

**Meeting Minutes**  
**BOARD OF MUSEUMS AND HISTORY**  
**December 3, 2015**

Location  
**Nevada State Museum**  
**Special Events Room, 02-27**  
**309 S. Valley View Blvd.**  
**Las Vegas, NV 89107**

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Robert Stoldal, Chairman  
Brian Allison  
Dr. Alicia Barber  
Renee Diamond  
Pete Dubé  
Dr. Doris Dwyer  
Robert Ostrovsky  
Seth Schorr  
Anthony Timmons

**BOARD MEMBERS EXCUSED**

Dr. Sarah Cowie  
Dan Markoff

**DEPARTMENT OF TOURISM AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS, DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES STAFF PRESENT**

Peter Barton, Division of Museums and History, Administrator  
Carrie Edlefsen, Division of Museums and History, Administrative Services Officer  
Lauri Brown, Division of Museums and History, Administrative Assistant  
Sarah Bradley, Deputy Attorney General  
Claudia Vecchio, Dept. of Tourism & Cultural Affairs, Director  
Felecia Archer, Dept. of Tourism & Cultural Affairs, Public Information Officer  
Dennis McBride, Nevada State Museum Las Vegas, Museum Director

**STAFF PRESENT BY PHONE**

Rebecca Palmer, SHPO, State Historic Preservation Officer  
Sheryln Hayes-Zorn, Nevada Historical, Society, Museum Director  
Greg Corbin, Nevada State Railroad Museum, Museum Director  
Wendell Huffman, Nevada State Railroad Museum, Curator

---

Stoldal: For the Nevada Board of Museums and History for our first two-day meeting, December the 3rd.  
Has this meeting been properly posted?

Rabe: It has.

Stoldal: Please call the roll.

Rabe: Robert Stoldal?

Stoldal: Here.

Rabe: Bryan Allison?

Allison: Here.

Rabe: Alicia Barber.

Barber: Here.

Rabe: Sarah Cowie. No. Renee Diamond?

Diamond: Present.

Rabe: Pete Dube?

Dube: Here.

Rabe: Doris Dwyer.

Dwyer: Here.

Rabe: Daniel Markoff? No. Robert Ostrovsky?

Ostrovsky: Here.

Rabe: Seth Schorr?

Schorr: Here.

Rabe: Anthony Timmons.

Timmons: Here.

Stoldal: Do we have a quorum?

Rabe: We have a quorum.

Stoldal: Great, thank you. Item number three, public comment. Public comment is welcomed by the Board. A period of public comment will be allowed after discussion of each item on the agenda, but before voting on the item. Because of time consideration the period of public comment for each speaker may be limited to three minutes at the discretion of the Chair.

The speaker is urged to avoid repetition of comments made by a previous speaker. Do we have anybody that would like to address the Board? I thought we had somebody that had come in.

Speaker: And Mr. Chairman, I don't know who's on the phone. We do have folks on the phone.

Stoldal: Who's on the telephone please?

Speaker: [inaudible 00:01:29]

Palmer: Rebecca Palmer and Jim Bertolini from the State Historic Preservation Office.

Stoldal: Welcome. And I heard Carey?

Barton: I think it was Sarah Cowie.

Speaker: No, I think it was Sherry.

Barton: Sherry? Sherry, try that again, we didn't hear you.

Sherry: Sorry about that. Sherry with the Nevada Historical Society  
[inaudible 00:01:49].

Barton: Okay, your phone is a little weird on that end, but okay, thank you.  
Item number four is acceptance of the Minutes for possible action of our September the 11th, 2015 meeting. Any discussion? Any changes? Mr. Barton?

Barton: Mr. Chairman, for the record, Peter Barton, and I would ask again that everyone get in the absolute routine of identifying yourself. If you've reviewed the minutes say speaker, speaker, because the transcriber had no idea who was speaking at the time.  
We do have a copy of the full transcription of minutes. There is a new transcription service, so they look a little different. But I wanted to Mr. Chairman, just raise that member Sarah Cowie pointed out a mistake on page 53, which she provided the correction, and we will insert that correction into the minutes.  
The word - it was - it reads, I just wanted to add my angst, it was actually what she said, I just wanted to add my thanks, not angst. But we'll make that correction.

Stoldal: Renee Diamond.

Diamond: I found this much easier to manage, maybe it's my age and eyesight, but this was much easier to read as printed in our Board books then all the detail or lack thereof that's been for the last six months.  
So I think everybody who led to this deserves a "at a boy or girl".

Stoldal: Any other comments? Hearing none, look for a motion.

Ostrovsky: Move for approval of the Minutes as amended.

Schorr: Second.

Stoldal: I have a motion and we have a second.

Barton: And could you identify yourself please?

Ostrovsky: Oh, Bob Ostrovsky.

Barton: Bob Ostrovsky made the motion.

Schorr: And Seth Schorr seconded it.

Barton: Thank you.

Stoldal: Further comments? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye? [ayes around], those opposed - motion carries.  
Item number 5 is the calendar for the next meeting. We have a meeting based on the last meeting for March the 11th of next year, to meet at the Nevada State Railroad Museum in Carson City. Any discussion or changes in that? Hearing none, that will stand.  
5B, June 2016 consideration for a date and a venue. Is there a reason to meet in the north again in June?

Edlefsen: Carrie Edlefsen for the record. Except for the fact that it's the budget approval meeting, there is a lot

of extra items to carry for a long distance, but that would be the only thing that would I think for us, would be - becomes an issue.

Stoldal: Other questions or thoughts?

Speaker: I could drive it out to Ely. We always want to go in the summer you know, like we always - we never want to go to Ely in the winter. So we always...

Speaker: We like Ely.

Speaker: I mean it's a long drive either way, you know it's very - but I haven't been out there in ages, but it sounds interesting.

Stoldal: So we have Ely as the - a second choice, what's our first?

[Laughter]

Stoldal: Well, generally we have...

Speaker: Well, [inaudible 00:05:37] at Boulder City, did I miss one?

Stoldal: No, I mean Boulder City is due, but again it's a...

Speaker: Oh that's the [inaudible 00:05:49] yes.

Stoldal: We generally have reserved - the June meeting is in Carson City for one, because of budgets. We're open, I mean what - anybody else have a - Pete.

Dube: Sure. I'd like to make a motion that we hold the June Board meeting in Ely. We've never gone, at least since I've been on the board, I mean it's time to go out there so, if it doesn't pass, I can live with it but I make a motion that the June Board meeting be in...

Dwyer: I'll second that. Doris Dwyer.

Stoldal: Okay, so I'm about to [inaudible 00:06:25] that one of your offered...

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, this is Bob Ostrovsky for the record. Do we have a budget cost for that travel?

Edlefsen: To travel to Ely, we have not generally put something together for that. We usually put together the airline tickets for the cost north and south. Off the top of my head it would seem to be that the cost that would be associated with the mileage to get there would probably equal the cost of the plane tickets of anybody flying north and south.

Something else to be considered is the fact that that is a two-day meeting. So not only are we going to have the two days of the Board meeting, but we're also going to have to anticipate the drive time from both northern - the northern side and the southern side, which would also you know add per diem costs and that.

Ostrovsky: For the record, Bob Ostrovsky. We can make an adjustment in the budget if we have to, if we decide that's what we want to do, right.

Edlefsen: Yes - Carrie Edlefsen, yes.

Ostrovsky: If we have to stay overnight two nights.

Edlefsen: Absolutely. And something else to know. In the last few years SHPO has been able to provide support for Board travel. And unfortunately they weren't able to provide that support this year.

So the Board is traveling on its own Board investment expenditures or costs.

Stoldal: Well, and the issue is it's been several years since we've been to Ely, and the same challenges that face us each year, and sometimes you add in the weather as a challenge. Renee?

Diamond: Do we have a date for that meeting?

Stoldal: June, that would be the second Thursday in June would be the 9th.

Diamond: Okay.

Edlefsen: I'm going to guess that's already a two-day meeting, that extra travel time might make it less with Ely. I mean it could also be a September meeting. September the weather in Ely is usually okay.

Barton: And Mr. Chairman, if I may, if we're going to do a two-day meeting in Ely, let's not do it Thursday, Friday, because that compels staff to travel on Saturday, which is overtime for most of these folks.

Stoldal: Well, and either - the reality that we're having most of our meetings maybe two days or a day and a half, as it is, as we move forward, there are lot of issues and things we have to deal with.

Certainly, the March issue - the March meeting could very well be two days as well. So the length of the meeting. What's the drive from Ely back to Reno, Carson.

Barton: Five hours.

Stoldal: Roughly, the same thing to Las Vegas, another five or six hours.

Speaker: I'll bet you could do four from Vegas.

Speaker: Maybe for a year we would to Vegas to shop and it was four hours. I don't know maybe - I don't speed, but...

Speaker: Okay, it sounds about right.

Speaker: I don't know.

Stoldal: Renee?

Diamond: For the record, Renee Diamond. We have a lot of new Board members that have never been to Ely. And I think it needs to be a priority that the expense needs to be secondary. Convenience for staff needs to be first, do it, and I'm sure our skilled person down at the end will find the money for it.

Stoldal: Well if you drive - the issue of lugging this stuff on airplanes is not there.

Diamond: Well, it's not a bad drive. It's from here four and a half hours.

Stoldal: So the only issue then would be that the meeting would be held on June - Wednesday, June the 8th, and Thursday the 9th.

