critical moment during the planning of this project, as it is moving from schematic design to design development. Typically, during planning projects of this nature, design development involves elimination of options that have been explored so they can continue moving towards producing construction documents and specifications. This building is nationally significant. You can read about that in our letter, in the areas of commerce and transportation. There is no other standard gauge railway property in the United States that preserves as complete railroad [inaudible 00:57:54] complex of buildings and structures, tracks, steam locomotives, and freight passenger and cars as the one in East Ely. Construction began in this historic district in 1905 and includes [inaudible 00:58:05] 14 contributing buildings and structures. This complex is extremely significant nationally. It is a national historic landmark, which is the greatest honor that properties can be bestowed upon. The team has been exploring options for adding insulation to this building. So if you start scrolling down through the photographs, you will see on page 8 of our letter, this shows an interior view of the freight barn as it exists presently. This is going to be actually the main event space. You can see the wood studs of the freight barn, and the gray in between the studs is actually the metal siding. So there's very little construction details to the wall. At the bottom, you can see the freight rails that were installed. As packages and crates were moved into this building, if things were put up against the wall, those rails helped to stop the freight from going out onto the platform outside. At this time, State Public Works has four options on the table, which I've outlined in our letter. Two of those options involve adding insulation but doing it from the exterior side of the building. This involves taking off all of the siding and modifying the exterior wood details to be able to install siding on the outside of the studs. Then they will be putting the siding back on. However, this is going to push the building envelope out and will forever change historic character, defining features, and the relationships between each other. Options 1 and 2, out of these 4 options - I'll talk about 3 and 4 in a moment. Options 1 and 2, installing insulation from the exterior of the

building is not recommended by the standards. It is not reversible. It may cause damage to historic buildings. It's also going to cause loss of historic materials and may alter, as I explained, the proportion and relationship of the wall to historic windows and trim. The standards recommend sustainability treatment such as these that have the least impact on historic buildings. Options 3 and 4, if you scroll down on your PDF to page - it's page 11 of 15 of our letter. Figure 8 shows the architect's rendering on how options 3 and 4 would look. This would actually be installing the insulation from the interior side of the building, as you would on most historic buildings. Insulation would be placed between the studs. The rail boards that you see down below would need to be taken off while they do that, but then they would be installed right back in their position. Option 3, I believe, would actually take the metal siding off the building, but it would be returned exactly in the same plane against the wood studs. Options 3 and 4 had been determined by our office to meet the standards, as these are least invasive options available. At this time, [inaudible 01:01:30] was requesting that Public Works eliminate options 1 and 2, installing the insulation from the outside of the building. Eliminate those completely from consideration as we move into design development and explore detailing options 3 or 4, as those would both meet the standards. At this time, our office is requesting the Board to advise in this matter and give direction to State Public Works. I'll turn this back over to Rebecca.

Palmer: Yes. Chair Stoldal, at this point, the action item, if you agree, would be a letter signed by yourself, recommending that options 1 and 2 be removed from further consideration and that options 3 and 4 move forward into the next step in the process.

Stoldal: Rebecca. Stoldal for the record. As you indicated at the very beginning, this is the first time something like this has ever come before this Board, so the freight beginning [inaudible 01:02:49] are two apropos words. A couple of questions. I'm going to put that on hold, and I'm going to ask you a couple of questions but I'm going to open it up to the [inaudible 01:03:05] Robin just stated that a formal letter has gone to Public Works and asking them to say a real good reason why it should be not used and they should be used. Public Works - do they have the authority to say yes or no and then move forward?

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. We are responsible for ensuring that the state's activities related to historical building's infrastructure and structures meets the Secretary of the Interior's standards. It's our statutory responsibility. We have done that. As to what action may be taken by Public Works, I cannot say.

Stoldal: Again, I'm going to go back to what you said. The Board is learning two things. One, that the request under the Nevada Revised Statute that this



board act in an area that it has been acted in before, so these questions really have two concurrent elements in them. One is to help the board understand [inaudible 01:04:35] process, whether it's the freight barn or whatever [inaudible 01:04:38] how this works and who has the final authority and who can say yes or no and who's got the bottom line. And then specifically, this particular project. So when I ask these questions, it is a Public Works. Somebody must have the final say, yes or no. If it's not SHPO, they can't say no, don't do this, end of story, or Public Works no, we like the way it's going, we're going to continue to do exterior or, no, we agree with SHPO. It's going to be interior or it's the people that are paying the bills, which I think is the State [inaudible 01:05:24] They have the final say. They may decide to override any [inaudible 01:05:36] your office or Public Works. And if they do have that authority, they can't just arbitrarily, I would think. Public Works nor the museum can just arbitrarily say, no, go away, we don't like. They must have some checkmarks, either that they think it meets the store criteria, or B, there's a cost factor, or C, there's something else. As this board meets, as we move forward [inaudible 01:06:08] really understand this process and [inaudible 01:06:15] and I think you're rightly so, this board does have some oversight, some responsibility, even if it's just recommendation to move forward. But we also - this Board needs to understand what its role is and the role each of the government entities has in this process. It sounds like your office doesn't have specifically - you're in charge of making sure this occurs, but it sounds like you can't say no, do it on the inside, not the outside. It doesn't sound like [inaudible 01:06:49] maybe [inaudible 01:06:50] Myron, is anything you can add to it at this point, although there seems to be more questions for Rebecca at this juncture.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Well, I think that the line of questioning here about the authority of SHPO, I think it's very useful in this discussion. As far as Public Works go, they are still in the process of working with the architects and the engineer on the solutions. So we're waiting for a full report from them at some point.

Stoldal: Rebecca, one of the things that I think will benefit out of this, as your word that this is the beginning, and I think [inaudible 01:07:34] going back to Dan Markoff's question about whether or not under the Comstock appeals process, this board has to follow the administrative code. It seemed to me that there would be - this is a matter for almost a shearing process, that we would shear from the various parties in this process. And I don't think we have a formal - we definitely don't have a formal policy for the Comstock Historic District. We [inaudible 01:08:13] Dan, you started to raise your hand?

Markoff: Yeah. I was wondering why we're even involved in the architectural aspect of this. Does that mean everything that's going to be worked on by the

state museum or railroad museum, that we're going to have a hearing process over that?

Stoldal: Well, I think only in the appeals sense. If there's some disagreement within the sides, that there may be a challenge and one side is calling for this board, we do have a responsibility under the board to work with the Department of Lands and Conservation, specifically SHPO. We do have that responsibility under the statutes. Your question is still on point in the sense that if that's what we're going to do and it's the appeals process, we need to have a process that we use.

Markoff: I understand that, but what I'm also concerned about is are we going to get involved in the technical aspects of how are restorations done? That's what this is.

Stoldal: It sounds like that's a request, but in some ways we're already deeply involved in that process when we reviewed national register to [inaudible 01:09:43] Over half of our board has specific category that by federal statute, need to be filled. Half of our board - well, not quite half - but I think four or five members of our board. It just has a category of the general public. That's the category [inaudible 01:10:03] For example, myself, I fall into the general category [inaudible 01:10:07] Bob Ostrovsky falls under the archaeologist category. And Courtney Mooney falls under the category of - I want to be specific.

Mooney: Architectural historian.

Stoldal: Architectural historian. And Sarah Cowie fits under another category. These are specific categories the government has to appoint, so therefore there are experts on the Board in a variety of categories. It's not just like we're all laypeople [inaudible 01:10:41]

Markoff: I understand that. But I'm talking about [inaudible 01:10:46] They're asking for our approval on one process over another.

Stoldal: Right.

Markoff: And -

Ward: Mr. Chair, for the record, Harry Ward. May I interrupt briefly? For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. And I'll read NRS 381.002, Section 6. "In all of the matters pertaining to the Office of Historic Preservation in the Division of Museums and History, the Board serves in an advisory capacity." So thus - and this is not a formal AGs' opinion - I don't think you can mandate anything, but this Board has looked to for in

its advisory capacity from the Historic Society. So I'm just throwing that out there, and I'm open for questions.

Markoff: Dan Markoff here. I can see that, but they're asking for approval of one process over another in terms of preserving the building. We really want to get that detail [inaudible 01:11:48]

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. I think, and I might be wrong, Ms. Palmer may have to ask me. I think they're looking for a letter to support them in their decision on do not follow 1 and 2, follow 3 and 4. I think that is the action and on the agenda in which before the Board and the issue before the Board. I tend to the floor.

Stoldal: Board can't say you're going to do this. I would think the way the attorney general's office is suggesting is that we would simply be advisory or support capacity rather than, but it still doesn't get down to - Jan Petersen.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. We have an architectural historian on our board and I'd like to know - I want to know her opinion on -

Stoldal: Well, let me jump in here and not put Courtney [inaudible 01:12:42] our Board member. Courtney is involved in this process, financial. She's a paid consultant to one of the elements of the - why don't you explain your role?

Mooney: We were hired by LGA Architects to review the project - the proposal as it's going through [inaudible 01:13:12] My understanding is it's not quite gone through the whole [interposing]

Stoldal: But it would be improper for him or the team to be involved [inaudible 01:13:22] Harry, what would you think?

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. I didn't hear the last part, but I would - if you're looking for someone on the board that has a background, just put it on the record and then if the question is should the letter come from the full board? Yes, but it sounds like that the board has someone with somewhat of a technical background in that aspect. I don't know if that was the question asked me or not.

Stoldal: Yeah, specifically - Courtney Mooney, a board member, works with Northwind [ph 01:14:00], and Northwind has a financial contract with the architect's that's involved. So she already has that position and I don't want to put her into an uncomfortable role where she's got two hats.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. Of course, she can always "recuse" herself from a vote in any manner, but that has to come

from her and her own knowledge, do I feel like it would be unfair or biased or something of that nature in regards to a vote in that matter. I don't know if that is the specific question asked to me, but that would be my suggestion, that it would have to come from that individual.

Stoldal: Well, we're not to the point of whether or not we're going to have a motion. There is a request for an action item that we support.

Petersen: Board chair. Rebecca, correct me - Jan Petersen for the record. Correct me if I'm incorrect, but I guess you need this decided today, don't you? You need a response from us, not to table this suggestion, request from you, you need forward motion on this, isn't that right?

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Yes, indeed. That's correct. We need an action, if the chair chooses. Board member Mooney is not the only architectural historian. Unfortunately, your architect is not here today, which is most unfortunate.

Stoldal: Well, [inaudible 01:15:52] my point is there's several key players that are not here today. So in one sense, we're asking for a hearing but we don't have all the parties that are here. I don't have a problem - an issue with this board having some advisory responsibility, which [inaudible 01:16:13] require to have that under the statute. The question for me is still two-fold. One is what's the process that we should use for this brand-new - the action of really becoming an advisory board that provides advisory advice, and then secondly, this issue that we have here. I'm going to take a board privilege and hold the process over for a second. I'd like to ask you a couple of questions, you and Robin, about the building itself. On page 8, you show a really great shot of the inside and pointing out that this is a unique building in the United States. And it's not just a great barn, it was a community site, and so it really has tremendous historic value. But I'm looking at - I see the exposed timbers in the wall. Are there markings on those timbers, either vertical or the diagonal one, that show that there was paneling all the way to the top?

Reed: Robin Reed, Nevada SHPO, for the record. Based on - we're looking at figure 8, correct? On page 11 of 15?

Stoldal: Yes.

Reed: Okay. It is my understanding that that is historically how the building was constructed from the beginning. It only had the rail boards at the bottom and then it had the studs, and then it had a metal covering on the outside.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 01:18:02] the wooden panel all the way up to the roof.

Reed: No. This was considered to be a freight building, right? So they would have moved freight in between the platform and the inside of the building to store it, and then it would have gone back on the train. So it was literally a barn. This was not used as an interior space historically except for storage and work programs.

Stoldal: I'm way out of my league here, but it doesn't make sense to me that you only panel four bars. If you got to put paneling [inaudible 01:18:36] the top, not just halfway, you're not going to do it [inaudible 01:18:39] why put any paneling? But you're the expert in that area. It just struck me as maybe this is not the original way it looked.

Reed: So, Chair, for the record. The paneling that you see down there, the rail boards, they go almost 5 feet in height. It's very misleading the way this picture looks. So it would have been very high up on the wall while workers were in that space to push freight against the wall.

Stoldal: Courtney, do you have any [inaudible 01:19:15] at all? I noticed it doesn't go all the way down to the bottom. Is that relatively traditional for that sort of architecture?

Mooney: What page?

Stoldal: Page 8 where it just shows the paneling doesn't go all the way to the roof but also it doesn't show it going all the way to the floor. Just wondering if that's original -

Mooney: Page 8 or figure 8?

Reed: Page 8.

Stoldal: Page 8. I'm sorry. Page 8 of 15, figure 2.

Reed: The picture. The picture, interior.

Mooney: Okay. Oh, I see. You're talking about the interior?

Stoldal: Yes.

Mooney: Well, that is the - from what I understand, that was the bumper, you know. It would not have gone all the way up because that's just keeping the freight from [interposing] into the metal paneling.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. Friendly reminder. Please identify yourself when you speak.

Mooney: Courtney Mooney for the record.

Stoldal: Alright. Further questions about the particular project and then we'll go back to our role in this.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. Instead of wading through all of this, what is the proposed remediation solution for insulation on this? Silver board type stuff - what is your preferred remediation?

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. We've identified options 3 and 4 as meeting the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation.

Cowie: Sarah Cowie for the record. Mr. Chair, can I jump in for a second?

Stoldal: Please.

Cowie: Sarah Cowie for the record. I would defer to the opinions of our architect and historical architect on this. They have a lot of expertise. But as the historical archaeologist on the board, we edge into some of this territory too. I don't know as much as they do, but I know a little bit because historic buildings are kind of like artifacts. They're just vertical rather than being under the ground. So we can look at the same concepts as we would for an archaeological site. So the least impactful thing that could be done with this building is to do nothing, but it seems clear that people would like to do something with this space. The most impactful thing, it sounds like, would be options 1 and 2. And so that would be like the least conservative approach. But it sounds like it's pretty clear options 1 and 2 don't meet the Secretary of the Interior's standards, so I could not support that. I would not support options 1 and 2 if they don't meet those standards. Those are national standards, so I would not advocate for that. If options 3 and 4 do meet the standards, that would be kind of the moderate approach to this building, and just with my limited expertise in this area, that's what I would recommend as a board member.

Stoldal: That's helpful. Please, [inaudible 01:22:40]

Unknown: I'm trying to help move this along. I'm referring to Dan's past comments and why we're involved in this process. Because options 3 and 4 preserve the historical integrity of the building and options 1 and 2 do not, and that is directly under our purview, under our obligations to advise to historic preservation. So I think we are ready for a motion. But if we do put forward the motion, at that point of the discussion after the motion, we can talk about the price increase that the letter addresses, why the price increase between the first communication and the second, why there's such a difference in price on options 3 and 4. But we can discuss that after the motion. Am I -

Stoldal: [Inaudible 01:23:33] do that as a secondary thing and not take that [inaudible 01:23:38] in the motion. So far, we have heard one of the most important parts of making a decision in the process, and that's the history of the building, [inaudible 01:23:50] the building. But are there - and I would ask this of Public Works or ask this of the museum system - are there other criteria that have to be checked off? In other words - I'm making this up - if 1 and 2 cost a dollar and 3 and 4 cost a hundred dollars, does that make a difference in how the decision is made by a state office? Does dollar figure - does the cost of something, is that part of the decision-making process? Or is the only thing that is to be considered by this board is the historic preservation aspect? If it is, then what you're suggesting is correct, but it seems to me that there are other elements that should be taken in consideration. And because we don't have Public Works here, I'm feeling a little uncomfortable about making a decision. Myron?

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. We do have [inaudible 01:24:52] from Public Works on the line, if you want to speak with them. Maybe you should hear from them first and then I'll have some comments too.

Stoldal: Okay. Public Works. Where are you?

Nalley: Hi. This is Kirsten Nalley with Public Works. Can you hear me okay?

Stoldal: Yes, we can. Thank you.

Nalley: Okay.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 01:25:11]

Nalley: Say that again?

Stoldal: You've been with us through this -

Nalley: I have been listening in. Yes.

Stoldal: Okay. So can you address some of the questions that we have? First of all, my question, which may not be the most important, is what are the elements that Public Works takes in consideration in making a decision on a historic property?

Nalley: Alright. And that's a great question. We definitely do the process of the NRS 383.121. We look to the State Historic Preservation Office to advise us on how to treat historic buildings. We do look at cost, of course, but I think the one item that has not been brought up that is very important is

that we also have to follow building codes when we address these buildings. So that's probably one of the key elements that the board needs to be aware of, that State Public Works has to look into and respond to.

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. We did address the International Existing Building Code.

Nalley: This is Kirsten Nalley. Yes, and I appreciate that understanding of the code. So that is a part of the process that we're looking at right now, is how does the International Existing Building Code, what requirements does that have, and how can we move forward on this building? So we're still on the process of understanding the input that that code has in the project.

Stoldal: Well, [inaudible 01:27:11] not necessarily in this [inaudible 01:27:15] but in this order. Historic preservation [inaudible 01:27:19] which can overlap that to some degree, and then financial can overlap that to some degree. But the first [inaudible 01:27:27] is historic preservation of this building and inside and outside, wherever. Kirsten, can you also help me understand where we stand in the process? This board needs to get a quick primer on how all of this works and when the deadlines are and also who can finally say I want A, I want B, and I want R.

Nalley: Correct. So where we're at in the process is that we are at the very [interposing]

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. And for the record, this is Kirsten Nalley.

Nalley: This is Kirsten Nalley, yes. Thank you. Yeah, we're in the early stage of design where per NRS 383.121 [ph 01:28:23] we submitted drawings and proposed work to the SHPO. We also submitted proposed methods and materials to be used. And they've been an excellent collaborator with us and understanding what we've proposed in their feedback regarding those items. And so that has led us to today where they issued their November 30th letter and their requested option 3 and 4 for the project. So we're taking that and we're going to incorporate their input. And we need to look at that in addition too. Like I said, the building code is moving forward. So we're still in the process of making decisions in the design process. So -

Stoldal: Kirsten, Stoldal for the record. Is Public Works taking in consideration finances, building codes in historic preservation? Does your office have the final say on we're going to do A or B, we're going to do this painting color? Does your office have the final say over this process?



Nalley: Right. That's a great question, and I'm not prepared to give a final answer on that right now. But I do know that in order to do the project, the building official will have to sign off on it.

Stoldal: Uh-huh.

Nalley: And that that comes down to that he agrees that the approach that we've taken on the code is appropriate [inaudible 01:30:21]

Stoldal: [Inaudible 01:30:24] Yes, please go ahead, Dan.

Markoff: I had a quick question. You've been mentioning the International Building Code. Was that adopted by White Pine County or Ely?

Nalley: The property is on the state of Nevada land, and so the adopted code is the International Building Code, which also adopts the International Existing Building Code.

Markoff: International is great, but was it adopted for use in White Pine County or Ely? We're on state property. Why are we using the International Code?

Unknown: It's the standard.

Nalley: Yeah, it's the standard.

Markoff: Those are usually governed by local laws, though.

Nalley: Well, it's still on state land and therefore the state building official adopted [inaudible 01:31:25] what we were assigned to.

Stoldal: Myron, why don't you go ahead and [inaudible 01:31:36]

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Member Seth Schorr stepped out of the room. I'd like him to come back and hear all of the discussion.

Stoldal: Well, so if Kirsten [inaudible 01:31:50] answer the question who has final say, if SHPO doesn't sign off on this, what happens then?

Nalley: I don't know and I'm not prepared to answer that question.

Stoldal: Okay. But I mean - and this really kind of goes back to Rebecca as well. SHPO's been around for a long time, Public Works has been around for a long time, museum's been around for a long time, working on projects over the last years, 5 years, 10 years, 20, 30 years. Is there something different going on in the relationship between the departments so that this is now coming before this board or how have these things been resolved

in the past so this board has some idea of how you have worked these things out in the past if we are now going to be asked on a regular basis that we become a part of this. How have these things been worked out in the past? I'm sure there's been some disagreements.

Reed: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. What is driving this was a public recognition that the state needed to be the leader in preservation and preservation of heritage resources around the state. And that came from our 2020 Nevada State Preservation Plan. It was a new element that the public raised that had not been raised in the past. So that instilled in our relationship with Public Works and, in fact, any party that works on state buildings, particularly state buildings that are in National Historic Landmarks, to ensure that we used the best preservation principles available and preserve the heritage in which we are tasked with being stewards of. And that's a new development. That's a 2020 development. And that has changed the way in which my office looks at proposals on historic buildings. In the past, the majority of the decisions have been made by parties whose expertise is not historic preservation or historical architecture. And they were presented to us often at the end of the process when all the decisions had been made. And we were left with providing the only other option available to us, which was mitigation of the adverse effect. And so for years, we were documenting historic buildings and historic structures before they were adversely affected. And while that is an option, it is not the preferred option that the public expressed in 2020. So yes indeed, this is different.

Stoldal: That's pretty helpful, putting it in historic context. Myron, you have thoughts?

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. First of all, it's just been a pleasure and an honor to be working with SHPO and with Public Works on this project. It's really an amazing project. It has some history to it. This building was basically in a near collapse state when the state took it over over 30 years ago. They had to replace the foundation. They had to replace the roof. They eventually replaced the metal siding. Many, many things have been replaced on this building to preserve it. The goals that we have for this building, as this board knows, is to continue to work on it so it's useful as a community center and a meeting space year-round. The winters in Ely - I don't know if you've heard - are extremely harsh. So the insulation question here is a significant one in order to achieve that goal of having it be an interpretive center year-round, a meeting center year-round. So that's a big consideration for us. Interpretive goal is also incredibly important. While the exterior and the interior are both absolutely significant to the history of the building and to its meeting of the standards set by the Secretary of Interior and by SHPO, as an interpretive historic element, we are foreseeing the use of the interiors being significant for tours, for

understanding how the building was used. The rail boards that are being referred to have basically - for lack of a better term, graffiti - that was carved in or written on, that identifies which of these historic companies used the freight building. So that interior space is really key to how we plan to interpret that building. So as we look at these different insulation plans, we're trying to keep the building warm year-round and we're trying to maintain the historic stories that are coming from the interior surfaces. And that is why we are wrestling over which of these insulation approaches to take. And as Public Works' Kirsten Nalley has pointed out, that is something that they're still looking at. If we do the exterior application of the insulation, and again, this is me talking before Kirsten is ready to talk about what's finally going to happen, with all the information they get from the engineers and the architects, there's an uninterrupted sheathing of insulation that goes around the building. If we come on to the inside, it's interrupted by the studs. And each piece of insulation has to be custom cut, as you saw in that picture, to fit between all of those stud sections. So then we're missing the insulation over the 2-inch width of each of the studs in the harsh Ely environment. So this is an important element as well. And that's why the studies that Kirsten's referring to for [inaudible 01:39:07] and everything is so critically important. Also, when the visitors come inside to experience the building, again, it's that interior space that we're going to be focused on. By adding the insulation to the interior, there will be some modification that removes that element of immediate historic feeling from that surface. There will have to be some kind of new material introduced to hold the insulation in place on the inside, and this [inaudible 01:39:37] So again, we haven't made up our minds here, we haven't made our decisions yet, but there's a lot of goals and factors involved here that we're taking into consideration, and the final one will be the cost. While there is some information there on cost, I know through Public Works, they are still finalizing that process and that work they're doing with LGA.

Nalley: This is Kirsten Nalley for the record. Thank you, Myron. That was a great explanation of where we're at. And I just want to just kind of explain to you that the amount of insulation on a building, there is an energy code, and so that is something that we're still looking at, what the impacts and what the required insulation on this building will be. And so we're still trying to study and understand that, what can we by code do to appropriately insulate this building.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman.

Stoldal: Please.

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. Honestly, Mr. Chairman, I really can't support this. I'm not an expert in this. I don't have knowledge in insulation.

I'm a financial person. I don't have knowledge in this, but I think saying option 3 or option 4, to me, is a little bit more granular than we should be. I think we should instead say that we support methods that preserve the historic heritage and are in line with the guidance as opposed to saying option 3 or 4. Because it sounds like we're not really even too sure if there's other options or what the pricings going to be or if it meets code. There's too much stuff that I don't even know about. So I couldn't support saying use option 3 or 4 if those are the only choices, but I could definitely say that we should be in line with standards and make sure that what they do do is in line with those standards as required by the code.

Stoldal: Jan Petersen?

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. Are there plans to insulate the roof?

Nalley: Yes, there are.

Petersen: Most heat loss is up and not out.

Stoldal: Kirsten?

Nalley: Yeah. Kirsten Nalley for the record. Yes, there are plans to insulate the roof, and so [inaudible 01:42:10] looking to our engineers who know how to analyze these types of design requirements to help inform our decisions moving forward with the walls.

Petersen: Jan Petersen again. You are looking at would it be the same materials in the roof? Are you talking about - I'm calling it foam, silver board stuff, or batting or [interposing]

Nalley: I believe the insulation is typically rigid insulation.

Petersen: The rigid silver board type stuff.

Nalley: That's my understanding.

Petersen: Okay, thank you.

Stoldal: It sounds like we got to, based on what Rebecca said, there is a renewed or - renewed, maybe it's not the right word because it seems to me there is more focus that has been requested starting in 2020 for SHPO to be more directly involved in certain elements of the process of preserving our history. And that has now generated request of this board to fulfill its advisory responsibility to SHPO. This board, from my standpoint - we don't have a process in place because this is the first time that this has occurred. Should we have all the parties to the table and have some

formal hearing? There are lots of boards that don't have the expertise on the panel but bring in the expertise to help them understand the particular issue. That said, we do have experts, and I mean that in a very positive way, on this board. More than happy this board is made up of experts. So I'm not worried about this board making a decision without knowledge. I am still concerned about the process we have, even though our process would simply be - we would recommend, we would support [inaudible 01:44:46] but we would support a particular [inaudible 01:44:49] And now I've got a list that seems to be growing. At the top of the list is the historic preservation, that we also have to follow building code, international as it may be, although [inaudible 01:45:02]

Unknown: I don't have any problems with international. I was wondering whether there was a docket.