Vecchio: This is Claudia for the record. Could we check and see when there is - I'm trying to find the White Pine County meetings. There are a couple of them that happened in June of 2015. They don't have their 2016 schedule, but it might be a good opportunity for you all to meet with the White Pine County people for what that partnership is you know we just signed a [inaudible 00:10:45] contract, so that might - we may have to see if they have a date in June where some [inaudible 00:10:52] can meet.

Stoldal: Well, let's have this as a two-parter. Let's first vote on whether or not we want to meet in Ely, and then if would be the week of June - well, it would whenever that meeting.

When was the last one? Do you remember when the last one...

Vecchio: It was like June 16th, and then there was a Commission meeting in July. But they don't have their 16 calendars, so it might that we could say you know - we could impact that meeting.

Stoldal: Would you like to - the motion was to hold the meeting in Ely, and that was no date specific, just the June meeting. So let's go ahead and vote on that. All those in favor say aye, [ayes around]. Those opposed - all right the motion carries unanimously.

And we know it's going to be - not going to be a Thursday or a Friday. It would likely have to be a Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. So the staff didn't have to drive on a weekend.

I don't know if we need a motion but can - as soon as we can determine if it's viable to meet - coordinate that meeting with the June meeting of the Ely's of the Sitting Council of the County, White Pine County.

Speaker: It's White Pine County isn't it? There's a couple...

Barton: Yes, Peter Barton for the record. The contract that Claudia is speaking to is our partnership contract that includes the City of Ely and the White Pine Heritage Railroad Foundation.

Speaker: So it would be City of Ely. All right, well we'll just check on it.

Stoldal: Well, I'm sure that they would be able to - all right, Pete do you have anything?

Dube: We had a motion that the meeting be the 8th and 9th of June? And if we find out something else, we can always vote on it at the next meeting.

Stoldal: Fine, if there's enough, okay. We have a motion to have it - the meeting on the 8th and 9th which is a Wednesday, Thursday. Do we have a second?

Diamond: Second, Renee Diamond.

Stoldal: Further discussion?

Speaker: That is the last day of school in our school district. So I don't know, sometimes that's - sometimes there's activities with our children, that's just the 9th, June 9th. So I don't really know, but there might be something that I'd want to be attending, but that's neither here nor there.

Stoldal: Okay. We have a motion, we have a second, further discussion?

Barton: Who made that motion?

Speaker: Pete.

Barton: And who seconded it?

Speaker: Renee.

Barton: Okay.

Stoldal: Hearing none, all those in favor say aye, [ayes around], those opposed - all right, great motion.

The next item is 5C. In your Board binder there is a proposed preliminary agenda. This is item 5C is consideration for scheduling a Board Planning retreat, a draft agenda, a section of a facilitator and expenditure of private funds that cover the cost.

Bob, do you want to walk us through a little bit of this?

Ostrovsky: Yes. Well, you'll recall we've talked about this at the last couple of meetings. We talked about at this meeting, trying to make some decision about what the agenda, when it should be held, where it should

be held, those issues, and included in your Board packet is a proposed preliminary agenda, we're talking - we'd really love to open for discussion, this is purely a draft document. I don't think - Peter, was it shared with anyone other than you and I until this came out.

Barton: Correct.

Ostrovsky: Peter and I worked on this together and we probably should with this agenda hoping that we get feedback, so we could adopt this as a proposed agenda with whatever changes we would like.

So I would like to - the idea is long range, that it would review the capital needs, discussion of future museum sites, and there are some that we already know about that may or may not develop with just the prison for example.

A review of our capital resources, how to bolster museum attendance, what our relationship should be with other institutions, the role of museum stores, the structure of the division itself, is it appropriate.

The structure of the Board whether it's appropriate or not. I know that the structure is set in statute, that doesn't stop us from asking the governor's office to think about changing the composition of the board and increasing, or leaving it just the way it is. But I don't think we talk about those broad issues in our regular meetings.

What's the appropriate use of the dedicated trust fund? You'll see today now that the trust fund is going to exceed between what we have invested, and what's in the Treasurer's office over two million dollars. We've never, ever reached those kind of numbers before.

What's really the appropriate use of those [inaudible 00:16:59]? Should we be doing more with them? Should we be holding them in reserve? How can any - and then I added an item here approving the efficiency of the Board meetings.

Are our agenda proper? Are - should we be doing things a different way. You know a lot of - a lot of groups and institutions use consent calendars for example to accept certain items. Should we be using a consent calendar? I don't know.

And those are just ideas about - you know where we should - what we should do over the next ten years. It's long-term. I see this as a jumping off point for the creation of our - of our committee to look for major donors, you know we've talking about that committee. We haven't met, because I don't have a vision to take to a donor.

You know it's one thing to ask the donor to fund a traveling exhibit or a temporary exhibit. But when we got to major fund donors, what are we selling? Are we just saying well we just continue to run our institutions, we need extra money? Or are we saying we have a vision for what the institution should like five and ten years, and if you want to be part of that vision, here's how you can help us. Here's how we can help you. Is there some relationship there?

So I thought getting this kind of a meeting off the ground. And then we need to discuss the other items, how to pay for it, who should run it, how it should be organized, where it should be. I'd like to start with the agenda and see if people have feedback on these agenda ideas.

And Mr. Chairman, we can take a moment of your time, or we can take people's view of the whole concept of this agenda. Is it appropriate for what we had in mind.

Stoldal: Before - a couple of ideas, as I'm going through this list, which is a great list, a couple of thoughts one is - and these are some minor, minor points, from day one, where you've got statutory mandate jobs, but we've got to include assistant court policies in that. Because that also operates how we operate the PowerPoint presentation.

I was also thinking on a bigger thing is to begin day two with strategies to increase interest and [inaudible 00:19:32] that sounds like something that should be discussed at the beginning of the day, rather than at the end of the day, and I think we should also combine a possible review of future museum sites with - relationships with other institutions. I think those two thing dovetail - connect with each other and so we take strategies and move that to the beginning of day two, we can move relationships which is - and the review of possible museum future sites together at the end of the first day, that's more of a vision kind of thing.

And when we define Southern Nevada, are we basically saying south of Tonopah?

Ostrovsky: Well, that's - this is Bob Ostrovsky, but that's kind of my concept. But I put some of them in here, because I think we need to have a discussion for example, whether or not we should focus for example on expanding and improving the Boulder City Railroad Museum, whether that should be the priority for the next 10 years, or should we be looking for some other museum site for some other type of museum. I mean that's the kind of discussion I think we should have.

My idea of Southern Nevada is south of Tonopah, but - well we can limit it to Clark County if you want and say and then the rest of the state.

Stoldal: So it's really a possible review of future sites and expansion of existing.

Ostrovsky: Yes, that's the kind of discussion I'd like to have, or maybe the descriptor isn't good enough. I'd really have to go and ask our legal counsel whether or not in this kind of an open discussion planning meeting, where you don't know what's going to be talked about specifically, do you need to identify that, to that detail.

Speaker: Well, I think you want to do your best to be clear and complete. So I mean if we're talking about future museum sites, the way it's written, I was thinking it meant new, you're going to talk about new possible ones. So you might want to just add it in there. Review of future and you know discuss expansion and existing or something like that. That way it's clear.

Ostrovsky: Expansion of existing. Okay.

Stoldal: So exactly it could be a whole [inaudible 00:21:54] anything could be said with [inaudible 00:21:55] and whether an expansion of that and I'm sure that some issues and opportunity with Indian Hills. So there are other possible expansion sites around the state that could be... Seth?

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. As a new member I think this is a great process and a great agenda for a 10-year plan. But at first glance, it just seems a little daunting and really to talk about the strategy of a new museum in 30 minutes, almost - I don't know that it would be as effective. It almost seems like that should take an entire day, or half a day. Maybe, we're just trying too much in this agenda.

Ostrovsky: This is Bob Ostrovsky. I agree, I mean I think the agenda is quite aggressive, I didn't know - at times we're just sort of best guesses, trying to contain it.

Barber: This is Alicia Barber. Yes, I mean I think if that item is kind of about prioritizing but also updates of what's actually happening. Because when it comes to the prison there's a whole other series of meetings happening regarding the prison right now. So we wouldn't have to be the ones hashing all of that out I guess. It would sort of be in the context of the different institutions, I guess that we have or something, so we don't feel like we have to take on so much in discussing it.

You know I mean I think there are a lot of - you know there's a Stewart Indian School discussion happening. There's a Nevada State Prison happening, these ideas about expansion are happening with our reflection storage committee.

So maybe at least it's a time to bring together the conversations about all those a little bit.



Schorr: That's makes sense, Seth Schorr for the record. I guess you know in looking at this agenda I see two important and concurrent things that we're trying to get accomplished. And one is what is our vision for expanding membership, making sure that we have money, raising money?

And then there's the structure, the structure of the Board. And as Robert said we you know want to add members or change the structure of this, it seemed to be like two separate things that maybe could be different meetings possibly.

I would hate to see our time diluted is my only concern.

Stoldal: The one thing that struck me reading this over three or four times is that this is great for planning, taking it - well, we have some immediate issues that we have to resolve now, quickly, meaning the next six to 24 months, or 36 months from a storage perspective. We've got facilities that have deferred maintenance that's been going on, has been deferred for too long, including the Southern Nevada Historical Society. We've been asking for those shelves that we fixed, until we finally got an OSHA violation and [inaudible 00:24:43] all that.