Stoldal: And then there's the dollar figure. And then there's the requirement that probably goes back to the building code that Ely does have some very strong winters. I think somebody said harsh but [inaudible 01:45:20] strong. So those are some of the things that maybe this board doesn't take those things in consideration. Maybe it is the only responsibility is in the historic preservation area. We looked at that and then other because we would just be recommending that. I'm going to suggest two things. One, that we, in fact, we do move forward with this today and either vote to support SHPO or not to support. But I do think that we need to have a group of this board where staff get together and come up with the outlines of a process. So we don't have to start from scratch. We at least have some - this is what we're going to do if we're going to become the appeals board, so to speak, for SHPO. So those are my thoughts and I'm going to go to the online board. Are there any other questions or comments? I'll start with the person that has their hand raised. Michelle.

Schmitter: My question would be to Kirsten. How far - I mean, is the [inaudible 01:46:41] team looking at options based on SHPO's letter in November? Are they looking at other options? And maybe this isn't exactly the right time to vote on this if there's other options being explored.

Nalley: Kirsten Nalley for the record. We just recently received the letter, and the design team has just now received it. And they are just really early stages of processing. We've been having great conversations with the SHPO and receiving this letter has been a necessary next step in understanding where they stand on the conversations we've been having. So what I would say is, yes, we are moving forward now that we have this letter and their input. The design team is continuing to move forward and they will be trying to decide. We still have so much to figure out, we have so many questions to answer, and we need to incorporate this SHPO

recommendation as what we're looking for. So yeah. We do not have our final design decision in place yet by any means. So -

Stoldal: Stoldal for the record. When is your sort of - I was going to say drop-dead deadline, but I'll use another - when is your final, final that you have to have and who would you submit that? What's the next step in the process once you have made - this is it, we got all the input, here's our report. Where does that go?

Nalley: Right. So our next step will be to submit design development documents and that will be reviewed by the State Public Works Division, but SHPO is also going to be a part of that review. And so design development documents are kind of the equivalent of 50 percent set of documents, I would say. So that's the next step, but there's no reason that if we feel like we need to reach out to SHPO prior to that submittal, that we can't engage them in conversation as we move forward in design as well.

Stoldal: Myron, what's your sense of what the hard deadlines are either to the architect or to your office making a final decision and then [inaudible 01:49:24] again.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Well, when we started this process, we understood it was approximately a year-long process. So we started it. I believe the first meeting was in May, I want to say, and I have just been working closely with Public Works on the various meetings and the various stages of review. So as Kirsten points out, they're still working on incorporating some of this information. They got the letter on the 30th of November. Today is December the 8th. So I think it might be 4 or 6 weeks perhaps before we're at that point. I don't know, Kirsten. I know you don't like to guess at what these dates are, but at least things do take time. [Interposing]

Stoldal: I'm sorry. Go ahead, Kirsten.

Nalley: No, go ahead.

Stoldal: Well, there's also - and I want to get this [inaudible 01:50:27] to another line, but there's also a question about when SHPO should be brought into the process. It's my understanding they were brought into it at a far later date than they felt was appropriate and that they should be part of the process in the beginning. But that's not specifically [inaudible 01:50:46] taking us off on another tangent. So what's the board's feeling about how we should - unless there's other comments - I'm sorry, Sarah?

Cowie: Sarah Cowie for the record. I'd just like to circle back to Anthony Timmons' suggestion, which sounds like a good one to me at this point. Rather than

the board taking a stand on supporting option 1, 2, 3, 4, to make maybe a general recommendation that this and any other project really, we would support adhering to the building codes and the Secretary of Interior standards for rehabilitation and find a financially feasible option. And if all three can't be accomplished, maybe the project just shouldn't happen. I don't think anybody wants that necessarily but better leave the building alone than do something that would adversely affect the integrity of the building too much.

Stoldal: Any other comments from people online? Any members of the general public at this point? On the back of the board, and Dan Markoff [interposing]

Markoff: I got to agree with Anthony and Sarah. I think what we're being asked to do right here is get too far into the weeds of the architectural stuff. We should set the standard and let them comply with it.

Stoldal: But the standard already exists.

Markoff: Well, then we can [inaudible 01:52:18] affirm that standard [inaudible 01:52:20]

Stoldal: Myron?

Freedman: Mr. Chair. Myron Freedman for the record. I would just add in, as the board contemplates producing an advisory opinion here, that they are also the Board of Museums and History, that they have statutory obligation to oversee the fiduciary elements that arise from programs and fees charged for programs and the revenues that come from those programs. So I'm going to just offer that this building becomes a significant component of that program at that museum. And so how we are going about this is keeping that in mind for the future use of the building and, in fact, is one of the major reasons we need to embark on trying to renovate this building to the degree that we're going for.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 01:53:18] and this is the Commission on Cultural Centers and Historic Places. It has two functions, support and finance historic preservation of building but also there has to be a [inaudible 01:53:32] right back into the building. And that's part of what is going on [inaudible 01:53:37] Rebecca, [inaudible 01:53:40] question again. Use your words [inaudible 01:53:44] beginning. Do you anticipate with a crystal ball any other - that this is the first of what could be other requests over the coming months or the coming year of this board to support something that [inaudible 01:54:05] has done or not?

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Yes, I anticipate that there will be more of these coming forward as the state attempts to balance the needs of their historic infrastructure with the programming needs that they have for maintaining an efficient state government. I do envision this to be more common. And it's a good thing. These discussions need to be had in a transparent, open public process. If the decision is not to adhere to the Secretary of the Interior's standards, that decision should be made in an open public, transparent process so that the parties who make the decision know that what they're doing is inconsistent with the standards, but that's the path they've chosen. And that's what the public was asking for was that these decisions not be made in a black box or in a small meeting with just a few people, that they be made in a public forum so that these different needs can be balanced and the decision, whatever it might be, can be made so that the public can understand it in the future. Because there are decisions to be made here now that will forever alter the character of the historic buildings. And if that's the decision to be made, then there should be a record that there was consistent and thoughtful discussion, which has occurred here and I'm very, very grateful for that. What I can do to give you a sense of how many of these might be coming forward is I would be happy to provide, Sir, for the next board meeting a list of historic buildings for which we are in consultation under NRS 383.121 to give you a bigger, broader sense of the ability that the board has to be that open, transparent public process. And with that, I just have one statement to make, Sir, if you -

Stoldal: Please.

Palmer: We would be happy with an advisory opinion that the Secretary of the Interior standards for rehabilitation be incorporated into decisions made for the freight building.

Stoldal: Thank you. Further comments? Further questions? Then I'll leave it to the board. I'm going to suggest two things. Clearly, this board is going to be asked to play a role in this advisory. Again, that's what the statute says, but advisory is averse. It's not [inaudible 01:57:33] way that we don't apply. That we're going to need to come up with a bit of a process, and I will look back to what we have done [inaudible 01:57:43] with the Comstock Appeals Board, see what the record shows there, and then the advice of our attorney general, and then individually call members of the board. I'll act as the point person and get input as to what elements should be included in our process of being an advisory board. I don't want to say [inaudible 01:58:11] because I'm not sure that [inaudible 01:58:12] an advisory responsibility with SHPO. So we'll work on that between this meeting and next. We've already been alerted that SHPO will give us a list of potential buildings that they're working with currently and where there may be some opportunities for the board to be involved. That said, today



we have an action item and would look for a motion or other comments [inaudible 01:58:43]

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. Before we go to a motion, I would like to request to [inaudible 01:58:52] the Public Works and SHPO that they [inaudible 01:58:57] possible coordinate with each other before a presentation is made to this board, that pros and cons of both of their proposals be presented in a more distinct form than [inaudible 01:59:18] pages.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 01:59:22] I would think that that would be something that we would put in part of our process as we develop [interposing]

Petersen: [Inaudible 01:59:29] order on that, but I [interposing] I think there needs to be coordination between those two entities.

Stoldal: Or we ask for input on both of those entities. With that said, anybody have a motion they would like to put forward?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I'd like to make a motion that we prepare an advisory letter and please, if you can just make sure my language is correct on this, that we provide an advisory letter to State Public Works recommending that they use the Department of Interior Historical standards and incorporate them into this project.

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

Cowie: Second. Sarah Cowie.

Stoldal: We have a motion. We have a second from Sarah Cowie. Any further discussion of this board regarding the motion?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I just want to make sure with SHPO and with Public Works that I got the language right. I just want to make sure.

Stoldal: It looks like the answer is yes. The exact comma and period were there. We will make sure that that is, but we certainly understand. Any further questions or comments on the motion from the board? General public? Anybody else have any comments on this? Please.

Schmitter: Michelle Schmitter for the record. It's my understanding that because of the historic building that the Secretary of Interior standards need to be followed. So I think maybe the motion is to reinforce that they be followed because isn't that correct, Kirsten and Robin? I mean, we need -

Nalley: This is Kirsten Nalley for the record. I would reiterate there's a sense of wrestling with the standards that we have to wrestle with. I would say that, yes, the Secretary of Interior standards are important, but the building code is also important. And in order to get this project built, the state building official will have to sign up on the approach [inaudible 02:02:15] and the design for the project. And so while we do our best to navigate the building code and honor the historic portions of the building and honor the Secretary of Interior standards, there can be times where those things don't agree with each other. And so that is what we have to learn how to balance as we're approaching this building. So I want that to be understood by this board as well.

Stoldal: As either 1, 2, 3, or 4, do any of them meet building code?

Nalley: That's a great question. That's one of the questions we are working to understand at this point. We do know that 3 inches of continuous insulation on the exterior of the building will meet code. Beyond that, my design team has to help inform me on the other alternates.

Palmer: This is Rebecca Palmer. The preservation field is older. There are thousands of historic buildings in this country, and there are many options for meeting the Secretary of the Interior standards. The state of Nevada is not alone. There have been these exact same questions asked of other historic buildings as well. And all that we are asking is that alternatives that meet the standards be fully fleshed out and be fully explored in a manner in which we felt very strongly had not. So that's all we're asking. There are examples of historic buildings around the country in climates that are similar to that of Ely. There are solutions out there. All we ask is that the solutions be explored to the best possibility and that the state in its infinite wisdom does its best to be a steward of the historic infrastructure that we are tasked with occupying, preserving, and ensuring remains for future generations.

Stoldal: So I think it comes down to this, that if the decision by Public Works is to go with the outside, I certainly would like to know why they rejected the inside. Was it money or building code? What was the primary reason why they rejected because to me - and this is only as a visitor - to me, it's one of the special buildings in the state of Nevada because of all the history that is just inside that building and what it meant to that community and still means to that community. I get engulfed in it when I'm on the inside, not on the outside. And so I look at the building, get my selfie and then I go inside and I take 30 or 40 selfies with me standing and getting all that. So rightly or wrongly, for me, the inside has more value to me. That's my little [inaudible 02:06:51] That's how I think about this building. So if one side [inaudible 02:06:58] the 1 or 2 or 3 or 4, how that decision is reached. I think that this board, if it passed this resolution, passed this motion of

support, should include that. This board would like to know how the decision was reached. What was checked off that said this was the deciding factor. Jan?

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. Rebecca, could you have - like you said, there are thousands of drafty old wood buildings throughout the United States. I'm not asking for 30 or 40 examples of how this was mitigated because this was the standard construction procedure of that day, but could you come up with 3 to 5 examples of how this was mitigated in other buildings in similar climates?

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I would be happy to start that research. And that's the kind of open, transparent process that I'm looking for here. The solutions are out there, and they've been explored in other states. And the public has just asked that the state, in its exploration of balancing programming with historic infrastructure, look to the best examples for achieving that balance. And we, in reviewing this - and thank you, Kirsten, for all of your documentation on this - really felt that the options that would achieve consistency with the Secretary of the Interior standards for rehabilitation needed further exploration.

Stoldal: Alright. Further questions? Otherwise, we'll - comments? - we'll call for the question. [Inaudible 02:09:16] online? Doris Dwyer.

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer for the record. Sean, did you want to weigh in on this in any way?

Pitts: Sean Pitts for the record. Just an extraordinary amount of effort has gone in on the part of the architects. I appreciate their willingness to keep what we gave as the direction, which was at the end of the day, we need a brand-new 100-year-old building. And hats off to Kirsten. She's done a bang-up job with that. So has LGA Architects. We appreciate SHPO coming in on this. And at the end of the day, we need a modern building that's made from a historic building. And that's a difficult tightrope to walk, but I'm confident we can reach an answer that will make this workable on all sides. Thank you. Sean Pitts for the record, director of the Nevada State Railroad Museum in Ely.

Stoldal: Alright. Anthony, if you would restate your motion.

Timmons: I'm going to try. Anthony Timmons for the record. Just to make sure [inaudible 02:10:32] is okay with that. Thank you. Anthony Timmons for the record. My motion is to prepare an advisory letter recommending that the Department of the Interior historical standards are incorporated into the project. I think that was it.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. And of course, I think you should have a - I guess an intro that this board supports the restoration of the building. Something like that, but yes, you know, something to build on.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 02:11:10]

Timmons: I shall. Anthony Timmons for the record.

Unknown: And then maybe a specific reference to the [inaudible 02:11:20]

Unknown: Now he has to restate.

Unknown: And one more thing. Can you say rehabilitation of the building and not restoration? Because I believe this is a rehabilitation project.

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. This is the last motion [inaudible 02:11:41] Sorry, [inaudible 02:11:43] [Laughing]

Stoldal: See, we do have experts.

Timmons: Okay. So I missed that last one. Anthony Timmons for the record. So far I have Department of Interior historical standards shall be incorporated into East Ely freight building motion.

Unknown: Rehabilitation.

Timmons: Rehabilitation project?

Stoldal: Yeah, because it's not a restoration. It's a rehabilitation.

Unknown: Correct.

Timmons: I'm just gathering all my notes [interposing] Anthony Timmons for the record. So Anthony Timmons for the record. I will restate the motion, clarify the motion. I have - let me get my beginning here - a motion to draft a letter advising - and I have to give this to Myron. Motion to draft a letter advising that the Department of the Interior historical standard shall be incorporated into East Ely freight building rehab project.

Unknown: Where's the letter going to?

Stoldal: It's going to -

Timmons: State Board [inaudible 02:12:55]

Stoldal: It's going to Public Works and to Myron.

Unknown: The Board.

Unknown: Mr. Chairman?

Stoldal: Please.

Markoff: Dan Markoff [inaudible 02:13:06]

Stoldal: No, we're not quite yet [interposing]

Timmons: Let me - thank you. No, no, I appreciate it. Anthony Timmons for the record. I appreciate it. Okay. Anthony Timmons for the record. Restate the motion. Motion to draft a letter advising State Works and Myron?

Stoldal: Why not Myron?

DeLeon: [Inaudible 02:13:28] Daphne DeLeon. Is this not going to State Public Works?

Stoldal: Well, I think it's going to whoever is in the process for the next step. Remember this is an advisory. Not a we command, we demand. We don't have that power.

DeLeon: So another question [inaudible 02:13:48] Daphne DeLeon for the record. If this is advisory letter, why you using the word "shall"? That is not advising. That is requirement. You shall do this [inaudible 02:13:57] Just per discussion, just putting out [inaudible 02:14:01]

Timmons: [Inaudible 02:14:05]

Stoldal: The law says that it shall be, but I don't know. It's your motion.

Timmons: So Anthony Timmons for the record again. Motion to draft a letter advising State Public Works that the Department of the Interior historical standards be incorporated into the East Ely freight building rehab project.

Cowie: Sarah Cowie for the record. Second.

Stoldal: Alright, we have a motion. We have second. Is there further discussion by this board? Look to the people online. I'm seeing none. Is there any further discussion by those present here [inaudible 02:14:51] General public or anybody else involved in this meeting? I'm seeing and hearing none. All those in favor, say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carried unanimously with the chair voting with those present. So with that, [inaudible 02:15:23] thank everybody, Rebecca and Robin and certainly Kirsten and Harry and the entire group. Part of this is that we will come up with a little bit more of a formal process so we can make sure that some of the input comes in a formal way as we go forward. And then we look to the meeting in March and the information from Rebecca on the great things that are happening in the future with building in the state of Nevada. So I thank everybody and I appreciate everybody's work. And I think all intentions are headed in the right direction to make the freight barn something that the state of Nevada we can all be proud of and very usable [inaudible 02:16:22] Thank you, and with that, chair is going to take a break for - what time is it? It is now -

Unknown: [Inaudible 02:16:29]

Stoldal: Let's take a break until about 10:50. Let's take a break for about 15 minutes.

Unknown: You want the court recording paused?

Stoldal: Please [inaudible 02:16:42] pause recording. Thank you. I'd like to call the order [inaudible 02:16:50] Nevada Board of Museums and History for this December the 7th, 2022.

Unknown: 8th.

Stoldal: We're the 8th? Yes, we are. We're the 8th. Yesterday was the 7th [inaudible 02:17:03] We are still on agenda item 10, the State Historic Preservation Office. And item 10, see the Commission on Cultural Centers and Historic Places [inaudible 02:17:18] Rebecca Palmer?

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. At the request of the chair, my staff has provided a summary of the activities related to the Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation. We're happy to provide this and I would be happy to answer any questions that the board might have.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 02:17:51] there's a list. Rebecca, why don't you take - if you would, take about 10 or 15 seconds and I'm not sure that this entire [inaudible 02:18:04] has a sense of the Commission on Cultural Affairs and how it's splendid and its process. Actually, the chair of that is Bob Ostrovsky, but he did say he was going to be gone until 1:00 o'clock, so if you kind of act in his place to just give a sense of the history of the commission and what it does and how it works.

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I'd be happy to do so, Chair. The Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation is the successor to the Commission for Cultural Affairs, established in 1993, as a way to consolidate all of the multiple requests that the legislature received for rehabilitating historic buildings all around the state. Senator Raggio felt that one commission funded by general obligation bond funds would be the more appropriate sounding board for these numerous requests that came into the legislature every session. And since 1993, the commission has awarded - I want to say somewhere in the vicinity of 49 or maybe 50-plus million dollars in general obligation bond funds to historic buildings that can be used as cultural centers. And it's actually not historic buildings. It's cultural resources that could be used as cultural centers. So the definition of what's eligible for receiving funding is anything owned by private nonprofit or a local government. And there have been over 100 recipients of those general obligation bond funds. The connection that this board has with the Commission for Cultural Centers as historic preservation is two-fold. One, yourself, chair, mentioned that the chair of the board sits on the commission but also that my office is staffed for that commission. And we review these projects to ensure that they are consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's standards for rehabilitation. This current grant cycle has 4 million dollars that has been granted out. It is renewed every biennium in the executive budget. As staff to the commission, I had been asking for owners of historic properties, nonprofits, local governments, to send me cost estimates as what it would take if they chose to rehabilitate the historic buildings for use as cultural centers so that I can continue to prove a need for the sale of bonds. Under statute, the state can sell up to 6 million dollars in a biennium, 3 million each fiscal year. So in a nutshell, that's why I've provided these tables in that the chair sits on that commission. And the board has an interest in advising on issues related to historic preservation. And this grant program is somewhat unique in the states in that it provides such a substantial amount of funding for preservation of historic buildings.

Stoldal: Rebecca, [inaudible 02:22:36] quickly, if you would, outline who the other members are. They're automatically members of other boards and commissions in the state.

Palmer: Yes. The statute outlines who or who is appointed. There is one governor appointee with someone interested in tourism in the state. There's a representative from the State Literacy Board. There's a representative from the Nevada Arts Council. There's a representative from the Division of Museums and History. There's a representative from a tribal government. And there's a representative from the humanities under Ms. Barr [ph 02:23:42] So they represent a wide range of cultural organizations within the state and provide assistance to the grantees to develop programming to place into those cultural centers.

Stoldal: Rebecca, thank you. Questions? Please, Jan Petersen.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. Rebecca, earlier in your report, there is a comment about the El Rancho in [inaudible 02:24:22] Is there a long-term plan to rehabilitate that building? It's in terrible shape.

Palmer: For the record, this -

Petersen: [Inaudible 02:24:35] Jan Petersen for the record. I'm just wondering what plans are for that building because it's been [inaudible 02:24:44] at the present.

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Yes indeed, there is a plan for the rehabilitation of the El Rancho. They've made quite a substantive movement on ensuring that it is structurally sound. The Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation awarded funding for rehabilitation of the electrical in the building so that it can receive a certificate of occupancy.

Petersen: Thank you.

Stoldal: Further questions, comments? It's brilliant information wise for this board. [Inaudible 02:25:33] play a role statutorily. Rebecca -

Palmer: Chair, may I ask your indulgence for one more moment?

Stoldal: Go ahead.

Palmer: There is an opportunity for state historic buildings used as cultural centers to receive funding as well and have received funding, particularly Stewart has been a recipient. The Stewart Indian School has been a recipient of a great deal of funding from the CCA and its successor, the CCCHP. And I would suggest that if in the process of developing a rehabilitation plan for the freight building, that they could seek funding for that rehabilitation through the CCCHP.

Stoldal: I would point out that the Northern Nevada Railway Foundation has received - should I say millions of dollars? - from the CCCHP for what's going on in Ely as well as McGill. That's exceeded more than a million dollars, hasn't it, Rebecca?

Palmer: For the record, yes, it has. I don't have the numbers in front of me. On our website, where CCCHP has a page, all of the grant recipients are on the spreadsheet there. And you can see every dollar received since 1993 all the way through 2019.



Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I'm kind of going through the - I mean, I'm looking at the CCCHP 2021-22 request and then the page before it. It looks like it's very north-centric. I know we don't have quite as much history down in the south, but is there an initiative to try to get more folks to apply from the south?

Stoldal: Well, I'll jump in quickly. The city of Las Vegas does not appear to see this as an opportunity. They've had to return some funds with La Concha [ph 02:28:11] over some issue. But you're right. There has been very few over the millions of dollars that has been provided, very few applications from Southern Nevada, even though there are meetings [inaudible 02:28:31] in the grant process. Public meetings are held explaining this and letters have gone out to various groups, but the enthusiasm that one finds along [inaudible 02:28:48] But maybe that will change. Rebecca, do you want to add some more to that?

Palmer: Yes. The commission is required to prepare a 10-year plan under statute. And we are in the process of developing the 10-year plan, and in doing so, we reached out to every county in the state. We had a meeting in all 17. So there were opportunities for the public to express their interest in the program and what they felt might be appropriate recipients in the future. So we did make efforts to reach out to all the counties and tribal governments who had historic buildings that could be used as cultural centers. It has been somewhat successful with tribal governments in that we now have several inquiries about historic buildings on tribal land that could be cultural centers. So we've made an effort to reach out, but the chair is quite correct in that the enthusiasm in Southern Nevada isn't what it is for the rurals and Northern Nevada.

Stoldal: Further questions? Comments? Rebecca, thank you very much. We will now move on to agenda item 11, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, and we see the director of that department. Brenda Scolari is with us. I think you saw - there she is. Welcome. An update and review of the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs regarding the museum system [inaudible 02:30:49] just in general. Welcome.

Scolari: Good morning. Thank you, Chair Stoldal. Good morning, everybody. For the record, Brenda Scolari, director of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. Just want to review some of the action in terms of the Division of Museums through the department. As most of you know, we hired Samantha Szesciorka - excuse me - in the spring, and she's been doing content marketing for the cultural agencies for the Division of Museums and for the Nevada Arts Council since. Just this quarter, we hired Francine Burge who will be handling public affairs, media outreach, and general public relations needs for the Division of Museums. Francine is on the call and though

she's feeling under the weather today, I'm going to ask her to just quickly show her face and say hello to everybody.

Burge: Leave my camera on? Hi. For the record, Francine Burge with the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. I'm excited to be working with everyone. I've done the tours and met all the directors, so excited to get working on some plans. So thank you very much for having me on.

Scolari: Thank you, Fran. Well, I hope everyone is feeling further supported by this dedicated marketing and PR team that the department is providing. What I'd like to suggest and have recommended to them is that they start to report to the board on a quarterly basis all of their, you know, kind of the highlights of their work in between. So that would be any ad placements, any earned media placements, kind of the nature of the creative and the messaging that's going out. A report very similar to that that the Travel Nevada marketing team presents to the Tourism Commission. And I defer to the board in regard to how the team will interact with the marketing subcommittee. Seth, I know you have that subcommittee in place. I don't want to circumvent any of the work being done there. So further discussions to be had in terms of how we interact. I'm open to any suggestions in that area. But we do want to start reporting on performance as well, determine some metrics to track in terms of what is working, what isn't working, what's being expended, what's to come, that sort of thing. Any questions?

Stoldal: [Inaudible 02:33:53] thoughts.

Timmons: On the entire report? I'm sorry. Anthony Timmons for the record. On the entire report or just that segment? Because I do have a question for you, Director Scolari, but not related to that topic.,

Scolari: Oh, just in terms of these new marketing and PR positions.

Stoldal: I think that the quarterly report would be great and more discussion with Seth and how we could link those two. We will work on that and take care of that [inaudible 02:34:19]

Schorr: Yeah. Seth for the record. I wouldn't say [inaudible 02:34:22] accelerate and help.

Scolari: Okay. Wonderful. Perhaps what we'll do is I will get in touch with you, Seth, offline, and we can communicate about next steps.

Schorr: Thank you.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman?

Stoldal: Yes, please.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. Director Scolari, I'd like to work with your marketing folks as well on some membership ideas. I'm the chair of the membership committee. So developing the membership materials, the membership cards, the design, that sort of thing. I would love to partner with you on that as well, please.

Scolari: Right, of course. I welcome that.

Timmons: Thank you.

Scolari: To move on to some of the other items I'll report on were in the final stages of budget preparation for the legislature. So we began working with the governor's finance office and the Legislative Counsel Bureau in August. We now await the governor's recommended budget and, of course, we're at a point where we have a transition of administration, so we'll see if there are any revisions to that recommended budget. We do have some legislation proposed by the Division of Museums and History for the [inaudible 02:35:44] session. That is in regard to the retention of vendor fees related to state lands assigned to the division. Currently, those fees revert to general fund. And the intention of the statute revision would be to retain those fees in the division budget, which I think everyone would agree makes a great deal of sense.

Stoldal: I think it makes a great deal of sense with the one exception. The board has not seen the legislation and clearly it's a little bit more detailed than just simply the money from things like [inaudible 02:36:29] goes back to the museum. Does it go back into the private funds? Does it go back into the museum's specific museum? So whether or not the board itself endorses this piece of legislation, we have no idea what it says. It sounds nice, but I think the board would like to really see what the legislation says before when the board is asked to appear and support it or is questioned by a legislator, what do you think? When did this board see the legislation?

Scolari: For the record, Brenda Scolari. Myron, do you want to jump in in regard to that? We can certainly provide what we provided to LCB in regard to the statute revision.

Freedman: Myron Freedman, for the record. Happy to do that. Bob, I did send you the [inaudible 02:37:31] language before when you asked for it. As far as I know, unless Tiffany and the GFO [ph 02:37:37] added anything - Daphne, do you know if anything was altered on that [inaudible 02:37:43] can you just briefly explain what it's supposed to accomplish?

DeLeon: Yes. Daphne DeLeon [inaudible 02:37:50] It's a little bit more detailed than what [inaudible 02:37:53] provided. So it provides the ability for the division to retain.

Unknown: We can't hear you.

DeLeon: Oh, sorry.

Unknown: I see Harry kind of leaning forward.

DeLeon: So the [inaudible 02:38:06] that adjusts NRS and allows the division to retain a certain portion of the lease fees that are coming from a lease that we are executing with state lands, and it allows us to balance forward a certain amount of those proposed lease fees and also to use a certain amount of those lease fees into categories to support the Boulder City Museum.

Stoldal: So they don't apply at all to Carson City?

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. Let me clarify that. There is a portion that also would go to support Carson City [inaudible 02:38:48] Museum. But the bulk goes to Boulder City.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 02:38:51] doesn't want to go to a private fund?

DeLeon: No.

Stoldal: So that the board is taken out of a loop of setting charges for the rent and use of state equipment.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. This [inaudible 02:39:09] was commenced on the fact that state lands and the division had decided to go forth with a lease [inaudible 02:39:18] for rail explorers. Waiting for the attorney general's opinion regarding the authority of the board versus state lands to manage this relationship.

Stoldal: Board would certainly like to see the legislative [inaudible 02:39:37] proposed. So I would simply request, but I don't think we need a motion, just administrative [inaudible 02:39:43] a copy of that to the board since it directly impacts a specific piece [inaudible 02:39:52] up until state lands stepped in, this board was in charge of the incidental, the rental and the lease of state equipment and state property. State lands stepped in and said no, no, no, and the board asked for attorney general's opinion to clarify that. [Inaudible 02:40:12] looking at a piece of legislation to go around that. This board needs to be involved in that. And whether or not

this board, either as a group or as a motion, that wants to support this legislation or not, I think we need to understand what this legislation - please.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon [ph 02:40:35] for the record. I just want to put it out there that although Rail Explorers is the current vendor, the proposed lease would be for any [inaudible 02:40:44] vendor. I don't want to give appearance that we are favoring one company over other while the bid is currently out there. [Inaudible 02:40:51] vendor to be determined through [inaudible 02:40:54]

Stoldal: Right. But also the language could also impact this board's responsibility as far as the NRS.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman?

Stoldal: Please.

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. Has there been a number assigned to the BDR?

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. I will check on that.

Timmons: Thank you.

DeLeon: So Daphne DeLeon for the record. What we [inaudible 02:41:23] I believe there is a number assigned to the BDR, so it is on the legislative website. So we will find it and send you the number and the link so then you can look at the BDR language as submitted.

Timmons: Perfect.

Stoldal: So, Brenda, [inaudible 02:41:50] get back to your - is any other legislation that is being proposed that would impact the museum board or the museum system?

Scolari: For the record, Brenda Scolari. We will be tracking any legislation authored by others and can certainly update the board as we find it or as that leaves committee and becomes viable. We'll keep you updated on those matters.

Stoldal: I'm thinking specifically of the Northern Nevada Railway. This board sort of got in halfway into the process and [inaudible 02:42:29] meeting to vote on a motion to reject the proposal that was before the state legislature. [Inaudible 02:42:43] if that legislation comes up, this board needs to know

more in advance so we can take action and potentially have a special meeting to deal with that topic.

Scolari: For the record, Brenda Scolari. Absolutely. I think we're all in agreement there and we just have to have a flow of communication about that.

Stoldal: You said for the history of this board, it used to have its own [inaudible 02:43:09] We paid that person \$60,000 a year. That was back in [inaudible 02:43:18] So back to you, Brenda.

Scolari: Chair Stoldal, I do have to jump off at 11:30. I have to prep for the Tourism Commission coming up today. And I do want to note that the Tourism Commission always falls on the 8th day of the last month of the quarter, so any time the museum's board is on the same day, it kind of limits my participation considerably. We did talk about Museum Advocacy Day, so thus far scheduled on March 10, which it sounds like aligns well with the board meeting. We do have a contract with Tiffany East to help us with not only the logistics of the day and what we might be doing in the legislature itself but creating any messaging, getting appointments with legislators, etcetera. So please communicate with me if you plan on not only being present on the day but would like to do any communication with lawmakers separately. We'd love to just keep all of that coordinated and keep us all on message in that regard.

Stoldal: Brenda, what was that - the regular meetings are when?

Scolari: The Tourism Commission are always on the 8th at 1:00, so March, June, September, and December.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. And I apologize, Brenda, because you know I've missed the last one which was on the 8th of September, and I had to have the substitute [inaudible 02:45:12] and then also today we will have a substitute [inaudible 02:45:15]

Stoldal: The other challenge, according to the Nevada revised statutes and chair, the Museum and History Board is also a member of the Nevada Commission on Tourism. Not as a voting member. The only thing that they chair - this board representative on the Nevada Commission on Tourism. Really is two functions. It gets to vote on who the director is when that comes up, if it ever comes up again. And secondly, we respond to any of those things that are deal with the history of the state of Nevada and provides a voice on the Commission on Tourism. Again, a lot of voting with the one exception, but it does provide a voice. So I would look. This board will not have a representative at today's meeting. So as we go forward, we would look at not have them on that 8th day. So we've got

one coming up and so - Brenda, anything else that you want to add before you have to leave?

Scolari: That's all I have. Can take some more questions if there are any posed.

Stoldal: Please.

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. Just a quick question. I wonder if you could provide an update on how the bond sale went. I noticed there was a bond sale related to Museums and History and Cultural Affairs.

Scolari: Correct, there was, Board Member Timmons. Administrator Freedman, you'd have more information on that bond sale and any upcoming.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. The bond sale was held a year ago.

Timmons: There's one like a month or two ago?

Freedman: Not related to the Museum and History that I'm aware.

Timmons: Okay.

Stoldal: That was [inaudible 02:47:23] decisions that were made, I think, regarding the bonds that were sold but how the money's going to be split up [inaudible 02:47:30]

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. DCNR, Conservation and Natural Resources, and I'm not sure I saw this in an announcement of any kind. Just in my communication with the administrator that they were planning to request [inaudible 02:47:53] the remaining funding for museums. I was going to talk about this in a bit, but let's do it now. So we welcome that. With those funds, we would be able to complete the construction of the Boulder City project. My understanding is that they will make that recommendation to the governor's budget. However, the treasurer will have to decide on the bond capacity for the state. And so they'll have to make choices based on that, and so we're kind of waiting to see how that might limit what they are willing to do. And I'm not sure what time we're going to learn about all of that. So if that goes forward the way we hope it does, the remaining funding we would receive to build the Boulder City Museum would be there. There would also be some additional funding. And this has always been part of AB84. And we would use that around the museum system as necessary.

Stoldal: Thank you. Brenda, thank you. I know you got to run, so thank you for your help.

- Scolari: Thank you all. Have a good day.
- Stoldal: Let's move on to [inaudible 02:49:14] We're up to agenda item 12, administrative report. There's [inaudible 02:49:21] museum opening and see the [inaudible 02:49:29] quarterly report and then the - actually, there's several items. [Inaudible 02:49:34] go ahead with the - I'd like you to take the ball and move forward.
- Freedman: So just on an overview basis, and I just reported on the Boulder City project, but in general, as Brenda was alluding to and as Daphne can fill in more information, the last few months really since August have been very focused on responding to the administration [inaudible 02:50:05] budget. And up until really a couple of days ago, we were still responding to questions from the GFO budget [inaudible 02:50:14] And so we're looking forward to seeing how that all shapes out into the governor's recommended budget. Daphne, do you have anything to add to that regarding the budget-building process we've been going through?
- DeLeon: So Daphne DeLeon for the record. Really not much. Only that as Brenda [inaudible 02:50:35] change in administration. There might be some adjustments to the process and we're hoping that the governor's recommended budget is released to the public as it usually is in January [inaudible 02:50:50] Thank you.
- Stoldal: Although reports are in the media that the state is flushed with cash, so hopefully it won't all get sucked up by the time it gets to us.
- Freedman: Two major CIP projects at the moment and I appreciate that Christopher McMahon, the director of the Boulder City Museum, has brought in the renderings for the expansion plans for the new museum at the Boulder City site, which includes the facility, the platforms, the plaza, the parking, and the grounds around that, and also exhibit planning. That process is, again, like the freight building, about 50 percent there and then about 40 percent there or maybe around 50 percent is exhibit planning process for the interior of the building. You heard quite a bit about the Ely freight building where it is in renovation and their process. For those two [inaudible 02:52:03] we meet regularly on these. At least once a week there's some meeting happening for one of these projects and things to review. For Boulder City, we held a stakeholder meeting in October. Chairman Stoldal was there. We also used that opportunity to meet with the city of Henderson. This has to do with the right-away on the tracks that go over the bridge into Henderson. Christopher McMahon can add more detail on this as he probably will during his report. And we really appreciate the fact that the city of Henderson, like the city of Boulder City and the Chamber of Commerce and everything, they're all looking for ways to help us connect this activity to their community. So we look



forward to that. In Henderson, it becomes a little bit complicated just having to do with where the residents are living and how the community is growing up next to the track. We'll have some limitations there. I don't know. Christopher, do you want to add something about that effort?

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. To mirror what Administrator Freedman said about the willingness of both communities, they see the value on this project, both in the expansion of the museums to a fully developed museum campus site. I followed the expansion of what we can offer for train rides further into the seat of Henderson. Both communities were supportive. Both are willing to find ways. Obviously there's some consideration with the city of Henderson on how minimizing disturbance to residents and other museum site. We appreciate that as well. We want to be beneficial to the community, not something that's look on with disdain. So we continue to work with Henderson and we're very optimistic that a deal will be reached in the coming year.

Stoldal: Any questions? [Inaudible 02:54:00] and there's been lots of meetings and with the city. The project originally was called a Visitor Center and Museum. The energy is focused on the museum in the most modern sense of that but would also have a facility where there would be museum store. There would be the ticket counter for the [inaudible 02:54:31] and that would all be in the building that they built. What's going to happen between now and our next meeting regarding this building? It would be nice to have a formal presentation where we stand between now and March.

Freedman: Well, Myron Freedman for the record. So that's a question I will take to Kirsten Nalley - Nalley is gone now - just to kind of pinpoint when they want to have the next review. We think it will be in January. And there have been some things that have developed with the project like a water tower and solar panels [inaudible 02:55:15] system. And so we've been juggling how far to go with these things, and what we're waiting for now is to see what kind of cost is associated with them before we can really go any further with that.

Stoldal: And maybe show the original plan which has these beautiful massive lawns and trees and shrubberies and all that, and now that slightly changed with the - please, go ahead.

Freedman: Continuing. Myron Freedman for the record. And Jill, I see you're listening in. Is there anything you want to say in 30 seconds about our project in Boulder City?

Lagan: No. I'm just really grateful for all the effort and thank you so much for all the work that's being done in contribution to this. It is a true collaboration

and we are all very much looking forward to the absolute benefit and asset this will be to Southern Nevada. It's a regional tourism project and very important for us to also protect and support history. And so this is a great collaboration for all of us. Thank you so much.

Stoldal: Let me just quickly jump in. This building would not have taken place if it's not been the hard work of Jill and the folks in Boulder City. This legislation got pushed very hard with their support. Jill and her team in Boulder City is on top of this on a daily basis. So formally, Jill, thank you very much.

Lagan: Thank you. It's been a great team effort and like I said, it's going to be a true asset, so a passion project. I'm really looking forward to that ribbon cutting. So thanks, guys.

Freedman: And for the record, that was Jill Lagan. She's the executive director of the Boulder City Chamber of Commerce.

Lagan: Thank you. I forgot the for the record part.

Freedman: Another activity that Director McMahon and I have been working on quite a bit is closing out the month-to-month arrangement with the railbike vendor. They will be off the property at the end of this month. We are in the process as we can report it earlier of working with state lands on the lease process, which has to do with use of the land by the railbike vendor. And so we look forward to seeing proposals and we understand that the current vendor will put in a proposal as well, and they're certainly familiar with the site and everything. So we look forward to reviewing the proposal as well. But at the end of this month, they will close out their operation there.

Stoldal: The request for proposal, I presume, does not include a museum store?

Freedman: No.

Stoldal: There's no store that the rail vendor would put in?

Freedman: Mr. Chair, this is Myron Freedman for the record. I think there's a conversation to be had about all of the various possibilities for revenue generation and whether the board wants to allow things like commissary or gift shop. That would be entirely up to the board. And we can look at what is coming back from the proposals to see what they want to do and then look at how that might be incorporated into either the lease with revenues going to the trust fund or something separate altogether.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 02:59:02] that state lands does not oversee the stores or do they feel that that's another concession that they're in charge of?

Freedman: No, Sir. Myron Freedman for the record. State lands is focused on getting lease revenues for use of the land that the activity is happening on. However, we know because of the nature of these vendors, there are going to be other things they're looking for. And there will be an opportunity to fold all of that into one lease, identifying where the revenues will end up or not allowing certain things. And that's really going to be a process of analyzing the [inaudible 02:59:45] once they come in, the proposals.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. As currently listed on the announcement, it's for the lease of the railway and certain land on site that they would use for their operation. There's no other considerations [inaudible 03:00:05]

Stoldal: But as Myron says, it doesn't stop them from saying, hey [inaudible 03:00:10]

McMahon: Correct, and at that time, we would come to the board and allow you to make a decision based on your prerogatives of what you would or would not [inaudible 03:00:19]

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. We will be reviewing all of this with the board so you can see the complete picture of what's being proposed by these companies.

Stoldal: I guess to the board [inaudible 03:00:30] There is going to be a significant store within this new building and the revenues and money from that should go to the museum, not to a third party. Third parties involved, I'll scrape the top off and the museum stores will get less than they should. But we'll see what the [inaudible 03:00:51] proposal is.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Perhaps later after the meeting's adjourned, we could take a closer look at the renderings and talk a little bit about what the possibilities are. I wanted to also report on the bus reimbursement program. This is a wonderful program. Unfortunately, it's been severely impacted by Covid, by lack of bus drivers. The school can't find bus drivers so there's been very little use of it. So I got in contact with the director of the Nevada Department of Education, and he was enthusiastic about helping us, about being able to help us promote this message to the superintendents. We put together information package and thanks to our new team, Samantha and Francine, they helped us with this and got that out. We're not seeing a big uptick still, and so we know that this lack of bus drivers is a huge problem [interposing]

Unknown: Yeah. I have the same problem, yeah.

Freedman: But this will come up in the legislative session, I'm sure. They will ask us about it. They'll say, why aren't these funds spent? So that's the problem there. So we've been continuing to focus on hiring. This has been a huge effort lately, working with the department director Scolari to approve recruitments, get them through HR. They were coming very fast and curious. And even some of these recruitments that have gone forward remain dynamic because we will have somebody take a job and then not stay in the job. And that's happened on a number of occasions. It's a little disheartening. But here's [interposing]

Stoldal: Why is that? What did they find? Want to be somewhere else or better conditions or what?

Freedman: I think it's a little bit of everything. I know with the Division of Museums and History, we've been down one of our administrative assistant positions for a long time now. We did finally hire somebody. We enjoyed her services for about, I don't know, 4-1/2 hours, something like that. And they had to come in because they need to show continuation of service, but then they went back to their old job. They just didn't think that their work in the office was going to suit them, I guess is the nice way to put that. But let me give you a brief rundown of what's happening in all the museums in terms of staffing. The Nevada State Museum in Carson City finally added the custodian position. We hired a custodian position. Seth Johnson's [ph 03:03:28] been in place since September. This week they're interviewing for the exhibits manager position, which has been vacant for a long time. And they have two candidates interviewing for the curator of information position. So that's great news for them and they're moving ahead. They're also currently recruiting for a part-time security officer. This is significant because once in place, they can go from their 5-day-a-week schedule to a 6-day-a-week schedule. So they're planning to do that in January once they have this new part-time person in place. At the Historical Society, Tiffany Jones [ph 03:04:09] was added as the store manager and administrative assistant, so we're very, very excited about that. They're currently recruiting for their curator of education. And they are planning to extend their hours in January as a result of this new staff coming on. So they'll be going Wednesday through Saturday, 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. with public hours. And you would not need an appointment anymore to come in and see the museum or the store. And then the research library will be open by appointment only, but they're extending the number of days, Thursday through Saturday. In the Lost City, there's Tracey Sprague. Maybe Tracey Sprague, you want to do a quick update on your hiring? On your newspaper system search? [Inaudible 03:04:55]

Sprague: So the position was opened a few weeks ago, and I just closed it on Tuesday. So hopefully we'll [inaudible 03:05:03] in the near future. And

then we did submit to have the curator of exhibits position posted but it has yet to be posted.

Freedman: And then [inaudible 03:05:17] Thursday through Monday.

Sprague: Wednesday [interposing] Sunday.

Freedman: Excuse me. Wednesday through Sunday. Thursday through Monday, that's the Railroad Museum. In Ely, they do have a temporary custodian now. So they have essentially a four-person team. The custodian is working part-time there, helping to keep the trash cans dumped and all that sort of thing. And they, of course, continue to operate as they always have. They're open Monday through Saturday and they have hours on Sunday as well. And then Boulder City -

Unknown: We currently posted the opening for railroad restoration specialist too. That posting went out last week. It's a 30-day posting. There are two applicants and I'm hoping to get several more so we can have an individual to take charge of the maintenance and future restoration projects at the museum.

Stoldal: Stoldal for the record. [Inaudible 03:06:16] applicants, not a broad-based opportunity. Is that true or there's a lot of people that can take another what they're doing and adapt to this?

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. I think it's going to be more narrow because of the way the job description is written. We need the railroad focus and it does require skills in diesel engine repair, woodwork, and metalwork. So just the nature of the skills that are required [inaudible 03:06:48] very narrowly focused what type of applicants we get. But we did put it out to railroad groups, railroad communities, both online per social media. We posted it on our museum social media feed. So we're getting the word out the best we can. And we do have two applicants, so that is at least positive we are getting applicants. So I'm optimistic.

Stoldal: And the future of the facility is it has significant growth, so it's a real opportunity to be on the ground floor.

McMahon: Yes, Sir.

Freedman: Here is Las Vegas at the State Museum - Myron Freedman for the record - finally we have a maintenance worker on board now. This is a position Hollis has been trying to hire since she started essentially. And she had a couple of near misses as it were, but now we have somebody starting on Monday. [Inaudible 03:07:38] starts on Monday. He has some important skills that are going to help them with their facility systems. And then she's

recruiting for the facility's manager. This will be the third time we're trying to find the facility's manager. And she submitted for a natural history curator, [inaudible 03:07:58] the curator of education. You'll recall Sarah Hulme took that job for a while, but she has then gone on to be the curator of education for the Neon Museum. And the Las Vegas Museum is operating in accordance with the spring's preserve schedule, so they're on a Thursday through Monday schedule. Finally, the Carson City Railroad Museum, they had a resignation recently of their groundskeeper, Jason Stultz, so there's a position that will critically need to fill as soon as they can, but they've also just hired two museum attendants, Noah Hansen and Ryan Coursen [ph 03:08:40] These are part-time positions. They will help with the visitor experience there. So we've made some real progress. We've got ways to go, and as you recall, I think people that have short memories about the pandemic and the impact it had, but I feel very positive about the progress we've made. I'm getting these museums back on their feet.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 03:09:06] halfway there staff-wise?

Freedman: I think we're better than halfway.

Stoldal: Okay.

Freedman: There is some positions that we would like to see reinstated at some point that went away a decade ago, not more. So I think we will turn our attention to that. However, we are looking to expand staff like the Boulder City Museum. These are actually new positions. So the priority right now is to align our goals with the expansion of the museum so that we are ready when that building is ready.

Stoldal: But we have a new administration, so maybe they'll want to do something for it. Well, I hope.

Freedman: That's a question in our minds, Chair. Myron Freedman for the record. We're looking forward to meeting the new governor and his staff and transition team to see if we can educate them as to what we're all about here.

Stoldal: Well, there's a list of the transition team that was put out in the press, so take a look at that list and see if you know anybody and put a good word in.

Freedman: Oh, one more item for the record is the NAGPRA report [inaudible 03:10:22] Anna Camp is with us. She's an anthropology curator at the Nevada State Museum. Not the anthropology curator but an anthropology

curator. More importantly, you are the NAGPRA curator, so Anna, would you please update them on the repatriations?

Stoldal: This is agenda item 12. See the board's request for a quarterly [inaudible 03:10:48] report. Please, go ahead.

Camp: Good morning, everyone. Anna Camp for the record. And I call myself the tribal liaison NAGPRA coordinator. Dr. Hattori is the curator of anthropology, just for the record. I have a report I'm going to read. I also want to mention thank you to Sarah Cowie for bringing this up last time, but there's some sensitive content in this document, so please be aware of that. The Nevada State Museum Carson City anthropology staff is working deliberately and conscientiously towards repatriating all NSM curated Native American ancestral remains. We repatriated six state-controlled individuals since the last board meeting. Rochanne Downs, UNR NAGPRA coordinator, project manager, assisted the Lovelock Paiute tribe and NSM with the repatriation at our Indian Hills [inaudible 03:11:44] Center. We also repatriated fragments of previously repatriated Native American ancestral remains received from California universities to several Nevada tribes. These fragments represent small samples removed from remains formerly curated at NSM and studied by geneticists and a radiocarbon physicist prior to the passage of NAGPRA. We assume a lead role in these repatriations due to our former involvement with these scientists, our existing NAGPRA relations with the tribes, and our knowledge of the NAGPRA process in Nevada. I am currently in NAGPRA consultations with the Lovelock Paiute tribe, Walker River Paiute tribe, Fallon Paiute Shoshone tribe, and the Washoe tribe. We are presently assisting the Nevada Historical Society, who is diligently combing the records to ensure accuracy of data for human remains from NHS collections reported in the 1998 NAGPRA inventory. NHS's NAGPRA efforts include determining location of discovery, attribution to archaeological sites, and the history of those collections. We still await word on our BLM assistance agreement that if funded, will be directed towards the repatriation of 137 ancestral remains controlled by the BLM and curated by NSM. We will be assisting them with their repatriations. Our proposal also includes funds to improve curation of all human remains and funerary objects. I devoted a significant portion of my time maintaining and improving relations and communications with tribes, resulting in mutual beneficial relationships, extending beyond NAGPRA. I met with the new Fallon Shoshone Paiute [inaudible 03:13:40], the Tribal Historic Preservation officer, Lela Shepherd [ph 03:13:44], to discuss future repatriations. During that meeting, she requested our assistance with tribal archaeological monitor training for upcoming culturally sensitive projects. We are also presently working with the Pyramid Lake Paiute tribe for archaeological monitor training to be held in the spring. NSM staff met with Naval Air Station Fallon Cultural Resources and NAGPRA staff to discuss

repatriation of three individuals from NASF [ph 03:14:12] lands and arranged a consultation meeting at NSM. I also met with Rochanne Downs regarding the background on NSM and UNR's NAGPRA efforts. I arranged and participated in a meeting with Rochanne Downs and Madeline Van der Voort, BLM state archaeologist, to discuss BLM-controlled NAGPRA remains and cultural objects curated at UNR. NSM anthropology staff also assists several cultural resource management companies, UNR, and state and federal agencies with various NAGPRA-related requests. These requests are ongoing and a frequent part of NSM's NAGPRA efforts. We are confident that we are moving forward as quickly and respectfully as possible with our NAGPRA activities and effort. We thank all the individuals, the tribes and agencies, that assisted and guided us along the way. Thank you.

Stoldal: Thank you. Any questions from the board? Sarah.

Cowie: Sarah Cowie for the record. I just want to say thanks to Anna Camp for the report and how impressed I am, how much work you've done since the last board meeting. And in so many different areas and it's especially great to hear that you're getting some movement with BLM, even though they have control of a lot of individuals, to be able to work and help them move forward. It sounds like you're moving forward in a lot of areas and I really appreciate your efforts to do it in a sensitive and respectful way. And I know that you're really good at that. So thank you. Yeah, this is really great to hear. I do have just one question, if it's possible to get a written report each quarter. I think just to help us understand what's going on but also there's a perception in the public that, oh, why doesn't this go faster and why aren't people doing enough or whatever. And I think the public would really be helped out to be able to see. My only concern about that is if there's sensitive things, if there's certain pieces that tribes would not want shared or not have the specific shared. You probably have a better sense of that than I would, but I would just put it out there that a written report would also be very helpful each quarter.

Camp: Anna for the record. Thank you, Sarah. I don't know that I make that call, but I am sure that everybody, all my supervisors would agree with you. I do have this written out and am happy to share. And I know that Myron wanted that available for the public at request.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 03:17:08] and is now public. I don't think there's going to be any problem in having - send a board a copy of what you prepared. Did you hear me?

Camp: Kind of. I apologize. Anna Camp for the record.



Freedman: I have a statement for the record. Anna, I will make your letter available to [inaudible 03:17:28]

Stoldal: Great. Thank you.

Camp: Thank you, Myron.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 03:17:33] It's a letter. Maybe it can just be a little bit more of a report at the next one. And this clearly was a report but the letter can be more than just a letter to the board [inaudible 03:17:47]

Freedman: Sir, can you elaborate just a little bit in terms - are you looking for statistics? Is that -

Stoldal: No. Just that if this is going to say Dear Nevada Board of Museums and History and [inaudible 03:17:59] it could be more of a formal document. Beyond that, I think it's fine. And just echo what Sarah said. Thank you for all the work and it is work, but it sounds like you also feel good about the progress you're making with [inaudible 03:18:21] Thank you for all that. Myron, is any more on that?

Freedman: No, Chair. Myron Freedman for the record.