So I think that we need to have something that is for the short term, meaning the next 36 months, and then a longer term [inaudible 00:24:52] to deal with some of those things, and then we get back to I think what Seth is saying. This is a week-long meeting. I mean there's a lot of topics.

The issue of the museum Board has been ongoing opportunity for quite a while. This Board is made of really two boards, one through the State and one through the Federal government. And the Federal government has specific positions that have to be filled, architectural historian, etc., etc. Not to say that those folks are not capable of raising money. It's more of an academic.

So half of our Board comes really [inaudible 00:25:37] from the academic side. Do we need to create - separate the two functions and create a museum Board that has a large part of its makeup is fundraising? That's what would it be dedicated to that we bring those people on board that have the skills or the ability to bring in or raise those funds.

So I think that that - you're right, that could be a whole another different discussion, but I think it is probably separate from some of these other things, although it could have an impact on how we move forward.

Diamond: So Renee Diamond. So we haven't had a long-range planning for a Board retreat for I don't remember how long. The last one I can remember was in downtown Reno in whatever that hotel was.

Stoldal: There was one in Lake Tahoe, but I think it was the late 80s.

Diamond: That was before [laughter] - yeah, it isn't that I can't remember last Tuesday. I really can't remember how long ago we had it.

So I see two things happening, kind of the way we all deal with our lives. Storage is an issue here and now, that's going to be one thing that has to be dealt with at Board meetings.

But then there is the long-term issue of storage with a capital S for the rest of time in terms of its relationships. And in terms - those things for the long term it seems to me are what you do at a retreat.

Short term we have to do it every time we have a Board meeting, we're going to be talking about it. The thing that concerns me is what do we do if we can't finish this ambitious agenda? Do we have something we write into it that says if we can't finish in the time that we have, not just the time that's written here, but the time we have that we'll do it again next year and take up those issues.

We, I think have to have some forward thinking process related to this.

Stoldal: I would suggest that we need to have something done well in advance of the next session of the legislature. I think that we have to have not that our action is not - we have to define our action - our relationship with the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs is largely positive to Claudia and Peter.

But you're the head of that Agency, that Department. And it's no secret because they've said it at the meeting, there is some angst amongst some Board members on the Department of Tourism of funding this agency, this part of their - they don't like the transfers.

They don't like the transfer to the Stewart Indian School, so there is some lobbying beginning to change that - change our relationship with the Department of Tourism [inaudible 00:29:16] the next session, whether it says we're not or - I don't know, but there is some word that one legislator got back to me and said there's some discussion going on. That's it.

I think for all the right reasons and we can decide what we want to be in order to present that to the Governor. He needs to - the executive branch needs to have some better ideas. I think it's incumbent upon us at this juncture to move relatively quickly on this and come up with an agenda that we know we can handle within a couple of days. And a lot of that work will be -should be done ahead of time.

We talked about hiring a facilitator, somebody that would go in and start gathering up all the information and then out of that, maybe we can come up with the proper agenda. Alicia.

Barber: Alicia Barber for the record. Yes, and in light of that, I mean thinking about these immediate needs and the upcoming legislative session, which will be here before we know it, two things that I - I don't know if they fit in the categories you already have here, or if they're things that would just come out during the course of discussions.

But I want to really understand better - we talked a lot about public/private partnerships as that being a partial solution for some of our long-standing financial problems. What does that mean? Who would be the private partners? How would that work legally?

What are some options we should be thinking about, you know if it's Indian Hills, or if it's something else - I guess I want to underscore public/private partnerships more.

And then the second thing I want to understand is how can we directly as Board members, even though of us are from academic backgrounds and don't really do a lot of fundraising, I think we need to do - I think we need to learn how to do it, and also learn how to talk with the legislature directly.

And I don't know how to do that. I don't know that works either, this whole thing about testifying and going in with the legislature and having more of a relationship. And if I could understand those two things a lot better before we go into the next legislative session, I feel like I would be better armed with possibly, you know solutions, how do we talk about these things, practical issues to bring up.

So I don't know if those could fit in this, or if we really just need to be talking about those in Board meetings over the course of the next year.

Stoldal: Someone has to do the leadership, or how the executive branch expects the departments to respond. Some Governors say you tow the line, this is the budget, don't ask for anything more. And you could be asked, and you can testify, but don't be proactive in doing your own lobbying. We come from the executive branch, you hold the line on this.

I don't know what this Governor seems to be pretty open to discussion. I don't see any hard and fast rules from him, but who knows what the next session is going to be.

Ostrovsky: And Mr. Chairman, just from a historical background, I've worked with the legislature a long time. We have an opportunity, I think, we have a Governor now who is probably as much or more interested

in history and the museum function, as any Governor that we've had in my you know 30, 40 years hanging around the legislature.

So but I think you're right, we need to take to the executive branch, the governor and his staff our vision, and what that means for the budget, and what support we need, because I think we have that opportunity, but Mr. Stoldal is right, there are some Governors that have said you physically can't even go in the legislative building. It's been that strong.

I send my budget people in, and you can show up on your budget hearing day, and answer yes and no, and that's the end of it. So I don't know where the Governor is on that, but - so the first step is to sell the Governor, but to do that, we have a very short period of time. The Governor's budget will get you know - start getting cast in stone by August, and by December, it is cast in stone.

Stoldal: That's right. So maybe we can just sort of back into this, and pick a date. I mean it can't be probably any later - well, we just picked our June meeting in Ely. Our off-site continued planning meeting probably needs to be in the early Spring.

Barton: Mr. Chairman if I might, and this is great discussion around the table, thank you all for the input, and Peter Barton for the record.

I'd urge we do follow what you've just recommended that this be sooner than later. I mean the public that the capital improvement project request, if we're going to influence that program, that's over by April 1st.

So you know we're already on the back end of that, in terms of getting this done. But I would think that maybe the next logical thing to do is suggest the date, and then try to pick a facilitator.

There was a recommendation that I had made to Vice Chair Ostrovsky that we look at Kendell Hardin, she's in Las Vegas. She runs the Idea Factory, has done hundreds of these plans quite literally.

She just worked - I sit on the Carson City Cultural Commission and she just helped us craft the Carson City Cultural Plan going forward. She's worked in museums, she worked for many, many years in Florida at a number of museums.

She understands the process of planning, facilitating meetings. I think we need to pick a facilitator, suggest a date and get this in front of her and see - I mean let's be guided by a professional in terms of how we structure this.

But certainly the issues of funding, moving toward self-sustainability, I have a hunch we're going to hear more about that from the Governor's office, specific to cultural entities and the parks in Nevada, moving us to a more sustainable future, less reliant on public, public funding sources.

So with all that in mind, you're right, I mean by August the budget is cast in clay, but by this time in December next year, it's a done deal.

Stoldal: That's right, the Governor is suggesting that the Casinos be...

Vecchio: No.

Barton: No, no.

[crosstalk and laughter]

Stoldal: Because all that room tax revenue goes to funding their business.

Vecchio: Not quite, so this is Claudia. So that Peter is referring a strategic plan that the Governor's office is now like initiating, and through input from cabinet members and others there is a number of stretch

goals that are currently in this very early draft.

One of them is that state parks and cultural institutions will be self-sustaining. But we don't really know what that means and how that all works and how - what the vision is for that. And again, it's just in the early stages.

We've put together some thoughts on how that could potentially be successful, but that's - we're just starting out on that process.

And then my second quick point is that statutorily the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs and the Tourism Promotion Fund which is the 3/8ths of one percent of lodging tax that funds us is therefore the purpose of Tourism and the Department.

So while the Commission is looking at how the transfer dollars are spent and to make sure that they spent most efficiently and for those revenue generating sources that make sense in a revenue-generating sort of an environment, statutorily we need to benefit the Department.

So the greater scrutiny is going to come from funds that go outside the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, but certainly making sure that every dollar that we all spend is done so in the most effective manner.

Stoldal: This is the Department of Tourism and...

Vecchio: Cultural Affairs.

Stoldal: And Cultural Affairs.

Vecchio: Right.

Stoldal: Sometimes that other part gets sort of left off the definition.

Vecchio: Well, it depends if you're talking about funding or if you're talking about programming. It does sort of nail words together.

Ostrovsky: Well, Mr. Chairman, this is Bob Ostrovsky. It leads to big issues.

Stoldal: Yes.

Ostrovsky: If you really want to toward self-sustainability off in the future somewhere, then you know we need to do a lot of work on increasing interest, bolstering museum attendance, improving the experience, because if you're going to charge more, or you're going to do things that can raise more funding, you can't do it a mining exhibit that was built I don't know how many years ago in Carson City.

Stoldal: Nor can you do it, if you've got a statute that requires everybody under the age of 18 being free.

Ostrovsky: Well, we can talk about that.

Stoldal: You know we're not Cirque du Soleil but we can start charging \$75 for train rides, and no more genealogy review that you paid - no more making silver coins for the legislature for next to nothing. There are a lot of ways to - I just needed to get that on the system.

[laughter]

Vecchio: And that discussion actually is happening across all agencies. There are a lot of things that are now provided, because on the freeze basis that everybody wants to eradicate, so I think that conversation will have a lot of traction.

Stoldal: So the question for us is, is our off site meeting, do we deal with this head on, the challenge that's

brewing within the - within State Government to become self-sustaining.

Is that the topic of our - Renee Diamond.