Stoldal: Alright. Then let's move on to item 12, which is the administrative report, and this is the loan agreement between California and Nevada for the [inaudible 03:18:42] museum in California regarding 17 [inaudible 03:18:48] The documents themselves really kind of speak for themselves. The history of it was that there was a loan agreement that was sent to California but that loan agreement did not have the approval of a board. And so a new loan agreement was prepared, this board approved it, the museum signed it, the director of the museum signed it, the board chair signed it, Myron signed it, and it was sent to California. And the concern was, okay, where is it? Did it just go into the - did they approve the loan agreement or are they still relying on the original one, which is updated? And if you look at the dates that are on the agreement, I think the dates are October 11th. Is that correct, Myron?

Freedman: [Inaudible] signed. Myron Freedman for the record. The signature shows October the 11th.

Stoldal: California signed it, and so they [inaudible 03:19:59] the curator there. So now they have accepted that agreement. We receive any communication from them regarding the confusion or the question?

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. I'm going to kick this to Dan Thielen, director of the Railroad Museum.

Thielen: Good morning. Dan Thielen for the record. No, there was no confusion, no question.

Stoldal: This is a pretty big deal for them. I didn't bring it, but it's a cover story on their full-cover magazine and California Museum [inaudible 03:20:35] Museum in California has a full story of the trains that we are loaning them for the next 15, 16 months. But it's a great story. They're very happy to have both of those trains, specifically car 17. But Dan, I don't know if you've seen that magazine that they put out.

Thielen: Yeah, we have a copy here. Thank you for bringing that up. You're correct. It's a great thing. They are making sure that the word gets out that these items belong to the state of Nevada and you can see more like it over the hill.

Stoldal: So that was it. Just really see that [inaudible 03:21:17] had signed off on the new agreement. So unless there's any other questions regarding that, Dan, or any more information, Myron, we -

Freedman: Just that I love the coat of paint they put on car 17. I think it looks fantastic. It never looked better.

Stoldal: Yeah and the little dots, I think, were really -

Unknown: Did you see the paint?

Thielen: I'm throwing up blood right now. Thanks. [Laughing]

Stoldal: The agreement said they can't do anything other than dust it to make sure it's [inaudible 03:21:52] Thanks. Then let's move on to E, which is the status of the online museum board. [Inaudible 03:22:03] The museum board manual was given to every new member and then when a new policy was - it's a hard copy - and when a new policy was developed, each board member would get a copy of that and would put it into their board. Because of Covid and really this is something that the museum staff really helped the board with, it wasn't in the top of the list but as things change and as we're getting staff back, we need to move it up to the top of the list. And Myron, I had some conversations about whether it's a hard copy or [inaudible 03:22:44] online, which is easier to update and change. And also the board packet is available to the general public. A lot of material in the board packet [inaudible 03:22:55] The board packet consists of Nevada revised [inaudible 03:22:59] and the administrator responsibility, open meeting law and so forth. But it also has a list of each of the board members, their term of office and their qualifications, plus all the board policies, a contact list for all the board members. So there's several things

that are in there and potentially from an ego standpoint, if you want to update your photograph rather than the one from high school. So Myron, how can we move this forward?

Freedman: Thank you, Chair. Myron Freedman for the record. I will work on a process to run by you on a step-by-step, how we go through each section. Obviously, the policies, but there's other pieces in there that need to be updated, as you're pointing out. I think Daphne and I will work - I mean, one of our focus right now is to hire that second administrative assistant, which is really critical to helping us get all of the preparation done for the board. That position actually we will detail to be - a large part of that job will be board support. So that's an important piece. Like I said, I think we want to methodically go through the manual and see what we want to update, agree on it, make sure it's what we want, and then I think we have a lot of help now on the posting side of things, on the digitizing and posting side of things through some of the employees that Brenda's brought on. So we get a lot of support there now, and that's why you see a lot of social media activity going on, a lot of content being posted. They will help us get all of that done as well.

Stoldal: So I will ask the board members to - if you would individually send me what you think should be in the board [inaudible 03:24:55] what you think would be helpful. Again, the things that are in there in the past were our board policies and procedures, who's a member of the board, why they were selected, their term of office. Nevada [inaudible 03:25:10] one central place, and it really came up as we're going through and updating our board policy is there's no place for existing board members to see what the existing policy is and what needs to be updated. So there was more paperwork that had to be done to make sure here's the existing policy, here's the update and yes, that's [inaudible 03:25:34] copy in email. But if that information had already been available on a website, you can simply go on there, write it over, and say, oh, this is from 1942, it no longer works. So it came up. So I'd like to move aggressively as we can. And as the board agrees, we want to - and this is just a discussion matter - we want a hard copy and/or the online site, all we really need.

Unknown: I would say - this is [inaudible 03:26:09] for the record. I would say could it be by request by the board members that's available as a hard copy if needed?

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. I got the PDF of an agenda here that I'm scrolling through, so - and the PDF works fine for me. Whatever works for the board.

Stoldal: Alright. But then again, I want to contact each one of you to see what you think needs are. And think about too, one is a board member but also as

something a new board member would have and to help them dive through where we are. So expect a call or an email or text from me. And then Myron, I will get together and we'll work out [inaudible 03:27:01] That was an action item, but I think that we can handle that [inaudible 03:27:12] Next is item 13, board policies, but if it's alright with everybody, I think we'll take a lunch break and [inaudible 03:27:25] The time is now 12:12. It's a perfect time for a new break, so we'll take the 12:12. Let's come back at 12:30 and you bring your lunch with you. Will you please stop the recording?

Freedman: Sorry. Myron -

Stoldal: [Inaudible 03:27:48] Nevada [inaudible 03:27:49] Museum and History for December the 8th, 2022. We are at agenda item 13, which is board policy, history of the board. As a general rule, we review the board policies at the end of the year as well as our spring meeting in March on those policies that have a fiscal year relationship. We have made changes at other times in the year, certainly during Covid and other things when adjustment is needed or required. And we also look at our December meeting as a time to - we propose additional board policies and procedures. And most of the board's policies and procedures cascade down from the Nevada revised statutes. So during the Covid period, we slipped a little bit, again, with staffing and other elements. We were not updating our board policies as often as we should. So I'm working with Harry Ward. We developed what he called a point person process. Actually, Harry [inaudible 03:29:23] and that is where individual board members are assigned a particular board policy to stay on top of and to present the updates or changes to that policy. And the way that they are able to do that is at least 90 days before the board meeting, they can contact each board member individually and say, what are your thoughts on policy A, B, and C, or policy A, actually, because they don't do A, B, and C at one time. Policy A, and that person then said [inaudible 03:30:02] change this. They then call the next person. The only thing they can't do is say to person B, person A said this, what do you think of what person A said? They have to do it in silo. Otherwise, we would [inaudible 03:30:20] When that point person puts all that stuff together, then we get to discuss it at a public meeting like this. As I stated, the responsibility, the board policies are based on Nevada revised statutes and in some ways what other board museums oversee. We have specific responsibilities under the Nevada revised statutes, but we also have - at the very beginning it says that anything that's not mentioned here, we serve as an advisory capacity. And, of course, the key to an advisory capacity is to be part of the information process. We can't advise unless we have information. So what we're going to go over today is the policies that are existing policies and if there's any updates. There may not be any update, but we do need to review them. For example, we look at our investment policy every year. And over the years, we have made some

changes. That policy is based on largely information from Morgan Stanley, and so we will deal with the investment policies and how we handle the private funds tomorrow morning. Those are two separate policies. One is the policy on how we handle private funds in Eureka, Nevada. And by statute, there's really some detailed things that we have to do and we're able to do. It's really a unique piece of legislation that allows the museum and this board some freedom. For example, we don't have to go out and ask three different people for if we want to spend private fund. The museum's administrator can come and say, here's the one we think that is best and we can do that. But we'll take a look at all those elements [inaudible 03:32:24] how we handle private funds as far as the administration and allocation, but then how we invest that, and that will come tomorrow. The first one we have - any questions? Any thoughts or comments? But a lot of members of this committee have been working hard over the last few months, specifically with board policy but also coming up with a procedure. The first one is 13A. This is simply an update of the existing board policies and procedures on museum store, and Jan Petersen is the chair of the standing committee. [Inaudible 03:33:03] Every chair of standing committee automatically became the point person for that piece of board policy. With all that, Jan, it's yours.

Petersen: Alright. Jan Petersen for the record. This was mostly kept as was. We had input from Doris Dwyer and Sarah Cowie. And the primary thing that was revised on this was the prohibitions that is in stores will refrain from selling artifacts or antiquities. They will adhere to relevant state, federal, and international laws pertaining to the sale of items and, equally importantly, will consult Native American tribes as appropriate for ethical considerations. And that was the major thing that was readjusted and revised on this. Does anybody have any questions, comments [inaudible 03:34:09]?

Dwyer: This is Doris Dwyer for the record. Okay. So this was adopted in September. Since then, has anything come up relating to the proposed online store that would need to be added to this? In your opinion as the chair, do you think this covers everything pertaining to the online store proposal?

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. Somewhere in here it says -

Dwyer: Well, there's a reference to it right in the beginning.

Petersen: Right in the beginning.

Dwyer: And that's the only reference to it. But this is covered. Any anticipated issues that might arise just online but not in a brick and mortar?

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. We believe that this will cover that online proposal as well. It's pretty much a blanket covering everything. It can be readjusted, but for the present, this is the proposed.

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer for the record. Since that committee is very active right now, I just wondered if anything would come up that might supersede or needs to be specifically [interposing] It's looks fine to me, but you're the chair, so -

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. We tried to not be micromanaging specific to it and to cover a broad spectrum of what's anticipated. Of course, things always come up, but for the present, we believe that that is functional and accurate.

Stoldal: Would you like to make a motion?

Petersen: I make a motion that the board policy as presented, September 8th of 2022, be approved as presented, please.

Stoldal: I think this is updated from September 8th.

Petersen: Slightly updated.

Stoldal: So this is the updated version.

Petersen: This is the updated version.

Stoldal: That's being presented today.

Petersen: As being presented today.

Dwyer: Doris Dyer. I'll second the motion.

Stoldal: Further discussion? Anybody online? I see Sarah had to go, but Sarah was involved in this [interposing]

Petersen: Oh, she's there. There she is.

Stoldal: Sarah, thank you for the input as well as everybody. We have a motion. We have a second. General public? And all those in favor, please say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carries unanimously with the chair voting with those present. And this is 12/8/2022 adopted. The next item is -

Unknown: Yeah, it looks like the official [inaudible 03:37:31] for the system. Somebody might be having trouble. But I don't know where it's ringing. It sounds like [interposing]

Stoldal: I don't think that was the phone. That's from the general public [interposing] Let's move on to item 13B, draft of the museum deaccessioning policy. This is a new policy. We do not have an existing policy. We have a reference in state law, but we don't have a policy. Michelle? Please lead us through this.

Schmitter: Michelle Schmitter for the record. So the beginning of this policy - since it's a new policy, we obviously took a look at the deaccessioning session policy of the museums. And they generally appear to follow the same verbiage. We grabbed what was relevant. As you may remember, at a recent board meeting - I can't remember the date - we received a list of items that were to be [inaudible 03:38:45] for each museum. So this kind of outlines that process. It mirrors the policy of the museum and mentions the one thing that we might want to speak to, which we say in item 5C, if the [inaudible 03:39:05] session item is sold, then the proceeds will be held in trust. And then we reference that policy. And I don't know, based on what you said, Bob, if we need to get into more information about how we spend the private funds or reference that policy more in this document. And the other thing we wanted to make clear on this policy that it does not apply to materials covered by NAGPRA. I know Myron had some comments that it would be great if you could share, since this is a new policy.

Stoldal: Myron, please.

Freedman: Thank you, Chair. Thank you, Michelle. Myron Freedman for the record. There is a bit to unpack here from the standpoint of the museum. So let me see if I can contextualize this from our point of view. The board's role with respect to the functions of the division makes policy for the investment, budget [inaudible 03:40:20] the division's private [inaudible 03:40:24] trust fund. No other matters. The board serves in an advisory capacity. On the question of [inaudible 03:40:35], the board is involved when the museum is departing that object from the control of the museum. And then it is in museum policy to review that for board approval. So I'm interested in understanding better why the repetition of the [inaudible 03:41:00] that's already been handled by the museum is repeated in the board process outside of the objects that are essentially going to be [inaudible 03:41:15] and sold.

Stoldal: Well, I would think that it is essential that the State Museum Board have a policy on [inaudible 03:41:39] I cannot imagine a museum board not having a policy on [inaudible 03:41:46] So rather than created out of whole

cloth, it looks like Michelle has reviewed the existing policy and matched that with the law that created 1008 that is, limited in its wording, is quite frankly expansive in its meaning. And over the years, preceding Peter and emphasized by Peter Barton, that this board had a distinct and significant responsibility in [inaudible 03:42:37] And so it's those three things. One is this board should have a policy on [inaudible 03:42:46] If there was any issues that was in Michelle's review of the existing museum system policy - and I would assume that even though only two that I'm aware of, two of museum board operating policies are on the line out of the six or seven museums that we have - I would assume that each museum [inaudible 03:43:18] policy is identical. And since that's an assumption, the feeling is that we need to have an overview policy for all the state museums on a [inaudible 03:43:32] process. This is based on ones that are available to the general public and to this board. And so really, for those three reasons. One, this board should have a [inaudible 03:43:46] policy. Statutorily, there's an advisory as well as a specific under 381.008. And for those reasons, I would support this, even though there may be and hopefully is some mirroring of the existing museum policy, which I assume was based off of a Best Practices Act of the American Association of Museums. So that's why I think the board needs [inaudible 03:44:23].

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. What I would recommend is to establish a working group with the museums' curators, directors, your committee members or your point person to see what makes sense to put into your policy because 381.008, the [inaudible 03:44:53] of the statute is "sale of duplicates, surplus, and inappropriate items, use of proceeds." So the focus on that makes complete sense. The [inaudible 03:45:08] policies are not uniform. They're not because they have been revised at different points in time. Not recently but back in the day. So one thing that we would undertake with this working group is to work with the collection managers to make sure that there was uniformity in the museum's policies. And then as you reference the policy, they can go ahead with their work of [inaudible 03:45:41] and then make the report to the board, as is in the most current policies. And then, of course, when it comes down to the sale of items, the board's role becomes pretty acute.

Stoldal: I'd like to suggest a different path, Myron. I don't want to wait another 6 months, another year. This board needs a [inaudible 03:46:02] policy, and if there are issues with this, the study group that you're talking about, the director, they can get together over the next 3 months and [inaudible 03:46:11] back and say item 1D doesn't fit or whatever, but this board needs a working policy on procedures on [inaudible 03:46:24] I can't imagine that even though they're not - it surprised me that the museums are not all the same. But I would suspect in spirit they are, Myron. Wouldn't you think that they're all roughly kind of the same, that they have to have a procedure. You can't just say, get rid of this item.



Freedman: There's definitely a procedure, Chair. Myron Freedman for the record. Definitely procedures for all of them. It's just that some of them predate the point where they add into the policy review by the board. And if I was to hazard a guess on that, because I wasn't here back then, that was at the time when museums were seeking accreditation. And accreditation is very strong about having approval by boards. However, the vast majority of museums that are accredited and part of the AAM are private museums or not state museums. And so the relationship that we have with this board doesn't quite fit what all of these other private museums have on their boards. Because we have the governor as our official oversight for our operation. And the board is called out, as I read earlier, for the fiduciary matters, and in this case, the sale of artifacts that are being [inaudible 03:47:51] So my only point is - and Chair, I think having a director's meeting and within the next 3 months, you know, work on updating the policies, is a good idea. But I think repeating that policy in the board policy doesn't sound very efficient to me. If the museums are already going through that process with the staff to report out to the board on the [inaudible 03:48:19], what is the necessity of repeating that whole process in the board policy?

Unknown: And I have a little [inaudible 03:48:29] deal with all of this. A lot of the things that -

Unknown: Dan, I can't hear you.

Unknown: A lot of the things that get [inaudible 03:48:38] came to the museum system through donations. And as a donation, that is a private function to the public institution and something we should have a little oversight on, just like private funds. Of course, the way things are right now, the way we [inaudible 03:49:02] on the sale of that thing. And the money we get [inaudible 03:49:07] comes in through us. So to complete the circle, we should be involved in the [inaudible 03:49:13] process as well. The private [inaudible 03:49:18] being donated to institutions [inaudible 03:49:22] different than money being given to us and then in the sale of it, the money comes back to us. So it leaves [inaudible 03:49:29] of responsibility to the board. The other thing is that there have been times that I'm aware of when museums have gotten rid of things and there were other institutions that wanted them. And the museum system is not aware of that. So amongst the board members here, we have a lot of contacts [inaudible 03:50:00] and we may have heard somebody that wanted something. And we can bring to the attention of the board, so things could be distributed to those who may want it as well. It's just another [inaudible 03:50:18] points of contact, more or less, through what we know. The fact that it's redundant with what the museums are doing shouldn't be a concern because a lot of the things we do are redundant. [Laughing] This

ain't the first time. So I don't see any [inaudible 03:50:47] in that. I know it's just a check on everything that we don't lose something that's valuable [inaudible 03:50:53] museum system.

Stoldal: I mean, I'm very supportive of this policy. The [inaudible 03:51:02] policy, I think, in the museums that we're able to review, that Michelle was able to review, are in some cases 2 or 3 pages long. This calls it down to the specific things that the board appeals are necessary. There may be as the museum would take this and expand some of these steps, that they want to have an internal process that's a little bit more detailed than this. And so I would support this motion today [inaudible 03:51:42] the idea that it goes without saying that all the policies of the board need to be updated. We have a policy that we update them every year, at least every year if not more often. Things change, so if there's something in this policy that the museum [inaudible 03:52:02] feels is draconian or just off line or it could be better stated, bring it back and we will look at it. But any questions online? Michelle, please.

Schmitter: Michelle Schmitter for the record. I appreciated what Dan just said because I was processing that when I was going through this about wanting more information about who was contacted in the family. I mean, this is really important, certainly when I've been raising funds for organization. You have the name [inaudible 03:52:42]. You have to go through this whole process. It should be the same with the [inaudible 03:52:47] So who was contacted when? What was the relationship with the donor? I was thinking about putting that down to have on the spreadsheet, but if we have the curator there going through it with us, I think we can ask questions. But I think that is really important [inaudible 03:53:06] that Dan brought out. So we might want to think about that or just leave it as stated, and we can always ask at the meeting. But that is important because people - you get rid of things and there is a family is just not one donor. So that's it. Thank you.

Stoldal: Also, I just remembered that what Peter said - and I think it was part of a board meeting, I'm sure it was - that he said that this was not only a protector of the artifacts and the donator, it protected the museum staff if those [inaudible 03:53:44] were made public and were not - I was going to use a terrible phrase - but in the backroom, that this protected the museum directors and the staff [inaudible 03:53:56]

Timmons: Mr. Chairman? Anthony Timmons for the record. May I recommend an [inaudible 03:54:03]?

Stoldal: Sure.

Timmons: Number 5B says if uncontactable for any reason or if the donor refuses to return, offer the material to related public institution as appropriate. Can we also add private?

Stoldal: Michelle, what's your thought on that?

Schmitter: I think that's great. I'd have to defer to Myron. I mean, the state museums do offer other things to the private museums, correct?

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Some of the directors here can chime in on the fact that they do reach out. Once the board has reviewed and approved the [inaudible 03:54:54] - that's what they do, they bring them to the board, the list of [inaudible 03:54:57] and in some cases then, there are decisions to be made about the next step, which is to find another museum to donate them to. Typically, that's the way. Those are another institution that somehow has a relationship with the history. That would be a step. The very last thing that would happen other than nobody wanting it and it being disposed of would be to have the board approve it being sold and then manage the proceeds from that sale. That is in place now with the museum policies. Let me invite some of the directors if they have anything to add to this topic. [Interposing]

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. One of my concerns with the policy as currently written is what it's going to do to staff, the amount of time staff would have to spend on this. For example, Boulder City, we have several thousand photographs in our collection that we're trying to digitize. If we follow this policy past written, when we go to dispose the original because they're now digital, we would have to document every single photo, what that photo of. That's going to consume a huge amount of staff time and it's going to consume your time as well. So I'd just like to bring that to your attention of how much time is going to be consumed if we follow this as currently written.

Stoldal: What's your current policy?

McMahon: I'm sorry?

Stoldal: What's the current policy?

McMahon: The current policy would be to list those items out for you and just state that these are photographs, these are the donors that did it, we are moving to dispose the original because they were digitized [inaudible 03:56:50] This policy states we would have to list out every single one, provide a description, copy [inaudible 03:56:57], everything that [inaudible 03:56:58] huge quantities [interposing]

Stoldal: Where is that [inaudible 03:57:01]

McMahon: Go up to item number 1. It says the curator recommending the [inaudible 03:57:12] must provide an information packet, a detailed object, description of the object or objects under consideration, catalog records, copies of [inaudible 03:57:21], photographs of the objects. No one's disputing the fact that the board should have a say in this. I'm just - from a management standpoint, that's going to consume a huge amount of staff time for things like photograph [inaudible 03:57:40]

Stoldal: [Inaudible 03:57:41]

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. So how many do you have that you are digitizing? Hundreds? Thousands?

McMahon: Thousands.

Petersen: Were they primarily - Jan. Did I say who I was? Anyway, were they given and why? Several like somebody gave four boxes from one family.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. What generally happens is it's a private individual who spent their life documenting and photographing railroads around the area. And upon their death, their collection went to tech museum as part of a will or a gift upon their death. And so we have thousands of photographs to work through. We can't keep photographs from early years just hanging around if we have the ability to create space. And so we're working on digitizing them so they're preserved permanently. But what do you do with those originals once they're done? You know, if the goal is to make space because Boulder City space is a [inaudible 03:58:55] as it is with the rest of the museums, and I know several other institutions are working towards digitization as well. Maybe Catherine can speak more to that. This is a concern I see, at least with it as written, and I want to be clear I have no problem with oversight or -

Stoldal: Let me suggest to you that with digitalization process, and you know this better than I do, the digitalization process is not simply copying the photograph. You have to describe what the photograph is. And this is [inaudible 03:59:27] 742, photograph of what. That data is easily transferred onto a record that could be presented to the board. You don't have to redo. There's already a record that's being created for the digitalization and I can't imagine that the board is going to ask you to present a thousand different photographs. I think it's -

Unknown: One collection as a whole. [Interposing]

Stoldal: You're already creating a record.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. As this policy is currently written, though, that is what is required.

Stoldal: Well, [inaudible 04:00:00] of the objects [interposing]

McMahon: [Inaudible 04:00:01] provide a copy of the photograph [inaudible 04:00:04] description, and even though there may be a record of it, that still requires staff time to go search out that information, print it out. I mean, you guys are going to get packets that are thousands of pages long because that's the case.

Stoldal: Well, I -

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. Why couldn't you say "Collection of John Doe's 30 Years' Worth of Photos"? We don't need an itemized list.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. That's the exact point I'm making is there's things in here. This is why museum is asking for a committee to look at this is because I think part of this policy doesn't take into some of the staff consideration and what that would ultimately entail as far as both staff time and time and effort [interposing]

Petersen: Yeah, I agree. This is a bit too much.

Stoldal: But I still don't understand. A, you are creating a detailed description.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. Even though that description is there, we would have to go through identifying each individual one, make a report for the board following this policy [interposing]

Petersen: Up to 30 years.

McMahon: Yeah. So you're talking, even if we're going quickly, that's 5 to 10 minutes per thing, and we're talking thousands and thousands of pieces.

Schmitter: Michelle Schmitter for the record. Are these images accession? And so there is a record, so I'm confused. And with like say a scrapbook or photograph collection, they should be grouped together somehow and we would just be looking for the number that's the largest number assigned to each of these. I don't know how you guys accession your photographs, but maybe we just need to get into this a little bit further, but like Bob's saying, I don't understand. If it's already in the system, you can run an Excel spreadsheet out, correct?

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. Boulder City does not have any collection management software. Everything we have is manual or done in a spreadsheet. We don't have collection management software, so for us, this would be extremely burdensome.

Gillespie: Can I speak here?

Stoldal: Please.

Gillespie: Hollis Gillespie for the record. I would like to step back from the Boulder City example just a little bit and offer maybe a slightly different perspective in what the draft policy brought to mind for me. I think I may be the only museum director here present today that has been the museum director several - well, maybe Myron, we're probably about equal in number of museums we've headed, and this is the second state museum I've been a director of. I've also been for 20 years an AMM accreditation evaluator, so I've been in the seat of looking for what are the best practices? Do they meet them? And so I think I was struck by - the role of the board as described in this is really a duplication of what is expected of a museum professional and their knowledge. So if they have the familiarity and knowledge of the item and whether it fits in the mission, the lion's share of work in making a [inaudible 04:03:40] decision happens at the museum level with oversight and input probably in our situation where we're structured with our administrator. We don't expect that our boards are museum professionals, so it's up to the director to have the knowledge base to make the presentation to the board on why it doesn't fit. And then the policy would then [inaudible 04:04:07] If we do [inaudible 04:04:09], what is the line of where it goes next? Does it go to another accredited museum? Does it go to a private institution or does it get sold, in which case the board is statutorily - I'm not sure that's a word, but anyway, they're responsible for making sure that that financial aspect is done properly. So I kind of looked at this and this looked like a duplication of what museum directors do all the time. And it seems to me that the museum director - it's their responsibility to make that case and make it easier for the board, which are not museum professionals, to say yes, I agree that this doesn't fit and we agree with what you choose to do with it.

Stoldal: Well, I'm going to disagree with a little bit of that. I mean, first of all, the fact that [inaudible 04:05:02] that only the staff, the museum or professionals are the only ones capable of understanding this process or the need or can read and write as far as what the donator wanted or what the process is, I don't buy that. Secondly, if this is simply a duplication of what's already the best policy, even though we've been told that museums each have their own different policy, this standardizes what's expected [inaudible 04:05:31] The board has the full authority to say this is what the policy is. Policy is not set by staff. Staff's input is essential to any policy,

but policy is set by the board. And there is no existing detailed policy of [inaudible 04:05:54] by the board. There are different policy that each of the museums and the effort, I think, by Michelle, where she read all of the existing policy, took out a lot of the language that really just fits within the museum's administration and just those things that would be important for a board to understand why is this particular piece of artifact, why do you recommend it being [inaudible 04:06:25] and the things that the board would expect the director or the administrator to tell the board. That's all this is. This doesn't slow the process down. This just provides a process where the board can quickly move through and look at that and live up to its responsibility. Hollis, there's a lot of people around this board that have very specific credentials that apply directly to the museum system from architectural historian to anthropologist, so the idea of [inaudible 04:07:09] is not something that this commission doesn't understand. And I know you meant that in a positive way, and I don't mean to sound negative. But if there's no other comments, thoughts - Myron.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Just for the benefit of the board, to repeat my opening points, which is that the board's powers and duties are limited to fiduciary and then comes advisory, that the only statute relating to [inaudible 04:07:42] is the sale of duplicates, surplus and inappropriate items and the use of the proceeds from those sales. And as I mentioned before, the museums have in their policy to have [inaudible 04:07:55] that list reviewed and approved by the board. So to the extent that the policy goes beyond the sale of duplicates, use of proceeds gets into territory that is not statutorily required.

Stoldal: And that's [inaudible 04:08:15]

Freedman: Dan Thielen.

Thielen: Dan Thielen for the record. I just want to address the execution of one experience we had here with [inaudible 04:08:30], some items that came in. I think we didn't have a historian on hand and things get donated that people don't deliberate on. And it ended up being almost the sweepings of a desk drawer from the last master mechanic on the [inaudible 04:08:49] And in these were matchbooks and soap stuff and a bar of soap was in it and there were stuff you'd find in a desk, you know, packs and paper clips and all the rest that this well-intentioned person had [inaudible 04:09:10] So they were now part of the permanent collection. And we followed our approved [inaudible 04:09:18] policy which is in our collection's management book. And as part of that, we brought it to the board to have these items [inaudible 04:09:29] and it took nearly a year before the board would finally approve getting rid of these items. That should have never been [inaudible 04:09:39] And some of those discussions on it, frankly, worried our historian because members of the board wanted to put a

couple of these items in their personal collection because, you know, they were kind of cool, but we tried to find a place for everything for it to fit, but it didn't belong in our collection. And that became a very frustrating year for the historian here to finally get approval to throw some stuff in the dumpster.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 04:10:14] Was this something you went through?

Thielen: That was - I think it finally got approved when I was the director here.

Stoldal: Because I don't remember that taking a year.

Thielen: It went through several boards. Board meetings.

Stoldal: As personal courtesy to me, if you would give me the dates that that took place because that's not how I remember the situation.

Thielen: Okay. I'll get it.

Stoldal: With that said, this - we've been told now three or four times - is duplicate, and I think quite frankly would speed up the process that you just described. The board now has the process. Before, it doesn't sound like there was a process. This process won't take a year if the director or the administrator comes through and follows [inaudible 04:11:12], it will be taken care of at one meeting. So this will speed up the process, not slow it down. And I will say without getting off onto another tunnel, the word here is [inaudible 04:11:27] You take the "de" out of it and it only deals with accession material. And it turns out that there's a lot of material within museum that have not been accessioned. They are now considered state property, and according to what we have learned, the museums could do whatever they want with it. So again, the word is "accession" material and not property. Coming up later on, you're going to see an item, if you haven't seen it already, where I think it's the state museum in Carson City. It was given five golden coin and to be sold, I guess. But those have not been accessioned, I presume. If they've been accessioned, then there would be a deaccession process, but it sounds like they're just going to be property and therefore the museum can do whatever they want with it. So this only deals with accession material, not everything else that the historic items at the museum [inaudible 04:12:31] So this is tightening up the board's role that already exists within museum administration, the directors of individual museum policy. Michelle, anything else?

Schmitter: No, but I appreciate everyone's comments and we certainly know that the directors and the curators are the professionals. I mean, that's why we have a specific role in this process and you each have a specific role too.



So we're not trying to jump into the middle of that. We're just trying to make sure we follow what need to do. Right, Bob?

Stoldal: Right. And did you want to make a motion?

Schmitter: I don't want to because I wrote it. So somebody else could.

Unknown: Mr. Chair [inaudible 04:13:25]

Unknown: Yeah, he's got his hand up.

Unknown: I just want to give a brief horror story about somebody who knew something about a subject and threw something away that was extremely historical and valuable. Forty years ago at the law library here in town, I was going through there one day and I noticed a box sitting on the floor. And I asked the head librarian, what are you doing with this? And he said, we're throwing it away. And I said, can I have it? And the librarian said, you certainly can. Now this is a person who was trained in not only the law but in what books are valuable [inaudible 04:14:14] Those books that I saved were the original United States Supreme Court reports, starting back in 1803, and they were tossing them out. So all I'm saying is it's good to have a second set of eyes look at something sometimes because it just may save something that's very valuable that nobody else recognized.

Unknown: I know similar stories.

Stoldal: Alright. We had a good discussion. Anybody would like to make a motion to accept?

Unknown: Move to accept.

Stoldal: We have second?

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer. I second the motion to accept the [inaudible 04:15:04]

Stoldal: We have a motion and we have a second per the discussion by this board. Anybody online? General public? [Inaudible 04:15:21] All those in favor, please say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed.

Timmons: Nay.

Stoldal: Motion carries with the board chair voting in favor. And please note for the record, Anthony Timmons, a no vote. Great. Thank you all and we look forward to details, anything that the staff can come back with to make this a more efficient and a better policy. We have a meeting coming up in just 90 days.

Unknown: [Inaudible 04:16:00] if it doesn't work, you can always change it.

Stoldal: Moving on. We have the draft artifact loan policy. Courtney Mooney.

Mooney: Courtney Mooney for the record. So I used at the request of [inaudible 04:16:35] Myron and [inaudible 04:16:37] State Museum of Las Vegas collection management policy and procedures as a model for the revisions to chapter 5, which is the loan policies and procedures. And I'm just going to walk through and briefly summarize the recommended changes. So there was one paragraph from the first section [inaudible 04:17:05] of museum overview that establishes the board's role in reviewing the policies, but there wasn't anything specific that says that the board needs to review the policy annually. And then skipping to chapter 5, the outgoing loan policy, 5.1, it talks about under the NRS, the Board of Museums and History has the sole discretion regarding loaning museum artifacts through locations in or outside of the state. So following up on that, the museum obviously receives loan requests from other institutions, and they will not lend artifacts or specimens to individuals, business or commercial enterprises, staff members, trustees, or members of the news media. Exceptions can be made with the approval of the director or appropriate curator and then reported to the Board of Museums and History for review at the next available meeting of the board. So a lot of this is just essentially adding some things to the regularly reported items. The other thing was that the museum reserves the right to refuse any loan that is not deemed appropriate or if there's a concern that there will not be accepted professional standards of care. And so there was an addition here that says that questions regarding legitimacy of loan request may, if necessary, be brought to the board for review. Considerations for outgoing loan approval include but are not limited to approval of the museum director, administrator, and the Board of Museums and History. Skipping forward to 5.2, outgoing loan procedures. The appropriate curator presents any outgoing loan requests during the weekly collections meeting and that is already part of the policy. And this would also include all requests and final decisions as part of the regular quarterly report to the board. Skipping down to 5.3, the incoming loan policy. All incoming loans shall be reported to the board for review as part of the regular quarterly report. And then the 5.5 procedure for return loans, there's [inaudible 04:19:23] number 7. The museum director will present to the board a report that the items that were loaned have been returned. And all parts of the agreement have [inaudible 04:19:32] So I think essentially it is - again,

I may be the example that was discussed earlier of the person who doesn't know a lot about museum procedures, so I'm open to all comments where this may be extremely time consuming and onerous. I'm hoping that some of this is just another line on the quarterly reports.  
[Inaudible 04:20:05]

Stoldal: Anthony?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman. Anthony Timmons for the record. I have two questions. First one is for Director McMahon. He makes reference to PastPerfect. I don't think you said you had that, right?

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. Boulder City does not have  
[inaudible 04:20:21]

Timmons: Okay. That was my first question. Again, Anthony Timmons for the record. Second of all, there's an NRS code that's specifically referenced as part of this, 381.0063. I just want to know if [inaudible 04:20:35] had an opportunity to make sure that this policy is in alignment with that NRS code.

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. No, I did not, but I will look at it.

Timmons: Thank you.

Unknown: Can you repeat the NRS you just mentioned?

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. NRS 381.0063.

Stoldal: Having looked at that, it does use the phrase "the board has the sole discretion", which I thought was a unique term. When I Googled that or did a word search for the rest of the Nevada revised statute, I did [inaudible 04:21:22] another place where it said "sole discretion." So whoever wrote it and approved it, they clearly had an emphasis to use that phrase. Again, this is to provide some clarity for both the board and the staff on the process. And there's nothing draconian here, but it clearly outlines what needs to be done before we loan some very important piece of equipment to California Railroad Museum. The board finally approved that, but that was a significant exchange and the board was not involved with the language of the loan agreement. And the loan agreement, as written, was California 30 days before expired. Let's say we want it for 2 more years, and then 30 days before that expired, they could have it for another 2 more years. And almost saying that all they had to do to keep it forever was let us know 30 days before. That kind of language - it needed to be cleaned up and that language is still in there. But California simply now

has to make a formal request that they would like to keep it for 2 more years. Not saying anybody would say no, but it's just they can't [inaudible 04:22:59] be the ones that make that decision. So out of that came the fact that the board needed a specific policy that staff could have and follow. So are there other questions, other comments? Myron.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. And again, for the benefit of the board, to consider a few things here. First of all, you mentioned clarification, Chair. So the approval process for approving loans [inaudible 04:23:42] going out of the state, piece of paper, whatever, would come before the board?

Stoldal: As the board as sole discretion, the answer is yes.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. So one thing to analyze a little bit if not greatly is that that NRS 381.0063 is the NRS that guides the powers and duties of the museum director. And there is a whole page of duties that fall under the museum director. And this is one item in there. And I thought what was helpful about it was the language that Courtney used when she said exceptions can be made because I was trying to think why was this line inserted again to the statute when all of these other things are under the power? Why would they put that single line in? And I think it is an oversight reason if there were exceptions being made. And that made sense to me. Exceptions for [inaudible 04:25:04] loans to individuals, to business or commercial enterprises, to other staff members, to trustees or members of the news media. You would certainly want oversight for those kinds of loans going out. They're not the typical. But regarding all of the other typical loans, again, those powers are listed under museum director. The museums have their policies for handling that. And there's even a museum policy where an artifact that would value over \$100,000 must be reviewed by the board. So there were already some checks and balances in there. Granted, what happened with the Railroad Museum seems to have [inaudible 04:25:51] that step. But nevertheless, I do think, again, there are policies in place, there is statute in place, and I think it doesn't require this additional board policy to make it work.

Stoldal: How do you read the last line?

Freedman: The last line of the statute? No, I don't know. I take your [inaudible 04:26:18] sole discretion of the board.

Stoldal: So if it's the sole discretion of the board, then we need a policy. We need something that can guide us rather than, as Dan alluded to, if there were some issues there that took a year, that doesn't seem responsible. These guidelines and policies are not just for the staff. These are for the board [inaudible 04:26:43] This is how we get from A to B. We don't have A to B. We have this sole discretion of the board but then nothing after that. This

simply codifies to some degree how the board has to ask, how we should respond to these things. And so this is just being looked at as something weighted on the staff. It's also weighted on the board. We have to look and review these things and read them and understand them. Christopher.

McMahon: And for the record. Sir, you're saying that these are for the board's consideration. I think the concern that we have is that the previous policy and this one, the staff was not consulted. And there's huge staffing implications for both these policies, and all we're asking for is [inaudible 04:27:34] so we can talk about it and make it work. But both these policies are going to have huge staffing implications, and if this is for the board [inaudible 04:27:42] then it should be dictated toward the board exclusive, not adopted policies that are going to dictate what the staff [inaudible 04:27:48]

Stoldal: Well, this is board policy. This is the proposed policy of the board that flows out of four or five words that we have the sole discretion.

Thielen: May I have a moment?

Unknown: Dan Thielen on Zoom. Sure.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 04:28:05] the board has the sole discretion in order to have some procedure to follow that, that we develop this board policy. The board policy, again, if there's something [inaudible 04:28:20] that is just so draconian that the staff through [inaudible 04:28:29] we can't do that, that just doesn't make any sense, then they can bring that to the board and we'll look at that at the next meeting or the meeting after or any time that staff feels that any of these policies need to be updated and so forth. But we need to have something in place. We've all been on two committees, too many committees that we study this, and 2 or 3 years later, nothing is done. So let's put a policy in place and then if there's something there that just [inaudible 04:29:05], bring it to the board and everybody around this table is the responsible human being in trying to get things to move forward but also protecting our history. Dan?

Thielen: I want to just address - thank you, Board Chair. Dan Thielen for the record. If you go to 381.0063J, it puts the responsibility and the discretion back on the administrator to govern, manage, and control the exhibit and display of all property and things of the institution administered by the museum director at other exhibits, expositions, world's fairs and places of public or private exhibition. Any property of the state of Nevada that may be placed on display or on exhibition in these places must be taken into custody by the administrator at the conclusion of the world's fair or exhibition and placed and kept in the institution subject to being removed and again exhibited at the discretion of the administrator or a person

designated by the administrator. So Jay [ph 04:30:21], it's like the first time we get to put something on display, the board has the sole discretion. And then when it's returned to the state, it's at the discretion of the administrator or a person designated by the administrator.

McMahon: If I might follow up, Mr. Chair, Christopher McMahon for the record. The items we're looking at here in the NRS, there's a [inaudible 04:30:44] directing the powers of the museum directors and the administrator. You're focused on one specific item in that list, and I think it's inappropriate to take that out of context with the whole of that section.

Stoldal: I reject the statement that it's out of context. It's the very last thing in the NRS and it says none of the above. In fact, the sole discretion of the board. It's not out of context. That line says sole discretion and it's the very last line, not buried in the middle. It's the very last thing. It says none of the above, basically takes away from the fact that [interposing]

McMahon: With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, you're looking at one letter in a series of subparts. It is taken out of context. You're focused on one line in the middle of that whole NRS.

Stoldal: No, it's at the end. It's at the end.

McMahon: It's at the end of one item in a series of items that are related to collections management.

Stoldal: So what's your interpretation of sole discretion? What's the board have sole discretion over?

McMahon: As I'm reading this NRS, the way it's written, it appears to me when it's traveling out of state, you have discretion.

Stoldal: But it says in and out. But it says in and out.

McMahon: The way it's written, I read it as out of state because it's listed with a series of collection management policies.

Stoldal: Harry?

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. I'm not about to step in this without an official [inaudible 04:32:23] opinion. It says what it says.

Stoldal: Well, Harry, does it say it's just out or does it say in and out?

Unknown: It says in and out.

Stoldal: What's that?

Unknown: It says in and out, but you need to take it with their context of what [interposing]

Stoldal: Oh, it says in and out. That's the context. In or out.

Timmons: Barry [ph 04:32:43] can I poke you? I got poked. Anthony Timmons for the record.

Stoldal: Please.

DeLeon: Chair, Daphne DeLeon for the record. So something maybe just to move us all along. If you look at policy and procedure [inaudible 04:32:58] NRS, there's no question about the sole discretion of the board to make a decision about a loan. There's no question about the board's ability to dictate to the administrator through the administrator [inaudible 04:33:12] This is the criteria that we're going to make our decision upon, correct? It needs to adhere to this, it needs to adhere to that. But if you look at procedure, procedure is really a duplication and it's instructing staff underneath the administrator to do certain things. You will go into PastPerfect. You will create a record. Museums don't have past [inaudible 04:33:32] We know Boulder City doesn't have PastPerfect. I would ask the board to really think about those procedural parts because they look as if they most appropriately fall under the administrator. The policy parts are the board. The board can focus on we having the sole discretion to make the decision. This is the information that we're looking for. We will rely on the administrator to ensure that all this information comes forth in a satisfactory manner in order to make the decision. And you can incorporate through an appendix [ph 04:34:09] the division policy. So it doesn't sit alone, so you don't see what the division is doing, but then that way it's a truly collaborative product where the policy is driven by the board and the decision is made by the board, but they also respect and rely on the administrator to implement it and put [inaudible 04:34:32] policy that works.

Stoldal: Daphne, just a piece of information. Over the years, the number of policies that have [inaudible 04:34:41] by the board were brought forward by the previous administrators that said to the board from the administrator, we'll take care of this, just give me the authority. And so much of the board's statutory responsibility has been delegated over the years to the administrator. And I think that that's something that a while back, when Anthony brought up the issue of the question about whether or not we should simply - I think you were [inaudible 04:35:17] delegate the authority of how often we should allow the administrator to delegate unilaterally [inaudible 04:35:26] that once again, we were just pushing our

responsibility from the board over to some place else. And I don't feel comfortable with that. I think that the board has some statutory responsibilities and that we should so the staff can understand what the policies are. We need to have policy. Let's take what Dan said is accurate, that he wanted to get rid of some matchbooks and it took him a year. Well, the policy that we passed - it's not going to take a year, it's going to take one meeting. There's details that are here, and if there's an issue with PastPerfect, then we solve it. But we're not going to let one issue take away an entire board policy because they don't have PastPerfect there. We'll adjust the policy so that [inaudible 04:36:24] but I'm not comfortable with having this board have a statutory responsibility and say, no, no, we just want to be here for the exhibits and we want to look at the pretty painting because we're on the museum board. There's some exciting and tremendous things that are going on within the museum system that are now being reignited when we're coming out of Covid, that this board needs to have some understanding about the building of this beautiful facility in Boulder City. The challenge is in Ely. There's going to be more challenge in this legislative section. So this board needs to take a more active role in making sure. It has a responsibility. It's got a procedure, a policy. So I think that these are just essential as we go forward if there's a glitch. [Inaudible 04:37:20]

Thielen: Dan Thielen for the record. I don't think it's a glitch, and I think it's going to be pretty fair language when we get to the end of this. But there's a list of places where the museum gets to exhibit things. World's fairs, expositions, and places of public or private exhibition. And then in the sole discretion of the board, it says that that exhibit that doesn't prevent the permanent or temporary retention placement or housing or exhibition of a portion of the property in other places, so places that aren't listed in there. And from my feeling of it, is giving control of a portion of the state's holding over to a governor, for instance, or to another state or to somebody else. Other than that listing of other items, that puts it at the discretion of the administrator. Those other places that we can't conceive of. It doesn't list the White House on there and it doesn't list if you wanted to put it in another place, other places at the sole discretion of the board. Not all places. Other places at the sole discretion of the board.

McMahon: Mr. Chair, Mr. Thielen. Sorry, Christopher McMahon for the record. That's what I was trying [inaudible 04:38:53] The other parts of the NRS lists what can be done and what you're focused on is a part of that but trying to encompass every -

Stoldal: I'm only saying because it's at the end and it refers to everything above. It says don't let these [inaudible 04:39:08], don't interfere with the board's sole discretion.



Thielen: And further on, it says the administrator's discretion. And it's other places. Anyway -

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. You're looking at item F. It goes on through item M. So it's not at the end of that statute. There's several things that follow it.

Stoldal: So Harry Ward, who is the expert here, I will say that it's the end of what I consider the loan process. Who has the authority for that? If you're not ready to suggest that that phrase is the governing element to this -

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. I guess that's why we have a [inaudible 04:40:12] general to when there's gray areas in a statute to ask for an official opinion. I'll be honest. I don't know where we go from here on this, especially for today's agenda item.

Stoldal: Well, the board can pass it and if the administration wants to ask for an opinion from the attorney general's office, they could do that, just as we've done that. But the board can set its policy and if the administration thinks it's inappropriate, it has the two [inaudible 04:40:51] Go to the attorney general's office and do what we did or it can go to a legislator and say clean the law, change it. But there's nothing that prohibits us from passing this today.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman.

Stoldal: Please.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I agree with you 100 percent. We need to have rules and policies and procedures in place. I'm just not a big fan of putting the cart before the horse, to borrow a Well's Fargo statement. I mean, he doesn't even have PastPerfect, Mr. Chairman. How do you expect him to comply with the policy we put into effect today when he doesn't have the tools to comply?

Stoldal: Well, we fix it. What's -

Timmons: You can't just fix it. We can't approve something, put it into policy today - Anthony Timmons for the record - and then go back and fix it.

Stoldal: Well, sure, we can say we can have a line here [inaudible 04:41:45] Boulder City. Why limit a policy for one museum because it can't do it but the other six can?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. Let's put the horse before the cart. Let's make sure. Let's consult with the folks that are the experts.

Make sure that the policy is in compliance with NRS and everything else that we need to do before we actually approve a policy that people can't comply with.

Stoldal: That Boulder City can't comply with. Myron.

Freedman: Mr. Chair, for the record, Myron Freedman. [Inaudible 04:42:19] member Timmons is talking about. It also implies that the board is directing the work of the staff and I direct the work of the staff. And I think for that reason, having a working session to kind of iron out what it is that works best in this policy, the language, who's reporting to who, that kind of thing, would be time well spent. And then we could come back with a version that has had input from myself, from the directors, from the other staff who are handling loans and whatnot.

Stoldal: Myron, I'll point out a report policy that doesn't have staff [inaudible 04:43:01]

Freedman: Well, this one specifically -

Stoldal: But they all do. They all have a staff, has to do something.

Freedman: Incoming loan procedures. The appropriate curator presents an incoming loan.

Stoldal: All the policies of the board has staff involvement.

Freedman: Well, they have staff involvement. It goes through me. I mean, I have to go back and look at all the policies -

Stoldal: You go through them. I'm 100 percent that all of it should go through you, but you got - for example, we were going to talk about the train charges. That comes from two specific museums, but it's got to go through. It goes through your office, but that's something the staff there have to work and develop. Each one of these things has a staff impact, so if the reason not to do something today is because it has staff impact, then we would have to look at each of these policies and say, wait a minute, we can't have this policy because it has staff impact.

Freedman: Well, Mr. Chair, for the record, really a lot of the detail in these policies [inaudible 04:44:04] You don't have this kind of detail in all the policies. This is quite a bit.

Stoldal: Not yet. Myron, I will tell you that over the years, these policies have diminished where this board has no responsibility. And I'm worried about

that legally. It makes me uncomfortable. Anthony, did you have a thought? You want to make a motion?

Timmons: I do.

Unknown: [Inaudible 04:44:36] Excuse me.

Delovio: Yes. I would like to bring up an issue regarding loans. This is Rachel Delovio, anthropology collections manager at the Nevada State Museum. And the anthropology department holds a majority of federal collections and that is the land manager's duty to choose whether or not artifacts from their federally managed lands is put on loan. So if the board was to approve it and not the federal agency, you'd be overstepping federal law.

Stoldal: This only deals with material that is in the possession of the state, not possession of the federal government.

Delovio: It is curated at the Nevada State Museum, but the ownership is with the federal agency. So whether that's the Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of [inaudible 04:45:40] or Bureau of Indian Affairs. So we hold our own collections for all those agencies.

Stoldal: Right, but we don't own them. We just hold them.

Delovio: Yes, we curate them and then the federal land manager has the input as to whether or not we do the loans.

Stoldal: Right, and they receive that. That's their responsibility is overseeing how the loan or their artifacts is handled. But we're not talking about their loan. We're talking about [inaudible 04:46:16] the state of Nevada loans. Not that we are taken care of.

Thielen: However - Dan Thielen for the record - one thing that we would consider with that is when we borrow things, we increase the liability on the state. And someone needs to look at that as well.

Stoldal: I agree with you 100 percent, Dan, and that's one of my concerns with our loans in California.

Unknown: Everybody here seems to have computers or iPhones or something. I'm a computer idiot. What is PastPerfect? How does it function?

Stoldal: One of the elements of it is recordkeeping, but it can be used -

Unknown: Inventory management.

Unknown: Inventory management?

Unknown: Corrections [inaudible 04:47:04] database.

Stoldal: Inventory, just in general.

Unknown: As far as we're concerned, Dan, you're PastPerfect.

Stoldal: I think of you as future perfect, Dan. [Laughing]

Unknown: My wife calls my flip phone the Fliposaurus. [Laughing]

Stoldal: So Anthony, please.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I would like to make a motion that we table this policy for further input by the museum staff, the museum directors, and bring it forth at the next meeting.

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer for the record. And I agree with what Anthony is suggesting because we've been talking about this for a long time today and we haven't made any progress, so there needs to be more work done, I think. We're not moving [interposing]

Stoldal: I'm sorry, is that a second?

Ward: Mr. Chair. Just for the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. Is that a second for the sole basis discussion? [Interposing]

Dwyer: Yes, it's a second [inaudible 04:48:16]

Stoldal: Alright, we have a motion and we have a second. Any further discussion of the board?

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, this is Bob Ostrovsky. I'll support the motion. In the process of reviewing these, I think if the legislature had wanted to limit the sole discretion of the board, they would have listed it as a separate item that the board would have had discretion for. I agree with the chairman. That language is broad enough to encompass all loans, in my opinion, but you can discuss that at the further meetings. But I'll support the motion.

Stoldal: Well, Stoldal for the record. I'm not going to support the motion. I think the language of the legislature, that the NRS is very clear. We have a responsibility if we have an NRS that we have a policy that can be worked through and if they're changing the policy, then we'll make change in the policy. But I don't want to delay this for another 30 days, and the 90 day

and 90 days turn into 6 months, 6 months turns into a year for a variety of delaying tactics. So I can't support delaying this process. So further questions, comments for the board? I'm sorry, Doris?

Dwyer: Doris [inaudible 04:49:32] Can we amend the motion to include that this will be on the agenda next [inaudible 04:49:39] there will be action in the next board meeting so that you don't have this delaying?

Stoldal: I think that will be on the agenda.

Dwyer: That's on the - yeah. But there are enough concerns on the part of the staff and the directors that I think maybe some additional time is needed and I think there's a way to promptly reconcile these differences with some more discussion. Anthony, are you suggesting there is a policy that needs to be put in place?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, aside from the motion, I do believe that a policy needs to be put in place. I'm in favor of policy. I don't have an issue with it. I just feel that it needs to be, first of all, you know in an agreement, we don't want to be on the opposite end of staff and fighting them in a conflict. Certain delegation of duties do need to go to the administrator where appointed by NRS, and again, I know [inaudible 04:50:29] doesn't necessarily want to step into this mess, but it is something that we probably need to look at from a legislative perspective and see what the NRS tells us. But I'm in favor of policies, procedures because it puts a direction in a step process into place, and I'm in favor of that. I just think that this one is a little premature in coming to the board for approval. I think we need to consult with the staff because there's already issues here, especially [inaudible 04:50:57] we're putting a policy into place that some museums can't comply with at this point. So -

Stoldal: I want to make sure I understand what [inaudible 04:51:07] a policy will be put on the board agenda at our next meeting?