Diamond: Renee Diamond for the record. So I've been through a few of state reorganizations from Governor Miller's condensing of certain agencies and renaming agencies, redirecting agencies to the latest rumors.

And I think we're getting ahead of ourselves, until we see an official direction from this Governor, which then has to get through the next unknown legislature, I think that this particular retreat should be about what we see as our vision, but more importantly I think that it's partly a Board orientation retreat.

So then it has to be instructive. I like Peter's idea of a professional person, but nowhere in here did Kendell Hardin, did I see her understanding the State structure of financing museums, the current structure, and dealing with legislatures.

I mean the fact that she did something for Carson City and is a good facilitator is different from understanding State government.

For those of us that have been around way too many years, what we brought to the table is understanding State government in the 80s and 90s, and our ability to control the fact that we go to a party, and we see State legislators, how much is it proper for us as Board members to deal with them. That's something that many of our newer members don't know, and haven't had experience with.

It's about a 20-minute learning process, and then a lot of self-control. I'm not big on either one, so you know for me it was a big leap.

But I think we're being too ambitious for too short a time. If you told me it was a five-day retreat, I'd say perfect. I like Peter's idea if Kendell Hardin understands the political realities of our day-to-day life, I one would like to know does she have an hourly rate? Do we know what it is? Is it a standard rate that everybody charges, or have we not gotten that far?

Barton: We have not - this is Peter Barton for the record. We have not gotten that far, unless you - have you Bob communicated with her at all?

Ostrovsky: No. I've been waiting for this meeting. This is Bob Ostrovsky. I was waiting for some feedback, before I reached out to anybody.

Diamond: So Renee Diamond again. I'd like to make a motion that we have Bob or Peter, or both contact this person who they have confidence in as being qualified, ask for some proposal and yes, ask that person to look at this and say is this too ambitious? You know maybe it's because I move slower, or think slower, or everything slower that I think this is way too ambitious for two days. And maybe not long enough in some increments, and maybe some increments aren't that hot and important to be in the first one we do with the new Board.

Stoldal: Renee, maybe back up one step before we go to the second on the - I think she's going to ask or that she would ask when are you going to have this. I think we ought to go ahead and pick a date, but before that, I'm not sure that we can't address - well, we can address all these topics.

So we need this Board's input on what they think are the important issues to pull out of this. So I would suggest that each member of this Board go through this, read it over the next three or four days send their notes to Peter. Peter could then bring them together.

We should also pick a date today, so Peter could - and Bob could take this information and the date to this person to see what they recommend to move the process on.

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, Bob Ostrovsky, before we get to a second, just on two things. I did - number one, you know hiring someone hourly, fixed - I mean I'm estimating just in my own mind, somewhere between \$10,000 and \$15,000 to do this.

By the time you hire someone which is probably in the range of \$5,000 I'm guessing and you find a room and you have a Board dinner, and you have to stay overnight, it will add up.

The second thing I intentionally did put in here a discussion about funding. So we can add it, if we think it's appropriate.

My idea as a long-term plan was the big vision, and then I would come back around and wrap my arms around what's it cost and how do we achieve that. Because the money has always gotten in our way for the last I don't know how many years I've been on this Board.

But every time, it's constrained by the Governor's budget, constrained by contributions from third parties, I mean we just - we've never been able to raise the money.

And I understand, Renee, your concern about you know if you do things that don't keep the cost in mind, you get a big wish list which takes you nowhere. But I was hoping - I was hoping we could do some long-term capital needs of the institutions, without thinking about we know that we're not going to get it in the CIP budget.

But if I know that the needs are five million dollars for an institution, and I've got five or ten years to get there, what kind of reason do you expect to get from the CIP budget, one-tenth of that? I have to raise 90 percent of it? I don't know. But I'd like to know.

And I'd like to be able to go to the legislature and say here's the big picture. We've got a lot of interested folks, but they - I think given by the hearings I sat through on the Nevada State Prison, there's a lot of interest in doing something, there's not a lot of interest in providing checks.

Stoldal: Well, let's get - Renee.

Diamond: Just one second, so Renee Diamond. So I agree, and it's been a lot of years that a lot of individual legislators and Governors have had a lot of interest in various parts of our institutional charm.

And then the money is controlled by the majority, never that individual or that individual isn't good at coalition, so they fall apart.

That's why I say, let's not think about, in terms of this meeting, what might happen, because we have no control over it. I'm not big on trying to manipulate what I have no control over.

Let's talk about what we want to know about ourselves, what we want to teach our new members about ourselves, find a date, find a person, do it, and if we have to raise the money for it, or have another one.

I am just a great believer in only tackling what you have the capacity to tackle, and policy for the State of Nevada, or legislative agendas of individual legislators, we have no influence over, and we can't control it.

So what do we want to know about ourselves, what do we want to teach the new people about who the heck we are, and who we'd like to be over the next 10 years, and then other things will influence it, there's always that caveat.

But you're right, we need a date, and we need a person. And I'm not sure we have to worry so much about the capital improvement list. We have our own goals, immediate goals that we can afford, and we have long-term goals which we're all very well aware of that we don't control or afford. And that could be a 10-minute discussion if you want it.

But frankly, I think we have another - we have to say where we're going in the next 10 years, not specifics about a building - a specific building. Maybe specifics about a region, where do we need one other institution? Where do we need more storage? That we're going to all know, I suspect by the end of the week.

The important thing to me would be let's figure a date. I don't think we ought to gear it toward April, because we've already set the June meeting past that. But I do think we have to be right around June, July, in the middle of the year in order to be ready for the fact that the Governor will have - by October will have a good sense, September, October, where the overall agenda would be.

Stoldal: I'd like to suggest we move much earlier in the year, even as much as February to give us time to digest whatever occurs of the two-day meeting, get a report out of that. Please.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Anthony Timmons for the record. Since it is already agendized, it's already put on the agenda, is it possible to table this until tomorrow. So that we can actually check in with the facilitator, and see what dates are available from her standpoint? That might help us make a decision.

Speaker: Normally, yes, but the way we would agendize this is that we would complete through item 7 today.

Timmons: Yes.

Speaker: But normally, you do have the ability, I mean and it does say that as well on the agenda that you can move an item or - but we've agendized this one specifically because of the two days.

Timmons: I know we have a motion on the floor, but that again, Anthony Timmons, that would be my recommendation.

Speaker: Well, what if we, because I'm guessing we're going to take some sort of lunch break or something, or other break. I'm just wondering, we could - we could move it to this afternoon and possibly somebody could try to find somebody now.

Stoldal: Well, we half of an agenda, or half of a motion, we haven't had the second yet. So we don't...

Speaker: Well, if there is no second, then eventually - I mean that motion would fail if nobody seconds it.

Speaker: What was the motion?

Barton: To contact Kendell Hardin, ask for a proposal and seek guidance on the agenda being too ambitious perhaps.

Stoldal: Peter and Bob, do you think we could get a hold of her during the lunch break? Or what's your thoughts on that?

Barton: Peter Barton for the record, I think if we give a range today, if you say we want to do it over two days in the first two weeks in February, that's probably good enough for us to move forward and contact her and see where this goes.

I think if we can provide that without necessarily hitting specific dates, we'll be fine.

Diamond: Was that my motion?

Barton: No, your motion was to contact the proposed facilitator, request a proposal and seek guidance if the planned agenda...

Diamond: Yes, that was my motion.

Barton: Was too ambitious.

Diamond: So, are we moving this to this afternoon? Otherwise, I'm going to call for the question...

Stoldal: We don't have a second.

Barton: We don't have a second.

Diamond: Well, you can call for a second, if it fails, it fails. And if it doesn't fail, just do it, move it.

Barton: Move it.

Speaker: Reread the motion.

Barton: I paraphrased this. I don't have it exactly. It was to contact the proposed facilitator, request a proposal, so we get an idea of cost, and seek guidance about the planned agenda, how it should be structured, specifically whether it is too ambitious as put forth in this document.

Stoldal: Yes.

Diamond: Renee Diamond. I'd like to amend my motion, and not to request an estimate of cost, but just to get an idea of her general idea of her hourly rate, but more importantly to clear whatever date we pick with that person.

And I don't see anything wrong if there is a second to that, if it passes there would - I'm speaking to my own motion, there would be no problem in terms of open meeting law, if we pass something and then it gets rescinded in the afternoon or at tomorrow's meeting, or at any time, if it can't happen.

Stoldal: Well, he just asked the question whether or not we can simply - this is administrative [inaudible 00:53:04] is just a half meter, contact her during the lunch break and find out about dates and you know [inaudible 00:53:10]. I don't think we need a motion and then I can slide this item to the afternoon, where we can have further discussion.

Bradley: Yes, I mean, I think you can always direct staff to get more information before you vote, so if people aren't comfortable proceeding, that could be the direction to get more information and then let's talk about in an hour or two, that's fine. I didn't say Sarah Bradley for the record.

Well, at least and part of the motion was to ask her to review it, but we can't do that until she's hired. So I think we have to take out.

Diamond: So amend that out of my motion.

Stoldal: Well, first is there a second to the motion.

Speaker: Or do you want to withdraw Renee? Or do you stick with it? Do you want to withdraw it or stick with it?

Diamond: No, stick with it and move on.

Speaker: So you're withdrawing though from it, have her review the agenda part, just contact her and see what her rates are.

Diamond: Yes, I amended that portion. Nothing - she doesn't have to do the written end, she doesn't have to - doesn't have to give us any written proposal, and she does have to review the agenda, just whether or not it's going to happen and an approximate fee.