Timmons: That is what I requested in my motion. And I'll even clarify. I'll say the March 9th meeting in Carson City.

Stoldal: That a policy is placed on the board.

Timmons: My motion is that we table the policy for now until we have a chance to discuss this further with staff and consult NRS, and that is brought up at the next meeting on March 9th in Carson City.

Unknown: And I'll second that.

Unknown: Yeah. I amend my second to conform to that.

Stoldal: I think we have a motion and we have [inaudible 04:51:46] We have a second. Further discussion? Anybody on the board? General public? All those in favor, please say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed?

Unknown: No.

Stoldal: Oh, you can hang in there, Dan. No. So the motion carries at our next meeting in March that staff has the existing proposal for the board. Staff will review this and come back with recommendations for the board's policy on the outgoing loan policy. As I said, the outgoing, incoming, and with that, the board representative on that is Courtney Mooney.

Unknown: And since Dan Thielen brought up world's fairs, I am selling tickets to the next world's fair as a personal fundraiser. [Laughing]

Stoldal: It's going to be in [inaudible 04:52:56]

Unknown: We got a popcorn truck.

Stoldal: Alright. What time do we have? We have -

Unknown: 2:00 o'clock.

Stoldal: 2 o'clock. We can move on to item 13D. It looks like board policy, membership. Anthony Timmons.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, that one's coming in March too because we're going to revamp the entire policy and the museum memberships prior to the next fiscal year, so -

Stoldal: Myron, help me understand how we are going to include this [inaudible 04:53:35] online store, but if we're not going to have a membership form until May or March -

Freedman: Let's have that discussion -

Stoldal: Yeah, good, okay. Alright, so then item D is tabled. Item E, board policy, update Museum and History admission train ride fee. There's - pardon me?

Unknown: [Inaudible 04:54:03]

Stoldal: Oh. Alright. Let's just go ahead and take a 5-minute break. [Inaudible 04:54:16] take a 5-minute break. [Interposing] And it is now - let's get back at 2:15. [Inaudible 04:54:27] Board of Museums and History for December the 8th back in order. We are at agenda item 13C. In your board packet, you have four pieces of paper. One is the current board policy, which covers everything from train rides to [inaudible 04:54:51] equipment to admission. And there's even a reference, I think, in there for membership. The goal here is to simply separate these three important policies into their own individual. The first one is the admission charge. We'll take it in that order. You should have one that specifically deals with admissions. And [inaudible 04:55:25] looks like this. And [inaudible 04:55:31] includes the overview and the statement under if you ever want to have time, you want to spend 15 or 20 minutes in trying to do a word puzzle, read 381.0031. It's how money that goes into the private fund and what money doesn't go into the private fund, but whoever wrote it enjoyed the use of [inaudible 04:56:00] so there are several things that do not go into the private fund. They include federal grants, legislative allocations, admission charges, and train fee charges. All of those go back into the general fund. So as we move forward, clean up and update all of our board policies, I thought it would be easier if rather than one policy that we separate these [inaudible 04:56:36] we have the changes, we could fix that. So this one simply pulls out out of the existing policy those things that are dealing with the museum admission fees. There was one, the second one, and that's the board grants the division and administrative the authority during the fiscal year to approve a one-time reduction or elimination of admission fees to each of the museums. We adjusted that to some degree this past year when there was a request from the executive office, I think, and there was a one-time request to give the administrator like a 90-day period.

Unknown: Instead of 1 month.

Stoldal: Instead of 1 month. We always have that option to do that, but rather than put it into specific board policy, we left it at if there's some [inaudible 04:57:35] during the coming year, the administrator [inaudible 04:57:40] could reduce it or you can eliminate the admission fee each of the museums. Further discussion? Otherwise, we'll look for a motion.

Unknown: [Inaudible 04:57:54]

Stoldal: We have a second?

Mooney: Courtney Mooney. I'll second.

Stoldal: We have a motion and we have a second. Further discussion? General public? [Inaudible 04:58:10] all those in favor, say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion is carried unanimously with the chair voting with those present. The next one is in no particular order but -

Unknown: Didn't we skip over [inaudible 04:58:32]

Stoldal: There are two more. There are -

Unknown: But they're in front of the one we just did.

Stoldal: Yeah. I think we took [inaudible 04:58:38] Let's then look at the train ride fee. This is the generic overview. There's a second element of this, and that's referred to in the last column or the last paragraph, that an annual review of train ride fee schedule and special train operation, those fees will occur in March of every year for the next fiscal year. And we will have a presentation later that will cover the rest of the coming fiscal year or the last half of the fiscal year. Otherwise, it's pretty straightforward. From the existing policy, we pulled out the train ride fee and -

Unknown: Excuse me, Bob. Are you on the train ride fee and railroad equipment or are you on the next one, which is just train ride? [Interposing] Okay, thank you.

Stoldal: Yes, please.

McMahon: A question, Mr. Chair. Christopher McMahon for the record. Is the requirement during the fiscal year - is that in NRS or is that the board's policy that set that?

Stoldal: It's in the board policy [inaudible 04:59:57] that it was a match-up in some ways with, let's say, for example, the Boulder City Museum private fund budget, what your requests are [inaudible 05:00:11] just borrow less [inaudible 05:00:14]

McMahon: Okay. Christopher McMahon for the record. I would ask the board to consider possibly doing that on a calendar year basis. It makes it smoother from a museum operational standpoint to change fees at the start of a new year rather than midway through the season, especially if the board adopts that policy on Friday. We're operating that. We run every weekend. We would have to change that policy within several hours of the board adopting that. So I would ask for consideration that it be put on a calendar year basis just to help ease the operation at the museum.

Stoldal: I'm not sure if I understand all of that exactly.



McMahon: So if you're reviewing and setting the fees on a fiscal year basis, so let's say at your March meeting, you set the new fees for the coming year, and you adopt those, we would have to change it midway through our operating season. So everybody that's been coming in 2023, in one weekend in May, it's going to be one price and then in June, it's going to be one price, and then the next weekend before the new fiscal year takes place, it's going to be a [inaudible 05:01:28] price.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 05:01:29] end of the year too. But we just get it at our December meeting and it would flip over -

McMahon: Neither Boulder City or Carson City run at the end of December, beginning of January, so it would allow for a transition period for all the prices to be adjusted and for the public to adjust to those prices rather than doing it midway through the operating season of both museums.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 05:01:55] question. Anthony?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I understand the idea.

Stoldal: We're not looking at that thing.

Timmons: No, no, no. I understand the idea, the concept, but - again, Anthony Timmons for the record. I wonder if that kind of messes up the concept of the matching principle in accounting, which says that we match it up with the fiscal year opposed to the calendar year. So to keep things cleaner, I think - and that's the way the federal government operates as well as the state government - I would recommend staying with the fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year because we don't operate on a calendar year basis, even though some businesses might or some museums might.

Unknown: Question, Anthony. What difference does it make?

Stoldal: [Inaudible 05:02:53] That's for the whole year. Anybody online? Question?

Thielen: Yeah. Dan Thielen for the record. I think that it provides a little bit of a hiccup when we do it in March for June, but if we establish in March that it is a June change in ticket pricing, then you still got a quarter to implement it. And then it's also driven. If we're going to make a price change, it's going to be driven by the staff that generated and put the request before the board. And so we're going to govern that but we're going to run that train, you know, because I don't think the board is going to say, hey, get ready because in June we're changing things for you. We recommend to the board and the board either approves or doesn't approve. So if it's in March, it becomes a hiccup if the day after the March meeting that we

have to implement it, but if we recognize it as fiscal to fiscal, your approval in March, we're executing it in June.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 05:04:16]

Thielen: Yeah. June 30th, July 1st. Yeah, yep. So we're executing it, July 1. And we're the ones making the recommendation, so it might not be as traumatic as we think.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. I think the biggest thing I'm concerned is obviously staff [inaudible 05:04:37] will make it work. My big concern here is the public and how they would react midway through the year [inaudible 05:04:44] especially in somewhere like Boulder City where we [inaudible 05:04:47] why is it on May 31st when they come out for Memorial [inaudible 05:04:51] one price and if they come out again the next weekend, there will be different price? That's my concern.

Stoldal: I was going to say something really smart [inaudible 05:04:59] but I hear what you say.

Thielen: Dan Thielen for the record.

McMahon: [Inaudible 05:05:06] I'm just thinking on a calendar year basis, if you say these are the prices for the year, then it makes it smoother from a public perspective knowing what the price is going to be for that calendar year. I understand Mr. Timmon's point on the financial side and I would defer to Daphne on how that would work, but from a public perception, the public doesn't operate on fiscal year. It operates on a calendar year.

Thielen: Dan Thielen for the record. There's nothing that prohibits our request from starting in March and saying that this will start in January. There's nothing that prohibits the board from approving it that way.

Stoldal: No other than it would [inaudible 05:05:48] the policy [interposing]

Thielen: No. That's not what I'm saying, Bob. Dan Thielen for the record. What you're saying is you approve it in March and then it begins the following January.

Stoldal: Yeah, although I think that interferes with the fiscal calendar. So we have the policy in front of us. We'll look for a motion. Please.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. Before you take a vote, I would say that the [inaudible 05:06:19] is more difficult if we change a fee structure midyear, but it can be done as long as you plan for it and if it's consistent. If we consistently change - if we're going to change fees come January

1st, then we can base that into our fiscal system and report it as such to the state budgeting process. So whatever the board feels is best.

Unknown: [Inaudible 05:06:40] I'm disqualified. I defer this [inaudible 05:06:43] Daphne.

Stoldal: We're all looking at you. [Laughing] [Inaudible 05:06:48]

Unknown: It's Seth's turn. [Laughing]

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. I make a motion to approve the [inaudible 05:07:00] [Interposing]

Unknown: You were too far away.

Stoldal: He's not been asleep since the [inaudible 05:07:12] Alright. We have a motion? We'll approve the train ride fees. We have a second.

Unknown: Is that 13e1? Ei?

Stoldal: Yes, 13ei, lower case. Do we have a motion or second?

Unknown: I'll second.

Stoldal: Okay.

Unknown: I'm [Inaudible 05:07:35]

Stoldal: We have a motion. We have a second to approve the [interposing]

Petersen: From Jan Petersen.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 05:07:39] train ride fee. Further discussion of the board? Those online? [Inaudible 05:07:48] all those in favor, say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carried unanimously with the chair voting with those present. The admission charge - excuse me - we are now at the use of museum facilities and equipment. This, again, is based on NRS [inaudible 05:08:17] which states "the Board of Museums and History shall establish policies and charges for the use of property, including the incidentally used rental and lease of buildings, equipment, pictures, and other property of the division [inaudible 05:08:36] Elements of this were challenged by the State Lands which said that specifically the example that State Lands gave was that we could focus on renting out museums

for weddings. The board feels that it is to go broader than that and I've asked the attorney general for a written opinion. That said, this is part of the board policy we're pulling up and basically it is exactly what the existing policy is, just moved into a separate policy in case we get an attorney general's opinion one way or the other. But this now separates it from the other three, so we have to change this. We don't have to change the other three.

Unknown: Mr. Chair.

Stoldal: Please.

Unknown: I [inaudible 05:09:27] all those museums as to what their fees are [inaudible 05:09:34] The Nevada Historical Society says we don't have [inaudible 05:09:42] and we don't really have facilities to rent. I'm open to suggestions. So I took care of that one. The same was true with the Lost City Museum. I discussed this with my team. [Inaudible 05:10:01] any time soon. So they got Tracey Sprague. You remember that, don't you? The Nevada State and Museum in Las Vegas has a set of fees for various events. The boardroom goes for - its 750 square feet goes for \$80 to \$120 an hour. I'm not sure why there's a spread here but there is [inaudible 05:10:37] The [inaudible 05:10:39] room is \$80 to \$120 an hour. The special events room goes for \$1,500 to \$5,000 a day. The lobby and the gallery goes for \$1,500 a day. That's the museum down at the springs. The East Ely Railroad Depot Museum has a freight building rental agreement and that is \$700 for rental fee. It's to be paid prior to rental. Then we have \$100 for tables and chairs. Salad bar is \$50 each. Projector screen \$50 and the sound system 0. They also require [inaudible 05:11:49] fee to hold a particular date and [inaudible 05:11:54] or result in a forfeiture of that amount. There's a \$250 check cleaning deposit - that can go to a cleaning business - prior to the rental rate. If the building is clean, the deposit is returned. There is no smoking or anything of that nature there.

Freedman: The building is never clean.

Unknown: Well, it's a freight building. [Laughing] Myron is [inaudible 05:12:25] I have it also. The rental fees for the Nevada State Railroad Museum in Carson City and Boulder City. [Interposing]

Freedman: Those are the train fee?

Unknown: Yes.

Freedman: Yes. I meant that it's background information for the discussion on the request for the special train. I just wanted the background information [interposing]

Unknown: Okay. Well, it was also a facility rental fee because they were renting out trains. And it's the same thing [inaudible 05:12:53]

Stoldal: Let me interrupt you for a second. With both this policy and with the train fees policy that we just approved, there is the last line and that is "the board shall annually review the policy for the train rides." It's just a policy but it will also annually review the fees that are charged. It's a separate motion and we did not include this portion of what you just went through, the work you just went through on the agenda. I don't think -

Unknown: [Inaudible 05:13:45] facilities and that's what I was checking.

Stoldal: No, no. That's the specific responsibility but there are two elements to it. One is just the overall policy, and then there is each year we look at what the fees are, and we approve those fees.

Unknown: The only one who would appeal fees are going to be the railroad [inaudible 05:14:03]

Stoldal: We'll bring that up, specific fees that [inaudible 05:14:12] because there's a real detailed, for example, the fees we charge for the [inaudible 05:14:19]

Unknown: For the chores [inaudible 05:14:23]

Stoldal: On the capital building for that facility there, we have a fee for use of that where people can close it and have a meeting up there [inaudible 05:14:34] The [inaudible 05:14:37] museum is over there.

Unknown: Yeah? I didn't know we could close [inaudible 05:14:42] for museums and collect a fee [inaudible 05:14:44]

Stoldal: Yes, you charge that too.

Unknown: [Inaudible 05:14:46] Revenue source.

Stoldal: But you got [inaudible 05:14:50]

Unknown: So you want to postpone discussion on this [inaudible 05:14:55]

Stoldal: Because that's the specific fee which is part 2. Part A is [inaudible 05:15:00] So this is the policy that is pulled out of 381.0045. The first two

were the train fees and admission. This is the third one for facilities. And it says that the board and management, they're working with a board of directors as well as the museum director will come up with the policy that's not just the board chair, Myron, and the directors. So look for a motion. [Inaudible 05:15:32]

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, I have a quick question.

Stoldal: Please.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I know the rules are a little different at the Springs Preserve, so I want to make sure that they're okay. Assuming this is the same policy we use all the time.

Unknown: I wondered that too.

Timmons: Yeah, because it's kind of a little strange at the Springs Preserve, our relationship with them and facilities and -

Stoldal: We don't have -

Gillespie: Hollis Gillespie for the record. We are actually in the process of renegotiating a more up-to-date interlocal agreement. And at least verbally, we're in agreement that we are not required to use them or their caterers or anything else. So we are free to go ahead and hire and bring in our own events and use this approved fee schedule without any kind of involvement of the Springs. So I hope that clears it up because I can understand why you have the questions because I know it was very detailed and very interjoined before.

Stoldal: And now we're all friends.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman?

Stoldal: Yes, please.

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. I'd like to make a motion. I'll take the term. Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I'd like to make a motion we approve the policy for facilities, [inaudible 05:16:52] museum facilities, fixtures, and other properties of the division as presented.

Unknown: And I'll second.

Stoldal: We have a motion. We have a second.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the -

Stoldal: Further discussion? There are none. All those in favor say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carried unanimously with the chair voting with those in attendance. This is 13F, board review and decision on fee schedules for train rides for the remainder of the fiscal '23 year. Several challenges [inaudible 05:17:49] challenges with the board [inaudible 05:18:02] Rather not ad lib this, but one of the issues is that the board had its last meeting as Myron and the two railroad museum directors that the presentation be made for the coming fiscal year and the remaining half of this fiscal year of '23 but instead the presentation is for all of the calendar years. Usually the phrase calendar year, which confused me. We also - there's several places in there where the board is asked to delegate its authority on plane ticket prices [inaudible 05:19:09] a TBA, to be determined. I'm not sure the board has the authority and back to delegate his responsibility on train ticket fees. But then thirdly, the more important thing is, and I've asked this over a long period of time and it has not been receive an answer. And the [inaudible 05:19:34] go back to the general fund tickets fee.

Unknown: Oh, it's that one.

Stoldal: And I'm not sure how this board legally got around that, why its responsibility to set the fees, and then with a wink and a nod, part of that fees goes to a friend's group and part of it goes to the general public. I could not find any administration in reviewing minutes, if there was some latitude that the board was given, but specifically train fees with tickets, specifically the charges go back to the general fund. So I'm not sure how we can allocate funds [inaudible 05:20:22] If there's any [inaudible 05:20:24] on this, if there's some specific administrator guide on how we been doing this, but I'm also very concerned about the simple process if we can do that, to let somebody else set the fee. So the first question. Myron, do you have any? Or Harry, you got to jump in here one of these days. [Laughing] And the rest of the train fees go back to the general fund. How do we charge train fees and they don't [inaudible 05:20:59] the general funds.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. For the first point on the language and the request about the [inaudible 05:21:13] In putting this together, included everything through the end of 23 and then you said no, it's just through the first half of 23. And so that's why the events listed only go through the first half of 23. But we forgot to change the [inaudible 05:21:33]

Stoldal: [Inaudible 05:21:35] Some of them are in July. There's another one, a music thing, that could be put on any time during the year.

Freedman: Right. That's true. We said July because if you start doing something in the first few days of July, you're going to need to be able to plan for that. [inaudible 05:21:53] That's why [inaudible 05:21:55]

Stoldal: Okay, we approve these things in March, so that should give plenty of time. Christopher?

McMahon: I'll let Myron finish.

Freedman: No, go ahead.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. For item number 2, that was an error on my part and I take full responsibility for that. So this is the first year I've gone through this process, so I'm still learning it a little bit. I read your authority as setting it and I didn't want to approach the board as telling you what to do. I wanted you to set that. My understanding now is that you look for recommendations from us [inaudible 05:22:30] So I take responsibility for that language and that was my fault. As far as working with the friends, what has happened in the past is those special events we do are fundraisers for the friends, which are covered under the MOU [ph 05:22:48] that's been approved by organizations. We collect the train ride fee of \$8.00 per ticket with the understanding that the friends group, he pays that as a per ticket fee as in accordance with NRS and the policies set by a board, and that they can use the train to generate funds additionally. So it's a fundraising mechanism that the sale of the ticket is that \$8 per person that goes back to the state.

Stoldal: I understand what you're saying the current process is, but I'm definitely not sure of our authority to do that. [Inaudible 05:23:27] or \$8 comes from as opposed to \$5 or \$25 and then whether or not we have the authority to make money. That's statutory issue, go to the general fund, and go to a friend's group fundraiser.

Unknown: Dan [inaudible 05:23:41]

Stoldal: Go ahead, Dan.

Unknown: So I think you are correct and we need to find a mechanism that allows use to satisfy the requirements of the NRS but takes advantage of an opportunity to generate funds. And I think how this is - because Boulder City's been doing it for years. We don't do it up here in Carson City. And when I say years, decades. And I think the principle was that the friends essentially leased the trains that for the cost of a ticket set by the board.



So at the end of the event, the general fund got its funds remunerated that was a per-person fee set by the board. And then the remainder was kept on hand to support the museum in its maintenance, fuel purchases, operations, and all the other things that go to make that very expensive railroad run. As I look at, it's ripe for misinterpretation by anyone outside of this organization that may think that something is not being handled right. And so I think we need to establish a clean policy that satisfies the board, satisfies the NRS and still allows us to generate fundraising for operations down there. I recognize absolutely that how we have handled things forever makes you kind of cringe a little bit. I think we can account for all the money. I don't think there's any nefarious things, but statutorily, I think we satisfy control of the money, and it's going in the right places, but I think you hit right on the head. There's an opportunity here to create a clear, that nobody has to go E. It sounds kind of right. I think there's an opportunity here. We do need to address it.

Stoldal: And I think that that's a really good food for thought in the sense that the board does have the ability to lease, but usually there's a price that goes with the lease.

McMahon: Mr. Chairman, Christopher McMahon for the record. That's what the board [inaudible 05:26:37] previously. I don't know how the board or why that \$8 but that's what [inaudible 05:26:43] when I took over the museum last January. But that's how this policy has worked. That's how it was explained to me when [inaudible 05:26:50] is that it's a lease at a per ticket fee set by the board.

Stoldal: I don't mean to become Mr. Policy or Procedure, but we need to [inaudible 05:27:03] I think Dan is on the right track with getting that codified [inaudible 05:27:08] some sort of a policy that allows them to do that. But the second thing, though, is Dr. Christopher and Dan, Dr. McMahon and Dan have trains that they want to run relatively quickly, so we need to let them do something now, but we also need to come up with a better policy. Anthony?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. We have established fees for lease, for the train. It says charter train community events, 2 hours, 1 [inaudible 05:27:41] including dining car for train for service clutch Chambers of Commerce, Art Commission \$500. So it's here.

Thielen: Dan Thielen for the record. You're correct. One of the challenges with that is if we go to \$5, then we suffer on the general fund side where we budgeted for the fiscal year to count on that \$8 per fee coming back in to the general fund side. So I think you're right. We could do that. We could run right through that and we'd have a lot of private money being held by

the friends, but then our budgetary problem on the other side - because we count on that general fund money to come through.

McMahon: Mr. Chairman.

Stoldal: Please.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. I want to just highlight what Dan said there, that we do suffer on the state side and that's particular important for Boulder City which, unlike the other museums, has to pay its own [inaudible 05:28:43] What we're talking about here when we do these special events is we're often running 10 to 15 trains for these events. So if you do that at \$500 fee, you might bring in a couple thousand dollars. For the holiday [inaudible 05:28:57] loan, currently if we stop selling tickets for it, we'll bring in [inaudible 05:29:01] That's going to bring about half of our annual revenue that we're required to bring in for the year. And so it's no - I don't want to be alarmist, but this is what makes us [inaudible 05:29:13] and I know there's ambiguity here but there's a possibility we would not be able to function without this micromechanism in place.

DeLeon: So Daphne DeLeon for the record. I just do want to clarify that Boulder City Railroad is the only railroad that pays 50 percent of their salaries out of train rides. So if the board changes something drastically that lowers that, that's going to directly impact the ability of [inaudible 05:29:47]

Stoldal: I'm going to make a [Inaudible 05:29:48] The board is seeing [inaudible 05:29:50] I think it's more important that we hear the first part of what you said and what Christopher said, and that is Boulder City is the only museum in the system that has to pay its own way and I know Myron is looking at that at this legislative section [inaudible 05:30:09] and I think it's something that this board should talk to all of their friends in the legislature. There's no reason why we should have to live under a policy that goes back to 2006 or that was going to pretend that we were going to pay our own way and don't worry legislation. That need to be, but the issue we have before us is two-fold. One, what we do to keep that rolling until we come up with the policy. Kind of what Dan said. And that we have maybe a least way to do this. There would be two elements to that, what do we want to set as our standard train [inaudible 05:30:52] for fiscal year 2024 as a standard fee while they stay at \$8 or move it up to \$10 because you would get half - how much money do you get out of that, coming back to you?

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. When we do these special events, the current rate set by the board is \$8 per ticket. This previous year we saw roughly \$13,000 from Marconi Express, which is a shorter event.

\$30,000 from the Halloween train and we're expecting someone in the vicinity of \$60,000 for a holiday train [inaudible 05:31:36]

Stoldal: 60, 90, 105? [ph 05:31:36]

Thielen: Dan Thielen for the record. Last year for Christmas, it was about \$70,000 of income for the general fund.

Stoldal: So at least \$100,000 and you get to keep some of that?

McMahon: That goes to the general fund. Now I don't know. Daphne would have to explain how that goes on the budget, the operating side. I'm not an accountant so I don't [inaudible 05:32:04]

DeLeon: So I'm come in. Chair, Daphne DeLeon for the record. It gets split specifically for Boulder City train ride, goes to the salaries, and then it goes into [inaudible 05:32:13] operating and CAP 45 locomotive [inaudible 05:32:15]

Stoldal: All 100,000 [inaudible 05:32:17]

DeLeon : Everything they earn it goes in. Yes. It's mapped that way.

Stoldal: So if I understand this correctly, we're talking just the narrow standard train ride. If we up that from \$8 to \$10, more of that money would come back to you.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. Theoretically, yes. The [inaudible 05:32:37] Daphne didn't mention is that we earn anything above what the legislature have said we [inaudible 05:32:42] Unless IFC gives us authority, which last year we did not get, that money just disappears. So last year we lost about \$130,000.

Freedman: So Myron Freedman for the record. Yes, typically there would be a work program down to capture those dollars. This was during the period where we did not have an ASO, and so we lost that. So we would try later on and it wasn't in time enough, but that's how that occurred. [Inaudible 05:33:14] this year, and again, regarding the other revenues that typically would go to the general fund from something like a lease, the [inaudible 05:33:23] would have it be forwarded to [inaudible 05:33:26] Also, while I'm speaking - Myron Freedman for the record - you mentioned two things at the top of this. One is the NRS requiring that you set the price of admission. That includes the train ride fee and then this is general fund money. So when you say \$5 or \$8 - well, the board is setting that. You have the authority to do that. So the additional revenue is trust fund money in some cases, but when it's the friends running the trains for

developing their revenues that they use to run the train program [inaudible 05:34:11] then yes. Do we want to put a cap on that? Do we want to set a rate for that? The thing that has to be calculated out is how many seats are we talking about and will that be enough money from that event? So there's a number of things that have to go into determining - we at least have to have a goal for the kind of revenue we need to bring in.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 05:34:37] You're answering part of the question I think the board has. If we raise that \$8 to \$10 or \$20, is that money going to come back to Christopher to help run the facility?