Speaker: Do we need to come up with a suggested date though.

Stoldal: I still think we can simply ask Peter, without having a motion, just Peter if you can get a hold of her during the lunch break, contact her and find out what she charges for a two-day event and if she could



do it in February.

Diamond: Okay, anyway Bob wants the maker of the motion accepts that if you ask for a second and there's no second the motion fail.

Stoldal: Okay, do we have a second? Hearing none, I think this is the first time in history, let's make a note of it as historical.

Diamond: It's good I'm not sensitive.

Ostrovsky: Bob Ostrovsky, so you're going to ask staff to make a call down, and then we'll further discuss this after lunch.

Stoldal: Then I'll move this item to this afternoon.

Ostrovsky: Because I would like to get a tentative date, get an agenda, if not completed, an agenda procedure which you've already suggested to the Board that may get individually back to Peter on their comments about the proposed draft agenda, so we can prepare an actual agenda, and pick a location, and authorize her expenditures to support this. I'd like to achieve all that in the afternoon, or after lunch. Because there's expenditures we've got...

Stoldal: Peter do you want to get a hold of this person which sounds like she has the knowledge and the skills in this area, determine the cost, which would include more than just the two-day meeting which all the pre-work that is done. And hopefully get back to us this afternoon. I think and I would refer to the AG, but I think if we don't get the information this afternoon, that we could - since we do say that we can move things around, we could move it to tomorrow as a last resort.

Bradley: I think we can. I mean normally I would say without a doubt, I'm just - it's just because of the two-day, we trying to I think let the public know we were going to do one through seven today.

So yes, I mean I think that be fine.

Stoldal: So please take whatever time you can and look over the agenda, and sort of prioritize. There's all important items on this agenda, but we can talk about this a little bit more in the afternoon.

Speaker: Okay. One question I had was the payment for her. Because you were talking about - I just didn't know what the RFP process and if that's going to be required.

Barton: Well, that's what we were conferring about here, this is Peter Barton for the record, I mean I am concerned about that. We know it's going to be in excess of \$5,000. It would be an excess of \$2,000, so it requires us to for a contract. And it is a service, so we don't get a pass on it.

Speaker: Yes.

Barton: So yes, I've got to confer a little more with my contract - certified contract manager over here to understand the process.

Stoldal: These are private funds?

Speaker: If it's private you're fine.

Edlefsen: Yes, Carrie Edlefsen for the record. Because it's private funds we won't be required to go out and do an actual RFP. But because it is a service, we'll definitely want to have a contract, just to make sure that it's stated and your funds are protected.

Speaker: Yes, okay. I didn't know what you were thinking. I was thinking either way, it would be a contract I'd probably review. It just might not be an RFP and BOE approval.

Edlefsen: Exactly.

Barton: It won't be BOE right.

Stoldal: So, I'll just ask you to think about the things that we've already talked about, the selection of facilitator, the expenditure of funds, the scheduling, and then the potential of location.

Let's move...

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman?

Stoldal: Yes.

Ostrovsky: Before we move onto the next item, just you know I would advise folks, take a look at your February calendars, if there's a serious issue for you in there, please think about it, so you're ready to talk about it, so we know. I mean if we pick a date and half the Board can't be here, that's not going to work either.

Barton: I could Mr. Chairman, Peter Barton for the record say that the week of February 7th to the 12th is very bad for us. You know we're actually hosting here, we believe it will be the final reunion of the eight sailors left from the battleship Nevada, and it's a pretty big deal throughout this museum and throughout Boulder City.

It includes a premier of a new documentary film on the battleship, so it's a big deal. So that's a good week.

Ostrovsky: So that's the week of - this is Bob Ostrovsky, the week of February 8th...

Barton: February 7th through the 12th is when they'll be here.

Stoldal: Just as an FYI, I know there are some [grousing] about the Stay Fresh, no pun intended. Just that that was the name of the on board newspaper of the USS Nevada was the Stay Fresh.

Speaker: Oh, that's cool.

Stoldal: There are a couple copies that we know are available. All right, let's move onto item number 6. Seeing that there's none to consider, there's no possible action. Rebecca is that correct?

Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Yes, indeed that is correct.

Stoldal: Item number agency reports. Items 7A, Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, Claudia, please.

Vecchio: Mr. Chair, members of the Board, Claudia Vecchio for the record. The Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs had an incredibly busy last quarter.

And I'll just provide a brief update on some of the activities accomplished by the various entities. The Nevada Arts Council started yesterday - the day before yesterday doing grant's workshops around the state. They do this in advance of the grants program, so that state wide arts applicants understand how to - how best to apply and how to use the grants and that sort of thing.

So they're going across the state, holding these workshops in various communities. The Arts Council is a very high touch group. You know they do their strategic planning through in community meetings and get through a lot of input from their constituents so this is kind of a continuation of the way they operate their partnerships around the State. So they're undergoing that at the moment.

They're getting ready for Poetry Out Loud. It's the 11th Annual Poetry Out Loud, which will in March and it will be in Reno and this time it's going to be held at Channel 5, which is the public television station in Reno. Channel 5 always does a program, a half-hour program, highlighting that

year's Poetry Out Loud. So that's always a big event for them. It involves high school students from around the State, and so that's a good event.

As you know the Arts Council, and this goes back to an earlier point was successful in gaining additional funds to the live entertainment tax. That happened as this legislative session kind of came to a conclusion, and so they're now hiring new staff.

They were allowed to hire new staff through those additional funds. And so that's happening right now, and really determining how to best use the funds.

They have a plan, it's not a lot of money, but it's \$150,000 per year through the live entertainment tax, but that's not small change, and that did come way into the legislative session.

Speaker: Out of the blue, oh, excuse me.

Vecchio: Out of the blue. I think it was the middle of the night. So then the Indian Commission of course is primarily all things Stewart Indian School. They are working on getting a - they have a private not for profit now that is working along with the Stewart Indian School for fundraising primarily.

And so that continues to be a big priority of the Governor, a big priority of a number of constituents around the State. So when we're looking at the future of cultural historic sites, that one really does rise to the top of the heap.

That is - as Peter and I talked about many times, that is a unique, unique story and unique opportunity for Nevada, so that's really when we look at of them, that is the most compelling and has the greatest potential for success.

From a tourism standpoint, we have our FY 15 report which was concluded, obviously in June, but generally speaking across the Board tourism continues to inch forward. Room tax collections were 6.1 percent over FY 14, and that primarily has to do with additional fees at the properties, but it continues - you know we continue to inch forward, Las Vegas obviously having record-breaking year last year, and they continued to be really strong this year.

Visitor volume was up a little over two percent, so pretty good news. It's dragging a little bit below our - we have a ten year goal, and that ten year goal is about 2.5 percent each year, so we're a little bit below, but anyway.

The Nevada Commission on Tourism has three new Commissioners, Jennifer Cunningham who is the interim acting Director up at the Reno Sparks Commission Visiting Authority, Dallas Haan who is the Chairman of the Board of Nevada State Bank, and Bob Morris who is Director of Hospitality for Caesar's Entertainment, so it's kind of an interesting group of new Commissioners. And they just had their first meeting with a recent Governor's Global Tourism Summit which we had a couple weeks ago.

You saw when you came in, which was fun, thank you for putting that up, a large meter board from the new campaign, we've launched our Fall/Winter campaign on Monday the 16th of November, so it hasn't been too terribly long.

It's been out a couple of weeks, and it really is about this whole idea of the characters you meet throughout Nevada, because we - they say we can win in the attributes game, but we can win in the emotional connection we have with our consumers and the characters in this rich, unique and quirky people that you meet around Nevada. It really does set us apart, and it's a great experience for visitors.

So that is out, television is in Las Vegas, I don't know if any of you have seen it down here, it's in Reno. I've had a couple people tell me they've seen it there. San Francisco, Phoenix, Salt Lake City, so are pretty much our regular cast of market.

Nevada Magazine, I don't know if you've all heard this, they were awarded the General Excellence Award at the Nevada Press Association and that really is - they're up against all the magazines in Las Vegas, the Reno, Eatable Reno, Tahoe Magazine, and these really you know well-established magazines, and Nevada Magazine continues to win that General Excellence Award, so we're really proud of the work that they are doing there.

The one thing they didn't do particularly well, and Bob Ostrovsky - Bob Stoldal was the one who recognized this as the historic calendar, and I just wanted to show you. This is the 2016 historic calendar and the front cover picture they got from U&R, and U&R has had this in their archives as being the Hoover Dam and they've had it for years, and it's been in their photo, it's been everywhere, it's not in fact the Hoover Dam.

He's the one who recognized the error and at first you know we got pushback from the University, but then they did some checking and it's actually a dam in California.

So get your calendar now, this will be a [laughter] one of those - so with those - we're continuing to send them out. We'll send them out with a note, and we'll give everybody a 20 percent discount next year.

If they want to return their calendars this year, we'll give the refund, but you know once you put the calendar on the wall, you don't see the misnamed Hoover Dam and - but anyway, thanks Bob Stoldal for recognizing that. And the Nevada Magazine has committed to check with you all to make sure their historically correct in the future.

Stoldal: We're going - we actually have formed a committee of a couple of people with - what's the address for the...

Vecchio: [inaudible 01:07:56]

Stoldal: And we're going to look for it in the photos that have never been seen before and properly identify it. So I think having this, it's all going to work out fine.

Vecchio: That's good, that is a good thing. And then finally the Division of Tourism, publicly known as Travel Nevada has - this is not the beautifully designed plan, but I have the FY 16 17 strategic plan, and I have copies if anybody wants this.

Really this is - this is the road map for tourism for the next couple of years and we have six key initiatives. The first is to amplify domestic sales and marketing, that's really the integrated marketing program that we do domestically.

And the second is to drive international visitation and there is a - there's reasoning between splitting the domestic and the international visitation, mostly to deal with how we do those things and the brand, and how that's embraced around the world.

The next is to boost partnerships, and that really is talking about the grant program that we have, as well as the partnerships we have with our agencies. So finding ways to better partner and be more efficient through partnerships is the third initiative.

The fourth is to create and convey value, and that really is talking a lot about what you were talking about in understanding the value of tourism and it may be surprising to you, but there are many people who do see the value of tourism, and do not understand it's continued leadership in driving the economic engine of this State. So there will be a fairly significant public affairs program that we're putting together right now that will be educational on our side, and advocacy driven on our partner's side. So that's going to be a large component of this year. We have a lot of people very interested in doing that.

The next is to enhance infrastructure, and this is ground, air and virtual infrastructure. You know we had just got the highway Bill passed through the legislature in Washington. So that's fantastic, that provides some funding for the I-11 corridor as well as the highway which is extraordinary between Las Vegas and Reno, as well as some other infrastructure kinds of things, so this continues to be a critically important piece of who we are, and how we convey, and how we welcome people into the State, because our infrastructure has a lot of opportunity.

The next is to run an effective business. We, really as a State agency, need to be sure that we're efficient and that we are running our business in a way that is transparent, it's accountable, and really smart and forward thinking.

So those are the six key initiative for the Division of Tourism and again I have the strategic plan [inaudible 01:10:53] it's a brand language our mission and our vision.

Our mission continues to be to enhance the economic - the mission actually is, and I should know this, effectively promote State wide tourism to enhance the economic vitality of Nevada.

And our vision is a vibrant quality of life of all Nevadans. We really - everything we do is for the people of the State of Nevada, so to make sure that they are enjoying the quality of life, that we can help enhance is critically important.

It has three values that we're insightful, we're research-based. Second, we're innovative, we look for new and intriguing solutions and then [inaudible 01:11:29] collaborative and that really is the whole partnership piece of this.

So again, this is available to anybody who wants it. It's a...

Stoldal: How does the museums and history fit into the...

Vecchio: Yes, the museums and history will fit into the - then what we do next is, this is the overarching roadmap, then those program components for each of these will be developed later.

So the public affairs claim that the overall strategic plan say to [inaudible 01:12:00] and convey value, we will put a public affairs plan together. That we must amplify domestic sales and marketing, we will put together that sales and those marketing plans that ladder up to that.

Part of that will be the cultural affair - cultural tourism piece of this that will live as its own separate plan to amplify...

Stoldal: Is there a general - the term I hear is heritage tourism. Is there an accepted within the tourism industry the term, is it cultural tourism or heritage tourism?

Vecchio: There is a little bit of a difference between those two, but primarily it's called - it's a history and cultural tourism. The heritage tourism really talks more specifically about the history of that location.

And I think the cultural piece is a little broader sense of place kind of a thing, but heritage ladders up to sense of place, it's great, but I don't think we're going to get - you know split those hairs like that.

I think if we can start with a cultural and historic type of a tourism program, we'll be way ahead of where we are now.

Stoldal: Okay. I mean the one reading is a significant piece of the tourism - international tourism and...

Vecchio: Don't mention it. Yes, so in most states the historic and cultural tourism component is the most coveted traveler that people can appeal to, and it makes up a large percentage of the number of travelers.

Nevada is different in that way and the Commission on Tourism has never, as you know, never really focused on historic and cultural travelers, so it's a push to make that happen.

And I think of the four years, and we're just inching along but you know I think Bob you had mentioned at the last Commission meeting just to have a cultural tourism committee.

We talked about developing committees, whether they be of Commissioners or of interested parties to help us achieve these goals, and how do we do all those things and having a cultural tourism committee would be a great way to be sure that that happens.

Stoldal: This Board, the Chairman of the Board is a member of the Nevada Commission on Tourism except for voting. We don't have a vote but we can open our mouth, and that's what we did at the last meeting, all of the ideas of the committee, and the Department of Tourism deals with historic and cultural affairs. So we'll push that idea.

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, Bob Ostrovsky for the record, this whole idea of having a strategic plan is something that I would hope the planning committee could eventually - the long term planning committee could produce a document you know like this, not this document but something we can have in our hand, to say this is our five and ten year plan for example.

Stoldal: How long does it take to produce it, was it one meeting, two meetings?

Vecchio: It was two meetings so that it took. It's been a long, it's been a process. We had a strategic planning meeting last year I think which was somewhat beneficial to this, but then I wrote the plan and we presented it to the Commission in one meeting. And then gave them time really to review it and they approved it at the second meeting.

Ostrovsky: This is Bob Ostrovsky, but it did start with a two-day meeting, two or three years ago?

Vecchio: I believe it was only one day, but it felt like two.

Stoldal: This was at the [Gold Legacy].

Vecchio: Yes.

Ostrovsky: Yes.

Stoldal: Oh [inaudible 01:15:49]

Vecchio: Yes.

Ostrovsky: Whether it was useful or not, I don't know, but that's where it started.

Vecchio: That's where it started, yes.

Stoldal: Will you be with us this afternoon or do you have leave?

Vecchio: I can - I have a meeting at four, but...

Stoldal: Okay, I think we'll [inaudible 01:16:04] the question will be what our discussion this afternoon on item 5C about an off-site meeting, what role do you think that the Department of Tourism should play in that discussion. Further questions for Claudia? If not, thank you - again, thank you for all your help.

Speaker: This is great. I really look forward to digging into it, thanks.

Stoldal: 7B, State Historic Preservation Office, Rebecca Palmer, and then I think after that, we'll probably take a break for lunch before we get into the - actually we get to Peter, maybe let's get through Peter Barton.

Palmer: This is Rebecca Palmer for the record. You have my Board report. I will be glad to answer any questions you might have on the report. You'll notice attached is our first attempt at a spreadsheet as requested by the Board previously.

I'm hoping that it's informative for you, and we welcome any comments you might have on the spreadsheet. I did want to note for the record that we have an update to that spreadsheet already in that the Douglas Frey Ranch was approved by the keeper on the 17th of November.

Stoldal: Please, Renee.

Diamond: I just want to tell you that this is Renee Diamond, that this was I'm sure a huge amount of work, because you had to go looking for every little bit. This is the best thing that I've seen in all my years on the Board.

I've always had to rely on my memory, which as I get older is more and more of a challenge. This is so great to have it here. You know we talk about these things and then it seems like we talk about it in a vacuum, and then it's a year or two, and we hear something, but to see it on paper was terrific. Thank everybody who had any part of it.

Stoldal: Any other comments on that? Alicia.

Barber: Rebecca it's Alicia Barber. This is wonderful. Can you just explain to everyone what the difference is between being approved by the keeper and being listed?

Palmer: For the record, I have with me Jim Bertolini who can explain that.

Barber: Okay.

Bertolini: Yes, Jim Bertolini for the record. The approved by the keeper note is for the additional documentation, so that's something that goes through a little bit less rigorous of a process, and it's just sort of noted, added to the National Register nomination, so any time that nomination is circulated that additional documentation that's been approved is circulated with it. So it becomes part of that permanent record.

For Douglas Frey Ranch it was listed in the National Register on November 17th, and so that is just for the official first time that this thing [inaudible 01:19:17].

Barber: Great, thank you.

Stoldal: Let's all - this really is and I'm going to pull it out of the binder and keep that in a separate file, it's a great tool Rebecca and Jim, thank you so much.

On page two, the second item Las Vegas Post Office. It's my understanding under current status that an updated version has been submitted, and the keeper which is a wonderful job title, the keeper is still - has been very busy, and has been able to deal with I guess, a short staff back there, but my understanding that it has been resubmitted.

Palmer: For the record this is Rebecca Palmer. Thank you, we will update the list.

Stoldal: Any other comments or thoughts?

Ostrovsky: This is Bob Ostrovsky. Just Rebecca could you remind this committee what the schedule is for the historic preservation commission meeting, and the old cultural affairs committee?

Palmer: Oh, for the record this is Rebecca Palmer, the Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation is accepting applications to our office by tomorrow. They can either be postmarked by tomorrow, or they can be received in our office by tomorrow.

The plan is then to gather all of the applications, scan them and make them available to all of the agencies that participate in the review. And once that - once we've accepted all of their comments on the applications, I will compile them and get them over to the Commissioners who will receive their very likely the first week in February.

After that, the plan was to give Commissioners an opportunity to review them and meet sometime in May or June.