Freedman: Well, it's general fund.

Stoldal: So the answer is yes?

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. The answer is yes as long as we projected and we make sure that we have enough authority in our budget to expend that money.

Thielen: Dan Thielen for the record. If I may add something. If we plan an event and the danger is if we have an event in May or June, so we budget it to earn \$10,000 and everyone's going to be happy with it and then something accidentally happens where we get \$100,000, in that short window of time between the event and June 30th, we may not be able to get a work program in place to capture those funds. We've had challenges with big, fat checks coming in from Rail Explorers to the general fund at the end of the fiscal year because we didn't have a work program in place and we will lose those funds. So raising the ticket price may increase the general fund, but it may turn out that prisons get to spend it, not us.

Stoldal: Dan, can you help me understand why we let Rail Explorers or whoever tell when they're going to make the payment? Can't we require them to pay us every day, making that up, every week, every month, so we would then have the ability to develop this work program. Why are they paying us off and why don't they pay us off in a couple of lump sum rather than quarterly or monthly or some -

Thielen: Dan Thielen for the record. They have been paying monthly but sometimes when they're too successful, when we switched and the board allowed us to go to \$6 bucks per person riding on Rail Explorers, it quadrupled the money coming in, and the money came in so fast in amounts that we could not capture by doing a work program. It's not easy to execute funds in the state. So when we set whatever goes to the general fund, the remainder should stay private, whether friends or the board. I think we need to be careful with that. The general fund needs some money and it should be near what our average ticket price is, but if it

doesn't, it's much safer in the trust fund and the friends as far as executing until Daphne gets the program in place that allows us to have a reserve and spend those funds past June 30.

Stoldal: You had your hand up for 20 minutes. [Laughing]

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. Two items first to provide further clarification. The way it currently works with the railbike vendor is [interposing]

Unknown: Chris, you have to speak up.

McMahon: Sorry. [Inaudible 05:37:59] way that the payment is processed through the railbike vendor is it's on a per person fee. So at the end of the month, they calculate the total riders and then write the check based on that. We usually receive it within the first week after the month. The problem is our busiest times as far as the railbikes are in the spring and in the fall, so their busy season comes April, May, June, right into the fiscal year. So rather than getting the normal \$15,000 to \$20,000 check, we start seeing \$40,000 to \$50,000 checks. That's great except if you're trying to capture it in a work program at the end of the year. Then it becomes very difficult. And an updated lease addresses some of those problems that we had. The second item is you talked about raising the fees in these types of agreements that we have for special events. I would caution the board about raising too high because when they do these special events, they still have to amortize their costs. So they're fronting all the costs beyond operation of the train to hold events, have catering, have tents. They're putting on an event. They've got a paper and even though it's a fundraiser for them, they still have costs to cover. And if you raise the fee too high on the state side, then you're making it so there's no fundraising possibility there. And -

Stoldal: But they get to set whatever the profit margin they want to set.

McMahon: That's not entirely true. What's happened in the past is the board [inaudible 05:39:43] and that's what I would recommend the board do again. Previously for Boulder City, it has been \$50. That has seemed to work well for our events. It covers the amortization cost, it allows them to raise funds, and they bring all those funds back to museum. Just one example. This year I spent \$65,000 to find a new radio system that museum desperately needed. We couldn't get that through the state, through our budget. We can't get it through our [inaudible 05:40:15] cost of that because we were going to have the [inaudible 05:40:19] running the train because our radio [inaudible 05:40:21] So all this money does come back and benefits the museum in some way, shape, or form.

Stoldal: And Dr. McMahon, this is clearly not an issue of the value of the [inaudible 05:40:33] It's just more of an accounting and where the funds go. And the issue of the work plan to use the money. It sounds like you're addressing that in some ways with whatever new lease it's going to be, so it gets leveled out [inaudible 05:40:55] and power company. Utility used that but you just have a lower price that we could come up with. You could come up with something like that.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. We have two things in place. One is the new lease. I'm going to address that board directly. And the second is Daphne or whoever for future [inaudible 05:41:14] We agreed that in January, we will review that annually to ensure that it's projected and captured well in advance so we don't run into the problem of trying to get it at the end of the year.

Stoldal: Alright. So a couple of things. We want to resolve this so you can operate but we also want to [inaudible 05:41:37] so we can add a functioning policy. And so as it stands now, working with Dan and yourself and Myron will come up in March for a plan for the 24 fiscal year. We can deal with that issue of calendar at some point later on but right now it's a fiscal thing and we want to keep doing that. So that will carry [inaudible 05:42:06] So I think it takes care of that. Then the question that we would have to vote on is two-fold within the action item. Do we want to raise the standard fee from \$8 to \$10? More money would the circulate back through the plan that I think Myron and Daphne put in place would come back to the museum. That's one element. I don't think we should go any higher than 10 at this juncture. And then secondly, the request was before us. This particular one, it's got three or four times it says TB [inaudible 05:42:53] We could simply change the motion when raise the standard fee to \$10 and then change the TBA to not to exceed \$50. That would give you some action that you could take and work for the next 6 months or so.

Petersen: Jan Petersen, record. Chris, would that work?

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. Yes, and again, this is what I was talking about. This was my typographical error when I put this together [inaudible 05:43:24] understandable what they're asking for, not to exceed prices, exactly that direction I was seeking from the board. And I think that works well. It's worked for us previously and I don't see any reason to change it at this point.

Stoldal: So that would give the [inaudible 05:43:38] groups a working figure of up to \$40. So those are the two elements. One, up the standard fee. Maximize the special rides to no more than \$50. There's a secondary request that Nevada waive the ticket fee for children. And then I'm

concerned about the dates on the [inaudible 05:44:13] Do you see any of those happening in the first six months?

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. My goal would be to have them either in spring or fall, prioritizing spring because we do have a lot of special things that go on in fall. That was my goal, but again, part of this is me learning the process of doing this with the board for the first time, so again, I apologize for some of my misunderstandings during this process.

Stoldal: Okay. I think it's time for the chair to make a motion, so -

Thielen: Dan Thielen for the record. We've requested \$5 per ticket. So if you go on the first paragraph under Independence Day weekend, we've requested \$5. Are you moving next to \$10? Our standard ticket price is \$8 to the public and our Santa train is currently approved at \$5. And we thought if we gave the friends. We currently do not have a friends fundraising relationship like Boulder City. I'm encouraging them to do the same, but I would like to get permission first.

Stoldal: First of all, I think the train rides in Carson City are at a much higher level in one area with the unique historic cars that you're running. I mean, it's just some amazing equipment that you have. While the city has a nice run down the line, that said, I don't think \$10 is - I don't know what kind of ride you can get in this state for \$10. That's one of the best rides in the world, so -

McMahon: I like it. No. I like it, Bob.

Stoldal: Alright.

McMahon: If you're telling us \$10, I like it.

Stoldal: So I'd like to make a motion one other area - and I don't think we need to be within a formal motion. I think Dr. Christopher said it that the titles to all of our special train rides need to be nondenominational and a [inaudible 05:46:34] invitation to all. So to Dan and to Dr. McMahon, if we could make sure that the titles of these train rides are really nondenominational.

Unknown: Got it. [Inaudible 05:46:52] for the record. Got it. So the motion would be that we would approve with the Nevada State Railroad Museum in Carson City [inaudible 05:47:04] I'm going to probably leave more details than we need but just because it's in front of me. The motion is to approve Story Time [ph 05:47:11] motorcars [inaudible 05:47:12] between January and March. [Inaudible 05:47:15] Extravaganza, 2 days in spring, and we will laugh into 24 fiscal year for Independence Day for 2 to 4 days in July. That the board approve a rate of \$10 per ticket for both Boulder City and

Carson City. And in Boulder City, permission for the Boulder City Bunny Express for 9 days in March and April. Again, that the fee is standard for \$10. That any fundraising efforts with the train tickets, the cap on that ticket would be no more than \$50. That we approve the Nevada Day. We waive the ticket fee for children who are Nevada Day and that the music train ride, again, would be up to \$50 but only one because of January and June of this year. That would be my motion. Myron, any thoughts on? I hope somebody will second. Oh, we have a second from Dan Markoff. Further discussion?

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I'm not going to make you restate your motion, Mr. Chairman, but -

Stoldal: I'd be more than happy to. [Laughing]

Timmons: I think you left off the \$10 ticket charge for the music trains. You said just up the \$50. So I just wanted to clarify and make sure I included that.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 05:49:06]

McMahon: I'd like to [inaudible 05:49:07] if I may. Christopher McMahon for the record. Those are ones [inaudible 05:49:10] All those fees would be remitted back.

Timmons: Okay.

Stoldal: So this fundraising train, we still get \$10.

Timmons: Got it.

Stoldal: So all those in favor, say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carried unanimously with the chair voting with those in attendance. [Inaudible 05:49:35] What do we need to clean up?

Timmons: No. I'm just [inaudible 05:49:43] You're saying \$50 a ticket. This is not [inaudible 05:49:49] So is this general fund or trust fund?

McMahon: I think that would be a decision for the board if they want to split it however they split it [interposing]

Timmons: So the \$10 would go to the state and then the \$40 would go to the trust fund.



McMahon: Anything above that \$10.

Timmons: Up to \$50.

McMahon: Yeah, I -

Stoldal: [Inaudible 05:50:10] that would be. This is not a trends group. It would come back to the -

Unknown: I think that's a clear way of looking at it, just being consistent about the train ride, state [inaudible 05:50:29] Everything else either goes to the friends if it's their event or it goes to the trust fund if it's the museum's event.

Stoldal: But we still need to clear up the issue of whether or not we can allow somebody else who's had a train fee and if we do that through a lease. So we still need to figure that out.

Freedman: Mr. Chair, Myron Freedman for the record. I think one way to look at this is from a fundraising perspective. The other museums raise money. They have raffles. The friends hold a raffle. If there's a special event, they're not necessarily charging on top of the raffle a state ticket fee. They're just keeping all of that money.

Stoldal: Are you talking about train rides?

Freedman: I'm talking about the other museums that are raising money through other means.

Stoldal: We're talking train rides.

Freedman: I realize that, but this is what the railroad museums have to offer for fundraisers is the use of the trains. So I understand that you want to make the state whole, but everything else, I think, is fundraising money, so the authority you're looking for is what I'm getting at.

Stoldal: The authority simply says that and my small mind said, this board said will [inaudible 05:51:55] train charges and that money goes back to the general fund. We support the friend. We support the way it goes. We just need to find a way to get from A to B. And I'm sure there is a way, whether it's that we rent the train on a one-time basis and we charge the friend a fee. We have to come up with what it would cost us to rent the train. And then we're not selling tickets. We're renting the train, which we have the authority to do. But I think there are a couple of paths that will get us to where we want to be. We just need to figure that out.

McMahon: Christopher McMahon for the record. That's the way it currently works. We rent the train to the friends for \$8 a ticket fee, which they [inaudible 05:52:47] They sell the tickets themselves. So you're saying that fee [interposing]

Stoldal: I just want to say that if you got it down on a piece of paper -

McMahon: Okay. Understood. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Stoldal: So thank you. I think we truly had an opportunity for improvement there. Make sure we put this on the next board. Have to clean that up as well. And I am now at 14 and the time is 3:15. Is everybody okay? I'm on 14 and 14 is -

Unknown: [Inaudible 05:53:32]

Unknown: Is it online, the online [inaudible 05:53:38]

Stoldal: So 14a, standing committee museum report. Jan Petersen is the chair of that. And 314a1 [ph 05:53:47] is the report on the what the store committee is doing. One of the things that the store committee did was updated the policy that we voted on and approved before. And we also approved the two summaries of the meeting of the store committee on online. And while not being a voting member, I listened and participated. A lot of thought and a lot of work has been put in by Daphne and the state as well as the chair committee, Jan Petersen, and we'll turn it over to Chair Petersen at this point.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. I am turning this over to Daphne.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record.

Petersen: Daphne, you have to speak up.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. Thank you very much, Jan. Board members, in your packet, you'll see that there is a report and a funding request for the pilot phase of the museum online store. And I'm just going to give you a quick synopsis. The first part of the report is really to give you a description of a pathway that we had taken in the working group, which included museum staff from all the museum stores and the store committee from the board to arrive at this funding proposal. And one thing I do want to point out and add a little bit more clarification about regarding this proposal pathway is when we originally put forth the proposal in October at the October 11th meeting, this is the proposal that was developed by the working group. We had a really complicated discussion

and a lot of questions came out about possibly implementing in different ways. Focused on how we were proposing to give fulfillment in this pilot phase by each museum. Perhaps we will do it in a centralized location if that would be easier to implement and also cost-effective. How we would choose a website platform, whether we go with a contract vendor or use a service like Shopify or Amazon. So what we did after that October 11th meeting is we went back and did a little bit more exploration on what those different implementations would look like and re-presented the proposal to the store committee at the November 16th meeting. So what we looked at there was we looked at fulfillment, if we were going to do a centralized fulfillment. What we had realized is it would cost more money upfront and it would take a little more time to get it up and going because we would have to find a staff person location. If every museum did their own fulfillment. They were able to leverage existing temp staff to add up to 10 hours a week to do fulfillment if the sale volume needed it. In terms of website platform, I did a little bit of exploration, looking at the terms of service both for Shopify and Amazon. There's certain requirements in the state. One, specifically, is we have to use a specific payment gateway, which is CyberSource, which allows our website vendor, whatever service we use, not to capture any of the payment information or any of the personal identifying information because the state wants to make sure that that gets retained by the state vendor. Shopify does integrate with CyberSource, but it is not the preferred gateway. They want everyone with any service. They want to leverage their own payment gateway and the incentive is if you use the Shopify pay, you don't have an extra fee that you pay. If you use CyberSource, then there is a transaction fee and a credit card fee also that comes into it. One thing that was very interesting when you look at Shopify and you look at the terms of service, it really is a different paradigm. The state has to give up control and the state's bottom line has a hard time doing that, right? One of the things that I had brought out in our November 16th meeting was a clause in the Shopify terms that said that at any time Shopify has the authority to remove materials. And the materials are your items, right? The items that you have, your description and your photo. They have the absolute authority to do that. Whether they do that or not, the option is there and that's something that is very difficult for state government to allow. If you look at our centralized IT, we can't even download any sort of update ourselves as staff. We have to go to the person who is appointed as the administrator by centralized IT in order to do that to our computers. So because of that reason, and I'm not saying that Shopify is absolutely no, but I'm saying in this pilot phase what we found out is it would be faster for us to implement a contract vendor to do a website using our CyberSource payment gateway. The gateway is already set up. I set that up with the state charger's office earlier this fall, so it's ready to go. After, if you look at the report, in September, after we have our 6 months' sales period, we will put forth a report that talks about the strengths and weaknesses of the website

platform to the board along with all of the sales metrics and the efficacy in terms of using tech staff. For the board to really get a good idea and the store committee to decide, if we're going to change things, we're going to change it then. And I would propose to Jan as the chair of the store committee, that every month during this pilot phase, for the first 3 months we're doing website development and integration with Big Harry Dog [ph 05:59:41] and the following 6 months that we do sales that we have a monthly meeting to report out on what's happening and getting feedback. Because one thing we wanted to do in the pilot phase is we wanted to try things out, minimize our risks, try things out, get our feet wet, and really be able to put forth some metrics to the board so we can make a decision about what we want it to look like moving forward. So if you look at the third page on the bottom, it talks about pilot timeline. There's a 3-month period, January through March, which is website development, propose the website development and BHD integration. During this period, staff in the working group that are working on inventory and metrics and website, they will all be working to either get materials ready to go up, they will take pictures. Inventory subgroup will provide guidance in terms of description, maximum characters, the types of things you should emphasize in your description. The website group will be the sounding board of the website developers, putting things together, sort of a test group to take a look at things, make sure it's working. We will also include functionality for donations and functionality for membership. And I know, Anthony, that you're growing out a whole new program for membership but what we can do is put the functionality in with the notation that it will have to be adjusted based on when membership rolls out. And the goal is to have the website approved by the board at the March meeting, the final product. Feedback if there are changes that the board wants to have make. There's still 2 weeks for the developer to make those changes and for the website to go live, April 1st. So our 6-month selling period will go April 1st of 2023 to September - I said September the 30th, 2023 but maybe it should be August, so then at the September meeting is when we can report out definitively to give the board and staff a good idea of where we're at, where the success is, where things need to be changed, and then really look to the board and the store committee as a full partner in this whole process to articulate the direction moving forward. So looking at that, if you look at the next page, page 4, you'll see that the funding proposal is actually in two parts. One is for website development and BHD integration and it's a total of \$22,250 and that would be evenly split amongst all the participating museums. And it turns out to be \$3,708 and that would be for the entire period until September of 2023. I also suggested that these costs, if approved, actually be approved at a [inaudible 06:02:52] for special projects in each budget account and we not move that money but we expend out of [inaudible 06:02:59] because then that way, it will be easier to track those expenses and be able to identify expenses versus revenue coming in. The second part of this

funding proposal is for merchandise. If you look at the very last page, you'll see that enumerated, listed by museum budget is an amount that the museum has requested for merchandise to carry the online store through the pilot period. And [inaudible 06:03:36] very consistent, has requested \$5,000 except for the Historical Society. They requested \$1,000. So the merchandise request is a total of \$26,000 for all the museums together, and once again, I'll reiterate that. The total costs and requests for website development by a private contractor and the BHD integration is \$22, 250. And with that, Chair, Double Chair Jan and Chair Bob, thank you very much. I am open for questions.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 06:04:15] was looking for your backup material, but I will turn it over to Jan. Questions?

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. Does anybody have any questions?

Dwyer: I do. Doris Dwyer for the record. Daphne, the fact that we set the board meeting on March 9th instead of later in the month has nothing adverse for the development phase? It's enough time -

DeLeon: It should be. [Interposing]

Dwyer: For them to do all that.

DeLeon: That is the requirement. [Interposing]

Dwyer: Because normally you'll probably be a little later in the month but we're doing it on the 9th.

DeLeon: So I originally assumed that the board meeting would be that following week, the [inaudible 06:04:55] So a week from [inaudible 06:04:57]

Dwyer: Okay.

Petersen: It's basically the same.

DeLeon: It is.

Dwyer: Okay, great.

Stoldal: Stoldal for the record. I'm not happy with this proposal. A couple of questions. One is are you saying flat out that we cannot use Spotify because it would be against Nevada law?

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. I'm not saying that, Chair. I did not say that.

Stoldal: So the reason we can't use - I wrote down. You said the primary reason is that [inaudible 06:05:32] is the faster way to do it.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. One, it's a faster implementation because we don't have to get staffing to actually concentrate on this project and explore Shopify to the level that we would need to explore it in order to pass it through and get it approved within state government. So let me clarify because it looks as if I'm not being clear.

Stoldal: So between this board and Myron, we don't have the authority to go to Shopify.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. What I am saying between this store and Myron, there is no authority to implement a software system because it's hooked up to the department and the money flows through the state without getting approval from centralized IT.

Stoldal: But with [inaudible 06:06:27] your proposal, we don't need approval.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. So what we are proposing does not require that extra approval from Enterprise IT [ph 06:06:41] because we are using the payment gateway and we are not seeding [ph 06:06:45] any control in the website. Everything that comes up on the website is going to be decided by state government staff and the board of the state entity, which is the board. If we go to Shopify and we can explore it, we have to make sure that the ability to control. We don't have 100 percent control over the system. Is centralized IT going to be okay with that?

Unknown: [Inaudible 06:07:07] record. If the scenario that we're concerned with is Shopify moving something but not adding anything, they must be doing that, so they have a client that puts up child pornography, they have the right to take something down. I don't know that they're going to like change our website. [Interposing] That, I don't think, is a good example [interposing 06:07:31]

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. I totally understand that, but when you look at the terms of service and it says they have the sole authority to do that, it is going to cause some concern [interposing]

Stoldal: What are we going to put up there that they're going to - I don't think we need to spend a lot of time about that particular thing, but I agree with you. [Inaudible 06:07:55]

Unknown: There might be other reasons. I don't think that's a good example.

Stoldal: The math didn't work out for me starting with the Historical Society. Why they have to pay was it 27 or 37 hundred?

DeLeon: \$33,708.

Stoldal: 33?

DeLeon: \$3,708.

Stoldal: Why they have to pay that [inaudible 06:08:19] Is Catherine online?

Unknown: She's having her [inaudible 06:08:25] done, so she might be -

Stoldal: So how much will they have to generate in sale just to recoup [inaudible 06:08:33]? They're going to have to sell - what's the markup? With a 50 percent markup? Catherine? How much money are you going to have to sell in order to pay back the \$3,300 at the end of this process?

Magee: Catherine Magee for the record. Well, I look at that as the money that's already in the Nevada Historical Society coffers that's controlled by the board. My understanding is that it's an equal amount taken from the seven museums to start up the online store, and I am fully supportive of the online store, getting it up and running. So I look at it as a startup fee.

Stoldal: But the startup fee -

Unknown: She's okay with it.

Stoldal: The startup fee doesn't go away. What's the fee going to be and when you said this ends in September of next year, there's going to be new fee.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. It won't be \$22, 250. It will be a maintenance fee. So you'll have a hosting fee and then you have an annual maintenance fee for the BHD integration.

Stoldal: How much was that?

DeLeon: So the BHD integration was \$1,250 total. The maintenance fee - the monthly posting fee, that depends on the finalized bid. The bids are still coming into me. But if you look at the high end, right? The last proposal we had was \$500 a month. That's the highest that we'll see. It will probably come in lower. So [interposing] No, total.

Unknown: Of all of them.

- DeLeon: Yes. So \$6,000 total for everyone for hosting. That's a high estimate. \$1,250 total [interposing]
- Stoldal: So let's say \$5,000. I mean, [inaudible 06:10:24] for the entire thing spread over the 6 or 7. I [inaudible 06:10:29] happy we can take that back. That money is \$3,300. We can just sort of blow away because it's sitting there. I'm not comfortable with that.
- Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. I think there is going to have to be some startup cost, so I think maybe in hindsight it would have been helpful is to show what - I had gone with Shopify but we weren't building something from scratch. We'd still need to pay someone to implement that. And really what [inaudible 06:11:04] between that and if it's not this, again, versus zero. [Inaudible 06:11:11] Do we have any estimates of what it could have been?
- DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. You know, we did an estimate to look at when we did centralized fulfillment. We would need one store person, one full-time person. And you seem to be on the level of a store manager that we pay for, as example, the position that the board pays for at Carson City State Museum. And that was roughly annualized including benefits full-time, is roughly \$65,000 a year. So if we take that and say we need them for 3 months, we can get an idea what the costs [interposing]
- Schorr: [Inaudible 06:11:53] I might not be asking the question clearly. Apples to apples. \$22,000 is to build a website.
- DeLeon: So no. Clarification. Daphne DeLeon for the recommend. Build a website's \$13,000.
- Unknown: Right. [Inaudible 06:12:08] Whether it's centralized or whether it's decentralized, that would make a difference if we use Shopify or building something from scratch. Where I'm getting hung up is what the cost would have been if we had the same structure, same decentralized structure but using - not building something from scratch. I guess I - Shopify works. It's proven. The MOM Museum uses it [interposing]
- Stoldal: Other museums use it.
- Magee: State museums use it.
- DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. No state museums use it.
- Stoldal: What about county museums and city museums?



DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. Different bureaucracy. Local government and state government [interposing]

Stoldal: I know, but there are a lot of bureaucracies around the country that have more draconian rules than we do and the whole idea of [inaudible 06:13:04] privacy and [inaudible 06:13:06]

Unknown: [Inaudible 06:13:07] for the record. I'm on the [inaudible 06:13:09] transition [inaudible 06:13:11] on technology and [inaudible 06:13:13]

DeLeon: So Daphne DeLeon for the record. I do want to circle back, Seth, to your question about trying to do an apples to apples comparison. So on the fly, when we were talking about apples to apples, we have a cost, \$13,000 to put up the website. Your supposition you had put forth, well, if we had Shopify, we still would need someone to implement it. I would assume that we would need someone full-time for 3 months. Is that a fair assumption?

Schorr: We have to hire a consultant. It's like you're hiring a web developer.

DeLeon: So how - in your experience, how much does it cost?

Schorr: I don't know.

Stoldal: Shopify already has all of these templates that you pick and choose. You don't have to create something from scratch.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. That's true, but you still have to have someone to implement it. So we have no one on staff that has enough time to be that focused to implement a Shopify website. So we would have to hire a consultant to do that. Assuming that we could get it through the state bureaucracy and they said, okay, we're good, we'd use the CyberSource payment gateway, we would not be able to leverage Shopify pay and save in transaction fees, we would not be able to take advantage of their [inaudible 06:14:43] a lot of mechanisms, right? with e-commerce where, hey, I'm going to send it out through social media using your customer list so you can raise awareness of your item. We would not be able to take advantage of that because the state does not want us to leave any personal identifying information with a third party. That's why it gets sucked up into CyberSource.

Schorr: So [inaudible 06:15:03] over the record. What are the transaction fees [inaudible 06:15:10] looking at now?

DeLeon: So the transaction fees that - oh, the system that works with CyberSource? It's our standard that we already are using for on-premise store. So it's .002% that we use per transaction. And with Shopify, I have

to double check. It is not that if we don't use their default. If we use CyberSource, it's higher than that cost.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. I think that's [inaudible 06:15:40] information. If there's a higher [inaudible 06:15:44] then that's definitely critical. I would want to know not what's cheapest to get [inaudible 06:15:59] difference. You know, what's going to be easiest for our limited staff to operate moving forward? And that's just where I get nervous. Because Shopify, it's like it's idiot-proof. It was made for person, individual store owner that's selling candles and does not have an IT staff and that's what it's for. It's tested. It's just - that's why I Shopify. I get nervous if we're trying to do something, is it going to be hard to operate down the road?