- Ostrovsky: Bob Ostrovsky for the record. Rebecca, the amount available is one million dollars, is that correct?
- Palmer: Correct, one million dollars is what the - what was proposed for the sale, however, because we missed the first barn sale held this year, we will have to wait until the Treasurer's office has sufficient projects for a sale, otherwise, the fees would eat the entire proceeds.
- Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, what Rebecca is saying is we're not sure when the bonds will - once we make the approvals, they'll be in the cue when the bond sales occurs and we can start funding those grants, after the whole grant process is completed.
- Stoldal: Pete Dube.
- Dube: Mr. Chairman...
- Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer, based on communications with the Treasurer's office it is probably sometime September next year when that might occur, unless they have a different alternative using the existing debt capacity to fund the one million.
- Stoldal: Pete Dube.
- Dube: Mr. Chairman, Rebecca could you share with us any of the concerns that the keeper had on the Harrison's Guest House. I'm kind of curious what...
- Bertolini: Sure, this is actually Jim Bertolini for the record. I have been working on the Harrison Guest House and in touch with the keeper throughout the year actually on working on what questions still needed to be answered.
- It sounds like the main concern is regarding the integrity, the historic integrity of the property. And specifically about the modifications - the non-historic modifications to the [inaudible 01:23:26] that's the side of the building.
- I don't have a clear answer yet. I was supposed to have a good answer either today or tomorrow from the keeper about any recommendations and whether or not they agree if it's even eligible for the register, if they agree with that determination.
- So I can - once I have that information, I can pass that through Rebecca to the Board if that's what you'd wish.
- Stoldal: Please, thank you very much. I appreciate that. Any other questions for Rebecca or Jim? Thank you all, a great - always a great job, really bringing that all to a new level there on the reports and the quality overall of the reporting.
- Barber: It's a good track record. It really is, like great job.
- Palmer: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Thank you very much, and thanks goes to Jim who worked very hard on this spreadsheet.
- Stoldal: All right, let's move to 7C which is reports by the Division Administrator, Peter Barton, Peter?



Barton: Thank you Mr. Chairman, for the record, Peter Barton. I'll try to go through these fairly quickly. The legislative audit report was released publicly in a public meeting on November 19th. What you have in front of you is the summary page.

This follows a reporting that we provided to you previously on the findings of the legislative audit that was undertaken from November of last year through late April of 2015. Seven findings, we accepted all seven findings.

We are now compelled to give a corrective action report by the beginning of February next year, and then a six month report on attainment of the corrections that were uncovered, and weaknesses in the audit.

A number of them focused on store, this audit was a little bit unusual in that generally the legislature is most concerned with how an agency handles its general funded side of the business and less on a private trust fund, though LCB does have authority to look into that. And they did this time.

They looked at museum store inventory. They looked at the process of the medallion sales which is a trust fund operation. And then looked at some of the general fund issues of when deposits are made, how deposits are reviewed and reconciled. And then our internal control policies.

As I testified to the audit commission, virtually every one of these instances is brought about by the lack of staff. When museums were cut from full-time to part-time in 2009 and not restored until 2013, and the staff that went part-time was restored to full-time that doesn't account for the staff positions that were lost in the work force reduction.

But when you talk about segregating duties in a place like Ely that had one employee, that's an impossible goal to meet. When you talk about deposits being late in a museum in Boulder City where there's two employees you've got to understand that that's certainly a possibility.

Interestingly the audit committee was very supportive and understanding and agreed and themselves spoke to the fact of how harshly museums were treated during the recession and certainly that they understand these issues.

That being said, we're addressing each and every one of these. I think we'll talk a little later, probably tomorrow in the museum store report about the specifics of the point of sale system, and inventory controls which would largely be remedied when a new point of sale system is implemented.

I'm a little disappointed in Wells Fargo, who the State's new credit card processing gateway. They had recommended a point of sale system to us. We've been trying to explore the - that system to see if it's the type of system that would best suit our type of operation, and we've been unable to make that final determination as of yet and that's a big frustrating to us, I think to all of us, Carrie and I think to Pete as well. But we'll talk more about tomorrow. But certainly a new point of sale system addresses some of this new controls, new policies that need to be implemented as well.

But all in all this was a reasonably, as we reported earlier, a reasonably favorable audit.

Stoldal: These are all - all the audits are important, the results are important, this one especially, because of the NRS. Museum stores fall under our jurisdiction. Pete's the chair of that committee.

Is there anything the Board, you feel the Board needs to take action on, changing a policy?

Barton: For the record, Peter Barton. Not at this time, I mean I think we've got to first make a decision on a point of sale system, and that will drive some of what happens after that in terms of policy and type of reporting, and the type of back office review that we can have.

Right now we can't look into the point of sale systems, they're all isolated in their own silos in each

museum. We have ascertained that the system that's being recommended to us does give us the ability to go in, from a management perspective, and review and approve inventory adjustments, which has been a huge problem in the past, and there was no control over that.

Stoldal: And we'll discuss this tomorrow? Great, any other questions for Peter on this? Renee Diamond.

Diamond: So I went into the safe site and got the full audit. And I thought we did really well. And I think your response was appropriate, and more importantly I think your nice words to the auditors were very polite and good job.

Timmons: For the record, Anthony Timmons. Mr. Chair I do have a copy of the entire audit if anyone wants to see it. I did print it out.

Stoldal: Well, audits are always a challenge of interesting and as I read through it, I was not left with oh gee. Instead, it was this was an effort, a positive effort as opposed to a negative effort looking for something and I wasn't wrong here.

And again, I echo what you said about Peter and the staff and really a positive job. Were there any other reports that you want to...

Timmons: No, I - for the record, this is Anthony Timmons. I would agree with Renee. I went through it, looked at it from a financial perspective, and exactly what Mr. Barton recommended and mentioned was specifically you know right to the point with the audit.

I mean there are some controls that are just out of our control, for lack of a better word. So yes, I would agree 100 percent with Renee.

Stoldal: Thank you.

Barton: Just to report on the Division Office relocation, we are up and running in our new office. And we expect to be there for a minimum of five years, possibly ten. So I do expect that it will be the last office I occupy for the State, I presume at least.

We're at 412 East Musser Street which is in the kind of capital core complex of State buildings and State offices in Carson City. We're located right next door to Wells Fargo bank, just off Stewart Street, and across the street from the Department of Administration and the State Public Works Board.

So we're finding that the office is - it's extremely convenient and our work flow - there's been an improvement in work flow through the office to have this group back together in one place.

That being said, I always acknowledge Claudia and her tremendous, kindness last year in letting us essentially be squatters in the Laxalt Building for a year. The other alternative last year, we'd have been in the dark dungeon of the old armory which has no windows.

Unfortunately, they just put the State's grant office over there.

Stoldal: How's your space? Do you have adequate space?

Barton: We do, we're right at the - you know the State has all the benchmarks for how much space you can have based upon your program, and we're right within the guidelines, and a nice conference room. I tell you Carson, the office beagle really enjoys that location.

The fiscal year 2015 museum attendance report, I think was folded in your document, I hope it was. Somehow it wasn't in mine, thank you Felicia for sharing yours.

So you know it's not a stellar report. 2015 and I think you heard Claudia say visitor traffic is up about two percent. Our traffic is a little bit even under that. We were up about 1.6 percent last year.

That being said, it was our best year in the last seven years, partially reflective of the fact that we've gone back to more or less full-time service and I don't want to say completely full-time service, because we have not. Most locations are still open five days a week, as opposed to six or seven which has historically been our public service hours.

But we're seeing modest increases, strong growth continues in Boulder City. It continues to be the strongest growth museum. Now, you'll see that the numbers in Boulder City are still down from the high in 2013, that's the years, 2012 and '13 we had done the day out with Thomas event in Boulder City, and while it brought a lot of people in, it did not realize the revenue that we felt was worth the effort, quite frankly in putting those events.

However, the staff out there have some new events. They do a nighttime pajama train now on the holidays. We're now moved - we've moved into the 21st Century, we're selling tickets online for the Santa train operations, both in Boulder City and in Carson City.

In the first 20 minutes when tickets went on sale in Boulder City for the pajama train which is not the five dollar ticket, it's the \$20 train that we do in the evening. We sold over 200 tickets in the first 20 minutes. And it's not selling out an Elton John concert in the first 10 minutes. But you know what it was pretty impressive for our first time, and the limited capacity we've got to let the world know that these tickets are available online.

So you know we're seeing increases, the second strongest leader in growth and we're - I meet with the Las Vegas Springs Preserve folks here quarterly face to face, and go over a wide range of issues, attendance is one of them.

This museum is having eh strongest growth in the last six months. It's just been extraordinary, I mean we're almost doubling on a monthly basis the number of visitors here. They're seeing growth at the Springs, not quite as strong there, but whatever is working here, we're seeing very strong growth that's not reflected in this report, because it's occurring now in the last six months. So we hope that trend continues.

The rest of the system has been pretty much stable, little change the East Ely, it looks like numbers went down, that's primarily because we now have an accurate count of who comes to the East Ely because we're capturing tickets stubs in a joint ticket arrangement. Prior to that in prior years we had used our revenue statistics and then kind of thrown a little bit of a swag, because people come who use some of the facilities, but not all the facilities. So it's more accurate reporting I think for sure in the case of Ely.

School programs are up a little bit. Surprisingly they were down here in Las Vegas from '14 to '15 by a margin of almost 20 percent. A lot of that is again hinged upon the school districts not being able to provide transportation.

The Las Vegas Springs Preserve is engaged in a program similar to what this Board did maybe 15 years ago, when the Board went out and paid for some transportation costs. The Springs Preserve is doing that. So they're seeing an uptick in their student attendance, but then we find out they don't have enough time to come over here, or it's not the day that we're open.

So still a few challenges getting schools to come to museums, and it's primarily related to transportation. It's not about program. It's about the cost to get them here.

So I'll entertain any questions. I do apologize, the notes did not get updated on this document, so we're talking on the bottom there about fiscal year 2015 numbers. We'll update and give you the correct and most contemporary data.