Schorr: Well, there's also the other issue too. Shopify is a great marketing tool. Once you get on Shopify, you're there with their search engines and we would have to have our own sort of marketing campaign where there's already a built-in Shopify, you just - like getting on Amazon. You're getting on Shopify. And I think that that's also important. My challenge is I don't see a line by line comparison of the fees or no fees or the opportunities. What I see is a lot of good stuff on this proposed policy and a lot of bad stuff over here, but I don't see the real comparison. That's just me and [inaudible 06:17:19] Any other comments? Anthony.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I just built my own website myself on WordPress. And it's great to build a website, but it's like building a tower. Nobody comes. So the question is I don't know if there's a marketing plan, a marketing budget to go along with this. I mean, I love the idea of having a website and everything, but if you build it, will they come?

Schorr: Yeah, Seth Schorr for the record. I think it's fair to separate the technology development plan and the operating plan. How are we going to operate this, how are we going to fulfill - you know, I think marketing, we should look at separately, and technically, that would be under my purview. And regardless of what system we use, that is something that we're going to have to address. So yeah, I wouldn't want to put that responsibility on the committee [inaudible 00:00:54]

Stoldal: Where do you think it would have a more instant effect and longer-term effect? Shopify or not Shopify?

Schorr: I don't know from a marketing perspective that's going to make a big difference. Seth for the record. I really want to make sure we thought about 9 months from now what's going to be easier, want to change something. Are we calling a consultant or a web dev? I mean, Shopify is [inaudible 00:01:25] You want to change a color, you want to add

something? It's really a simple platform. So I hope we're really thinking about down the road what's going to be easier for [inaudible 00:01:37]

DeLeon: So Daphne DeLeon for the record. I do want to note that Tracey used Shopify at the Neon Museum, so she really has hands-on experience [inaudible 00:01:48]. So Tracey, do you want to share?

Sprague: I think there's a few things. [Interposing]

Unknown: We can't hear you [inaudible 00:01:55]

Sprague: Tracey Sprague for the record. [Inaudible 00:01:58] pricing. That's something we have to also consider because Shopify, at the level we would need it, is not necessarily that cheap. It was like \$300?

DeLeon: I think 99.

Unknown: \$399 [ph 00:02:09] a month, right? So at some point, we would actually have to [inaudible 00:02:12] be more beneficial, right? So we would have less cost, I think, in the long haul. I mean, have more [inaudible 00:02:18] with the [inaudible 00:02:19] website versus Shopify. Yes, in regards to Shopify being somewhat idiot proof, I do agree, but I also have spent a lot of time in there maintaining things, just because it's not always user friendly in some regards. It really isn't. I didn't personally enjoy using it. As somebody who has built websites and has been coding since I was 12, not a fan personally. The other thing we have to consider is that Shopify owns the website. So if anything happens, we end the contract, they end the contract, something happens, then they go out of business. That's it. That website is gone. We no longer have access to it. So we'd be starting up and rebuilding again anyway. So that's something else to consider. I think there's something to say about having something in our own possession that is ours that we can alter ourselves, and it can stay the same way. I mean, you can say change the color really quickly. That actually is a pretty easy fix in regards to that. And actually, most websites, unless they're I would say super tech savvy, we don't have to change it all the time. Like we can have a consistent website that's strong, that will last 5 or 10 years as long as we consider all the things that need to go into it in regards to [inaudible 00:03:36] over-the-top things like, you know, at one point in time I remember Flash was a thing, no longer is, right? You know, JavaScript, still used but not nearly to the extent [inaudible 00:03:46] one point in time. So those are things we have to consider [inaudible 00:03:49] and when we build it. And I'm sure our consultant will be savvy on what trends are, what is a necessary trend, and we can still build something that's strong. But I think as a government institution, do we really want to relinquish something to a third party? That is something we really have to ask ourselves.

Seth Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. It's great that you have that experience, and that's going to be hugely valuable regardless of what platform we use, what approach we take to build it. To be clear, when I say ease of use in changing it, I'm not talking about the architecture of the site but the ability to run promotions, change the inventory, throw specials, [inaudible 00:04:31] just manage the store. If the web developer that we're hiring has built websites that can show example they've done it, it's going to be really easy, great. It's definitely not set it and forget it. And I think we want to be able to make it a -

Unknown: Yeah. I agree. When I say like, I mean like the base side of it. Like you don't have to rebuild the whole structure. Updating is one thing but like rebuilding - we wouldn't have to do regularly.

Stoldal: So the experience, got to answer that question. How many other shop sites have this web designer built?

DeLeon: So I haven't gotten their bid yet. Remember the first - Daphne DeLeon for the record. The first vendor, when I went back to them, to ask them for additional information and to talk to them about contracting because we have a specific state contract, they decided that they didn't want to sign the state contract. So I reached out to two other vendors and I'm waiting for the bids to come back.

Stoldal: Daphne, you'll remember that this person was recommended by those other two people, other two [inaudible 00:05:35], so their credibility with me is not very good if they recommended this guy who we thought was a company and like a lot of entrepreneurs, it's out of his - he's a single person in his living room. Nothing wrong with that, but it's not this big company with all those credits that [inaudible 00:05:55] I started with kind of a little lump in my throat, so -

DeLeon: So Daphne DeLeon for the record. I will note that the person who recommended all of these vendors that I reached out to were ones that they worked with before because they're the BHD integrator. So they've worked with them before to integrate sites, specifically that [inaudible 00:06:20] So that's part of the transaction too, trying to find vendors that will work together smoothly, in a relatively quick period of time. But Myron, did you have -

Freedman: We have additional resources that I mentioned earlier in the Department of Tourism to help with things like marketing and content specialists to integrate social media into our efforts to get people to see that products are being offered, specials in connection with special events, things like that. They're already doing that for Lost City, for example. So they're

excited to do that. So we will have some additional people right away to help with that. And we won't be flying blind with that. And let's get started. Let's get to work on this. It is an investment of \$22,250. In 3 months, we'll have a platform and get started.

Stoldal: Questions from the - anybody from the [inaudible 00:07:34] Internet or Zoom? Seeing none. Any other questions here from the board?

Thielen: [Inaudible 00:07:42] Dan Thielen up here in Carson City. We second the motion of let's get moving on it. [Laughing]

Unknown: Should somebody make a motion so somebody can second it?

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. Are you ready for a motion or is there more discussion needed?

Stoldal: That's my question. It sounds like there's not and so we're now at the point where if somebody wants to make a motion, they can.

Petersen: Well, since I'm the chair of this project, I move that we propose with the online store funding proposal for the pilot period of 6 months.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. I second the motion.

Stoldal: And a question, please, from Anthony.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. I just want to [inaudible 00:08:46] This is coming out of trust funds, right?

DeLeon: Yes.

Timmons: Yeah, okay.

Unknown: Anthony, what was your question?

Timmons: I just want to make sure it was coming out of trust funds. That's my question.

Stoldal: And so when we use the term pilot, it sounds like we would have the option in 6 months to change programs, although I don't think that's the reality. I think in 6 months, we're going to get a report on how well it's working, but we're not going to have a real opportunity to change and say, oh, let's go Shopify. We're going to stay with this program.

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. I would say this. I think that there is an option, but there will be a cost for it, right? Because what we'll lose -

Stoldal: Exactly right. So yes. [Interposing] No, no, no. This is not a 6-month deal. This is the deal that we are solidifying. If we bail out of this deal, it's going to cost us money. So the discussion will be do we really want to lose that money or do we want to stay with the program?

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. I would say this. I haven't started a store, but I've done lots of projects before with different agency. And you do invest in the pilot with the understanding that something that you're getting out of it is a real sense of what you need and what you want and what you can sustain. And sometimes that means that you change direction and the cost for the startup includes moving on to something else. And I would say that, Bob. I would say that. There's nothing that's in my mind that says - and I don't think in a working [inaudible 00:10:19] that comes at the end of the pilot period. If this is not working, we'll know sooner than that because we'll be meeting with the store committee monthly to get updates. We'll need to make changes. And if at some point we need to bail early, then that's totally up to the store committee to put that forth and we can and make a directional change.

Stoldal: Further comments? We got a motion. We have a second.

Timmons: Going through this right now with my website. It's in pilot phase. I'm going through this right now with my website. Anthony Timmons for the record. I understand exactly what we're doing. I'm in pilot phase until January 1st and we'll see how it goes, and if it doesn't work, I pull the plug or change course or do what I want to change. And I'm using WooCommerce, so that's the platform I use, but [inaudible 00:11:06] work with that.

Stoldal: Well, you ought to see my site [inaudible 00:11:09] Alright. We have a motion. We have a second. All those in favor, say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Those opposed?

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:11:23] I don't understand any of this stuff. [Laughing]

Timmons: They'll make it available on flip phones. [Laughing]

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:11:33]

Timmons: Flip phone optimized. [Laughing]

Unknown: Flip a store.

Stoldal: Alright. We'll move on to the next item which is, Seth Schorr, the CNE [ph 00:11:44] tech committee.

Schorr: Okay. Seth Schorr for the record. I'll make this relatively brief. Deal some handouts, which I won't hand out. I'll speak to this. The chair asked me a few months ago to look into our transcription process, service, costs, etcetera, with my understanding that this was based on a little bit of our disappointment in terms of the timeliness, maybe accuracy of some of the transcripts earlier in the year. So having that information, I thought about it a couple of different ways. One, what service we're using, are there some other services or tools that we can use? And then because we've been doing hybrid meetings and probably will have some form of hybrid meetings forever - by the way, before we always had them, we just did it over the phone on a new concept - should we be looking at how the meetings are being, you know, the hardware that we're using in the meetings? So the first thing that I explored were some artificial intelligence software [interposing]

Stoldal: Seth, I need [inaudible 00:13:08] Chair needs to take a break for about 5 minutes.

Schorr: Sure.

Stoldal: Please. So we'll resume -

Unknown: I'll second that.

Stoldal: I resume the Nevada Board of Museums and History for December the 8th. We are now at agenda item 14 [inaudible 00:13:27] committee reports item 14b, standing tech committee report. Seth Schorr, chair. Seth?

Schorr: Alright. Seth Schorr for the record. I [inaudible 00:13:37] I explored some artificial intelligence transcript software. Very, very cool. Very, very affordable. Very, very fast. Unfortunately, not built for hybrid meetings. So if anybody is doing online meetings only, they were amazing. They're nearly 100 percent accurate. The challenge with a hybrid meeting is the AI will [ph 00:14:06] know exactly who the people are online. It can't differentiate all of us who are coming into the same audio [inaudible 00:14:14] so it uses the robot. Probably give it another 5 years, it will have figured out [inaudible 00:14:21] and it will be able to do it. So, unfortunately, that exploration -

Stoldal: [Inaudible 00:14:26] We identify ourselves.

Schorr: Yeah, the AI is - it's still not smart enough to differentiate, even if we say it. Because really the way it's programmed when it's online, it knows what

source they're coming from and that's how it - you know, so it's not quite there yet for hybrid. I think it's something that I'll keep an eye on. I'm certain that someone's going to solve it. Might be Meta, might be any number of technology companies that are very focused on what we're doing, so -

Stoldal: Let me ask you this question, though. Is Zoom recording now?

Schorr: Zoom is recording and Zoom does have an AI feature. It's really for two reasons. One, it offers closed captioning, so it's really - if you think about transcripts, it's actually doing it in real time, whether it's audio [inaudible 00:15:22] or whatever the reason you want closed captioning, and then of course, you can print that as well.

Stoldal: Why can't we use that?

Schorr: [Inaudible 00:15:29] to people in person would come in as one voice. Once again, it would differentiate Harry and Dan and -

Stoldal: But would the transcript would say Fred Johnson identifying himself?

Schorr: It doesn't do that yet. It only -

Stoldal: No, no. I mean, if I'm saying it out loud, it's going to -

Schorr: Oh yes. Yes, that's correct. Yes, that is correct. [Interposing]

Stoldal: So, I mean, why can't we use - I mean, the challenge here is we are not getting transcripts for far too long. I mean, it's really frustrating when we get a transcript 2 months later. I mean, there's got to be a system that does it quicker than that.

Schorr: So I did speak to Daphne and she informed me that there were submissions early on in the year. Our transcript company, Precise Transcripts, dropped the ball. They had a little bit of a mix-up in the charge, which she was able to correct. So acknowledge that there were some issues, but we're going to test them this month. We're going [inaudible 00:16:42] tomorrow's meetings, so [interposing] So we are sticking with the same outfit, right? that we're going to send this transcript to. See if they meet our expectation in terms of time and accuracy. If they don't, then I have identified another - I'm not talking about AI, I'm back to a traditional service called TranscribeMe through [inaudible 00:17:09] I did some research there. [Inaudible 00:17:12] A lot of people use them, major blue chip companies. It's 79 cents per minute. So I think [inaudible 00:17:19] Daphne had informed we spent approximately \$500. It seemed to fit in our budget. So my recommendation is to hold that in our back



pocket. If our current vendor does not meet our expectation for this quarter, then we should at least test out something new.

Stoldal: What are our expectations that we're asking them?

DeLeon: Once we transmit to them, that it's back to us in 2 weeks.

Stoldal: Okay. So back that up. How long does it take to transmit it to them?

DeLeon: It's instantaneous. It's on [inaudible 00:17:54] FTP site. Daphne DeLeon for the record. We push the file through the Internet to an FTP site, and then the vendor brings it down. So Monday, we will transmit and we will let them know the clock starts ticking that day, 2 weeks.

Schorr: Perfect. So 2 weeks -

Stoldal: Monday is -

DeLeon: Monday is the 12th.

Stoldal: 12th? And then so theoretically 7 would be 19 and 7 would be by the 26th which -

DeLeon: Day after Christmas.

Schorr: [Inaudible 00:18:27] Let's see if we can push that.

DeLeon: It might be Christmas present

Unknown: This is a bad time.

DeLeon: And then it does take a couple of days for us to post because we send it to the department, and then staff posts it online. So if we wanted to know when it's actually posted, it will probably take a couple of days after we receive it back from the transcription company to have it posted.

Stoldal: And what does staff do with it?

DeLeon: DTCA staff posts it onto our website.

Stoldal: I mean, does staff read it? Does staff review it?

DeLeon: We do.

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:19:00] And we review it and that takes time too, especially when -

Stoldal: Why do you review it?

Unknown: Huh?

Stoldal: Why do you review it?

Unknown: Well, just to see if there's something super garbled in there and then I can look at my notes and see if I can ungarble it. But yeah, that's it. We're not changing the text or anything that's already there.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. So this transcription service, because I know nothing, is like the closed caption on TV? And it's higher scale than that?

Unknown: Yeah. It's taking what we're saying now and it's transcribing it into a document and it will have our names next to it, who's speaking and that often is wrong too.

Petersen: So there could be funky misinterpretations of words?

Unknown: Yeah.

Schorr: Let's see if they get funky -

Ward: For the record, Harry Ward, deputy attorney general. Sometimes my interpretation - and it might sound funny - but my middle initial is B and when I say Harry B. Ward, sometimes it comes out Harry B. Hard. [Laughing]

DeLeon: So Daphne DeLeon for the record. I would say it's not to the level of [inaudible 00:20:31] but it's a [inaudible 00:20:32] skim. Want to check the quality and want to make sure that if it's garbled, then we also have notes and we might add some clarifying information.

Stoldal: To me, that's a waste of staff time. I mean, if you're going to read a 2-day - spend the time to read 2 days, if the administrative assistant is going to spend the time to read 2 days of a meeting, I think it would be easier to just post that up, and if a board member has a question, would call you. You look at your notes and you say, oh, my notes are garbled too. So, I mean, I'm trying to shorten that time between to get it online and we have access to it.

Dwyer: Doris Dwyer for the record. The people who are transcribing it were not at the meeting, and that alone requires that it is reviewed. I mean, it just seems pretty simple. They weren't at the meeting, so there could be a really serious or embarrassing mistake, kind of like Harry's example. It

needs to be reviewed and it's going to take staff time. It's just the nature of the beast.

Unknown: Mr. Chair.

Stoldal: Yes, please.

Unknown: How much would it cost to [inaudible 00:21:52]

DeLeon: So Daphne DeLeon for the record. On average -

Unknown: Like this meeting, how much would it cost to transcribe?

DeLeon: So for a 2-day recording, approximately \$500.

Unknown: Have you considered using court reporter?

DeLeon: So Precise Transcripts has a statewide contract. So without doing any bids, they have a statewide contract. So without doing any bids, we can just use them directly. And so because they have a statewide contract, we started using them.

Stoldal: But we don't have to use them.

DeLeon: We don't. If they don't work and we want to use TranscribeMe and TranscribeMe is not a statewide contract, we would just do three bids and we would choose the one that you would like to go with.

Stoldal: But where does the money come from to pay for this?

DeLeon: Out of private funds.

Stoldal: So private funds, we have the ability to go to any vendor we want?

DeLeon: Daphne DeLeon for the record. You are correct. That's a good [inaudible 00:22:49]

Unknown: Having practiced law for 44 years, I've read thousands of transcripts over that time, and reading over a 2-day transcript is nothing. I mean, [inaudible 00:23:04] zipping through a transcript pretty darn quick. It doesn't take 2 days to go through a 2-day -

Stoldal: I understand.

Unknown: With all due respect, Dan, I like Bob's suggestion. I'm down with that. [Laughing]

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. We can also have the Zoom AI. I think it's \$29.00 a month. We can still do that as backup if you want to see a transcript right away. I think now this is on our radar. We should just make sure we're looking at all options.

Stoldal: I'm not sure I heard that. You said that we - and we have a Zoom contract. We could add \$29 a month?

Schorr: Yeah. \$29 a month was the monthly fee for one of the AI software and that was integrative with Zoom. I tested it. Myron sent me the audio file - I think it was our last meeting. I uploaded it and he sent it right back within a minute. And it's all done by computer. Clearly, there will be errors and -

Mooney: For the record, Courtney Mooney. But that's without the people in the room.

Schorr: Correct.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. [Inaudible 00:24:21] same thing [inaudible 00:24:23]

Mooney: My issue with that is that - I mean, until that software catches up because not all of us identify ourselves, and when we do, sometimes it's not right off the bat. So sometimes we accidentally start speaking and then we identify ourselves, and because so many of the board members have been doing this for a while, they kind of like speak through it really quickly. So I can see where - to your point, where you said you would hear that, you know, Bob Stoldal for the record, you might say it quickly or you might not say it right away, so it's not going to be as easy as that.

Stoldal: But that's also with any system that we would use. So far, I have had just great luck with Zoom, Zoom transcripts.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. I'll just circulate amongst the board so you can see what it looks like. Seth Schorr for the record. One other thing to consider, since we're doing Zoom, I'm on the Esports Technical Advisory Committee, which is a part of the gaming control board. All [inaudible 00:25:27] meeting laws. And they just post the Zoom on YouTube and it's out there for the world.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. So I noticed like other agencies do the same thing. I'm not sure how to do -

Schorr: Somebody could be recording us right now. [Laughing]

Freedman: So then we would just have the whole thing as a video.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 00:25:52] And for those that want to see if the city of Las Vegas have posted their meeting schedule or their last meeting yesterday, it's now online, and at 9:00 o'clock, they're ready [inaudible 00:26:04] You may want to watch that.

Freedman: Myron Freedman for the record. Maybe a motion for the board is to allow us to explore that because we could talk to some of the other agencies and then go ahead and start posting, if it's possible.

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:26:20] for the record. [Inaudible 00:26:21] take on. However, can I go to my last part? If we're going to put this on YouTube, there is no chance we're going to put that terrible image on YouTube. [Laughing] So this is a perfect example - this is definitely a federal [inaudible 00:26:38] totally inefficiently. It's like the worst thing. [Laughing] I don't know how much money we spent on these TVs and cameras, but they're not laid out right.

Freedman: Now you see why I have to [inaudible 00:26:53]

Unknown: Even I figured that much out.

Stoldal: And I hope you don't think [inaudible 00:27:00]

Schorr: That would be helpful. So it is one of my recommendations. Okay, in all seriousness, as we move to different locations - there is a location like this which has amazing technology or whether we're in a gym that has no technology, every single meeting we're spending time fussing around, trying to figure it out. And it's my suggestion that regardless of where we are, we have the exact same solution. So they make what's called a Meeting Owl. It's a little device that looks like a speaker. It actually has multiple [inaudible 00:27:44] You stick it in the middle of the table and it knows who's talking and it will show, Bob, me. It will show Daphne. Amazing high definition. It's an amazing speaker, so the quality is great, both for recordings and the people online. It's just a really great piece of technology. It's about \$1,200. Not nothing, but it's not - I think it's affordable. It would plug into a computer, so in this case - Myron, you have your laptop. Plug it in, that's what's streaming to Zoom. That solves the recording, the quality of the recording, and it solves giving the viewer at home a great experience, feeling like they're more in this meeting. What it doesn't necessarily solve is people in the meeting seeing people on Zoom, so whether we would just connect an external monitor and see the laptop, that would just be something to consider. But we could have a solution that's fully self-contained, even if we wanted - right now, I'm not sure if you all know, but we're on a hotspot, we're not on their Wi-Fi. We could even

just bring a hotspot with us. So [inaudible 00:28:56] whatever museum doesn't have great Wi-Fi, we can really just [inaudible 00:29:04] same solution, be online right away.

Stoldal: The challenge with that, which I think is a great - is you almost need to be sitting in a circle and it doesn't -

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. It would work with this. It's made for boardroom tables.

Stoldal: I was in one meeting with one of these. It was actually at the end of the table. It wasn't quite this big, but it was at the end of the table. And you saw it. As you spoke, it would turn to look at you and just kept turning around throughout the whole meeting.

Schorr: It will be better than this. Seth Schorr for the record. I Zoomed into our last one. That meeting was a disaster. [Laughing] Respectfully. We have enough to worry about [inaudible 00:29:57] technology [inaudible 00:29:58]

Stoldal: Well, and the opportunities, that we are trying to transform these meetings as well as the business of this meeting at a board meeting, also to make sure that we understand each of the museum facility and have time to visit each one of those facilities. That means we're not necessarily going to go into high-depth location where there's already a fantastic system, though something like what you're suggesting we can bring along. If there's already an existing system that we look at, this is perfect, no it's not, then we can use this system. I think this is a great idea for something [inaudible 00:30:39] in Carson City. That's nothing on the staff because staff was told that that was a fantastic site and we all realized, despite all the efforts that Daphne was making to bring everybody positioned in awkward spot, to get the sound out. This thing - we could just plug this puppy in, plug it into computer hotspot and go forward.

Petersen: Jan Petersen for the record. This is probably as good as it's going to get.

Stoldal: Although it is kind of weird. This is really a weird [inaudible 00:31:16] [Laughing]

Unknown: I feel like [inaudible 00:31:19]

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:31:20] [Laughing]

Mooney: Courtney Mooney for the record. What happens when people talk over each other with the Owl? Doesn't it like kind of [inaudible 00:31:33]

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:31:34]

Stoldal: Well, the answer is yes, but we all, just like you learn on Zoom, you want to wait until that person is finished [inaudible 00:31:45] You can't talk over each other, so it's more kind of a [inaudible 00:31:50] You're right. I've seen it. [Inaudible 00:31:54]

Unknown: How [inaudible 00:31:56] I don't know if we've learned that [inaudible 00:31:58]

Stoldal: People are getting better on Zoom.

Unknown: We're getting better but -

Unknown: So for transcribing the recording, though, is it like transcribing a Zoom recording? Is that what we're doing?

Schorr: So I want to separate the hardware from the transcription. So I think the Meeting Owl that I'm suggesting, it's going to [inaudible 00:32:23] another web camera and microphone that happens to be self-contained and you put it in the middle of the room as opposed to trying to find that perfect location. So I think the hardware is just an upgrade. Those make the experience better no matter what transcription software we're using. I'm actually not suggesting we abandon the old school transcription, whether it's Precise or TranscribeMe, I think for the reason that I said I don't know that the AI is quite there yet. What I was suggesting earlier was I would just go run it just so you can see it, just out of curiosity, I mean, in addition, and then maybe we -

Stoldal: So the answer is it would just be, if we purchase this - I'm hoping somebody will make a motion to do that - that it would transcribe just like any others [inaudible 00:33:17]

Unknown: So we send the recording off to the transcription service.

Stoldal: Well, yes, except if it's a Zoom transcription. It's occurring almost instantaneously.

Schorr: Yes. Seth Schorr for the record. The Owl is still [inaudible 00:33:30] as the Zoom. All it's doing is replacing that camera or like in Carson City that had the cameras [inaudible 00:33:38] around, it's just a better version of that. And we happen to have this external mic, which was lucky. It just has a great mic that just picks up sound from everywhere.

Unknown: Mr. Chairman, I have to go. [Inaudible 00:33:52]

Stoldal: Oh. Got you. It's starting to get dark. It's dark in Boulder City before [inaudible 00:33:58] But I think that was it. And we look for a motion if we want to approve.

Unknown: Do we still have a quorum? Jan's out of the room and Dan's leaving.

Stoldal: [Inaudible 00:34:09] 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Bob Ostrovsky. Now we have Michelle. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. We would have seven. You staying for 2 seconds?

Unknown: Sure.

Stoldal: Or if you want to give me your vote.

Unknown: How about if we hear the motion? Nobody's made a motion yet.

Stoldal: Do you want to make a motion, Seth?

Schorr: Oh. I'd love to make a motion to purchase an Owl web conference solution.

Mooney: I second. Courtney Mooney for the record.

Stoldal: Okay. And this is item 14b2. Report of improvement options and possible action. So all those in favor, say "aye."

Group: Aye.

Stoldal: Michelle? Aye. So that's 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 - who are we missing here?

Unknown: Jan's in the hallway. But we have enough. I mean, we have a quorum.

Unknown: [Inaudible 00:35:27] with Michelle.

Stoldal: Okay. Alright.

Unknown: I think everybody approved it, didn't they?

Stoldal: Those opposed? Motion carried unanimously with the chair voting with those [inaudible 00:35:38] Thank you.

Unknown: That will be exciting to see how that -

Stoldal: You know what? It is now 4:19. I think coming up, we've got Bob Ostrovsky's report, which we will take tomorrow morning at 9:00. And then after that, we will go for museum reports. I may move up a couple of items to fill in the time between 8:00 and 9:00 o'clock.



Unknown: But we are starting at 8:00?

Stoldal: Starting at 8:00 o'clock.

Unknown: Yeah, okay.

Stoldal: So we are formally adjourned for the day and thank you all for a very productive day.

Unknown: It was.