Ostrovsky: Peter, Bob Ostrovsky. Do we know any reason why the numbers are improving here in the Las Vegas

Museum? Is it something we did in terms of programming, or is it something that's changing with our audience? Or do we know?

Barton: I don't think we know, Bob. We don't really exit survey customers, and it's something we need to do I believe, because I asked the same questions. We sat with the Springs Preserve management team, and asked the questions. They're not sure.

Some of it's certainly programming related, exhibit related, strong exhibits that we had the sesquicentennial exhibit was a tremendous boost. I would - if you asked me that question for the - the number one thing I think that's influencing it is the type of programming we're doing.

New exhibits here, I think that the fact that we've had, I think a far greater presence through the media, and the efforts that Felicia Archer has done, we get some pretty extraordinary coverage down here.

Archer: Thank you.

Barton: And down here - and yes, that's in Felicia's report, you see that stellar photo of Mr. Ostrovsky there.

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, Bob Ostrovsky. You know you can have the greatest exhibits in the world. If you don't let the world, your audience know that it's there and available, you won't get them here. So it's a combination of both.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. The Las Vegas Natural History Museum had the same decline in students for the same exact reason. And hearing you know early admission of the cultural affairs offices to educate the State, it's terribly sad that we can't get our school kids to any of our museums, both the ones that are publicly and privately run.

And for the record I believe that should be added to our agenda, to help solve that problem.

Stoldal: Okay.

Barton: Good point. Moving on, the History Relevance Campaign just to update you on that - I'm sorry.

Barber: This is a huge question, so you don't have to really get into it, but you know when you look at the 10 to 12 year period, if these numbers are really accurate, I mean what's the big picture explanation for why there's such a drastic decline in attendance from like fiscal year 2003, 2004 to today with so many of these?

I mean Nevada State Museum, 30,000 less a year, you know and the historical society, at least 10,000. I mean what's the big picture explanation for the fact that there were such higher levels of attendance 10, 12 years ago? Is there one? It's not really a larger economic situation of the country kind of thing. Is it...

Stoldal: Renee?

Diamond: Renee Diamond, the end of '08 was a catastrophic decline in everybody's life if you take into account foreclosures, and every - and subsequent job loss, and so I don't know right before it why it was declining. But I don't think we're alone.

Illinois closed their State Museums, Pennsylvania's on the verge, the Field Museum had something online that they have declined. I don't know about specifically about the rest of Las Vegas. It might be something for the Museum and Attractions Association to look into the historical, but I know what happened to people I know from about the end of '08 on.

Stoldal: You also have the other issue of we reduced the number of days a week, and school kids they had no money, so that - you took out all the school kids, and that's a significant piece of change every - a number of attendance every year, and then closing our doors three days a week, or four days a week -

or two days a week. That would impact significantly.

Diamond: Mr. Chairman, Renee Diamond. What was the year that the Greyline and other tour companies quit going out to...

Stoldal: To Lost City?

Diamond: To Lost City. They used to come out a couple times a week with 50 plus people on a bus. And I don't know when - I can't remember what year, and that...

Stoldal: That was when gas - the cost of gas.

Diamond: It was related to cost of fuel.

Stoldal: Remember a lot of companies all of a sudden, like Arrow Head Water was adding a gas surcharge and Blue Rim, and it also had to do with the fact that I don't think we were giving the bus companies enough refund, if that's the proper word to come out - all the way out there. They wanted a larger...

Speaker: Incentive payment.

Stoldal: Incentive is the word I was looking to - I'm sure there's a proper business [inaudible 01:43:12] that. So I think there were a lot of reasons.

Barton: For the record, Peter Barton. I would just say that you know I ask this question a lot.

Barber: I'm sure you do.

Barton: I've talked to some of the old timers and said you know what's going on here. I think some of it is - I would question some of the older statistics you're looking at.

Barber: Okay.

Barton: I guess I should drop off of this - the fiscal years 2002 through 2004, I question the voracity of the data, as we compiled it. From 2005 forward, I think it is a reasonably accurate snapshot of what's going on. And there are still some significant ups and downs in this ten-year period.

I think anything that you look at certainly from 2010 forward has been the impact of the recession and the crazy schedules and even though we've restored schedules somewhat, there's massive confusion out there. You know we're subjected to finding links on old websites that still have us open four days week, that we don't control. They're old small Chambers of Commerce or whatever, so it's a constant battle to get the public to understand that we've restored some service, but it's still inconsistent.

That's about the best explanation I guess I could...

Stoldal: Also I think we have to deal with the reality is there's a giant shift in people's lives where they get their entertainment. I mean 10 years ago or 15 years ago, you talk about YouTube, you talk about a lot of these things now, they're just a dominant challenge for people's time in life.

And I'm not sure, you know I - my first experience was with - that still comes to mind and that was about 1994, 1995, I actually cried, I have to tell you, that I was online in 1994 and 1995 with a squealing sound of getting online and so forth, and I got into Israel and saw the Dead Sea Scrolls live, and it was like a big change for me in my life to be able to see that kind of thing.

I don't know if we've got that on our websites. I don't know if we've got that sort of impact, and maybe that's one of the things we need to talk about and be able to shift how we think about a museum and maybe the museums need to be online. Maybe we need to have the 360 [inaudible 01:45:51] where the people can look at what they want to look at and so on.

I think that part of people's lives have shifted a lot, I'm not sure if we can say that's what...

Timmons: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Barton, I'd like to find out if we saw that uptake in the last six months you said in Las Vegas has that translated into any new memberships or growth in memberships as well or is that strictly ticket-based.

Barton: That's just been ticket-based.

Timmons: Okay. Thank you.

Barton: Actually I would say membership's actually dropped off here a bit. There was a large swing up in membership in this museum when we opened the new facility that was sustained for a couple of years, it ticked back up a little bit last year with the sesquicentennial, but this year it's been flat and I think the report actually shows a decline this year.

Timmons: So maybe membership ticket packages or ticket benefits would be another opportunity to discuss.

Barber: And I think also - just Alicia Barber again - just ideas of thinking about the retreat, those ideas about not only increasing - trying to see what we can do to increase the visitation of students again.

The digital presence I think is critical, what can we do for the digital presence kind of across the board, and then the refreshing of content. I mean just there are - there are exhibits that haven't changed in decades. You know there are full museums that have rarely changed in decades, and I think that will be another important thing for us to talk about. Thank you.

Stoldal: Great.

Barber: So it was a big question, thank you for answering it.

Vecchio: This is Claudia. Did you also discuss Carson City visitation just generally as a destination during this time period? Okay, I'll find out the numbers for that, because that will also - I mean that impacts your numbers as well, it's just [inaudible 01:47:33] Carson City, so I'll find out.

Ostrovsky: And Mr. Chairman, I agree on that. When we look back at the proposed agenda for long-term planning strategies increase in [inaudible 01:47:45] museum - at the top of the list I put modernization of visitor experience, which is all encompassing of really offering something that people want to come and spend time with, given vis-à-vis what's really available out there today.

Allison: This is Bryan Allison. Does anybody remember when they opened the bypass in Carson City?

Barton: Peter Barton for the record. That would have been three years ago, four...

Speaker: It was seven or eight I think.

[crosstalk]

Barber: I'd say about four years.

Barton: Four years.

Vecchio: Well, it happened after I got here, I got here four years ago.

Barber: Yes, three then.

Vecchio: And the actual bypass is going to go all the way across out in - that still is a couple years down the road from the looks of their...

Stoldal: We're building more highways in Carson City?

Vecchio: Smack down the middle.

[crosstalk]

Diamond: So yesterday, I was at Boulder City for the - we had buried my nephew at the veterans cemetery, which I can't go over in the last few years how big it is and developed, and talk about growth industries.

And the bypass is it going to do the - the bypass that cuts off the - towards Searchlight in Loughlin, is that going to do the same thing - is that going to hugely impact Boulder City?

Wow. I understand the implication on our particular train that we can get more mileage, but oh my God, when we did the original thing to the conventioner and visitor's authority for funding for that back in the 1990s, when I was young and slender, and they wouldn't have anything to do with it, because they weren't sure that there was enough traffic coming from Phoenix along that Boulder Highway.

Well, now I don't what the new Boulder City - new Phoenix Highway, all that's going to be changed.

Ostrovsky: Bob Ostrovsky, I think Bob Stoldal you were there too, we did something at the Boulder City Railroad Museum in conjunction with the Chamber of Commerce from Anderson and Boulder City who are both concerned about the impact of the bypass and traffic and what to do about you know maintaining Boulder City as a tourist attraction.

And they see the Railroad Museum as a big part of whole process. So it hasn't - as if - people have thought about it. It's not like they've overlooked it. They had some potential solutions. They all cost money and they working on it and hoping we're cooperate in that as we go. And I think that part of the long range planning is what we want Boulder City to be operation and how does it fit in?

Stoldal: It's going to go like me, just off and go through Boulder City.

Diamond: Right, no you don't.

Ostrovsky: If you want to go to the dam.

Diamond: If you like to go to the dam, right.

Barton: Mr. Chairman, I'll proceed if that's all right. And just in response to that - Peter Barton for the record - last Monday I met with the redevelopment authority off of [inaudible 01:51:18] Boulder City again as we thought about how can this museum expand to serve a larger customer base and provide a different sort of experience and we're well on the way to at least having that plan in place.

But according to - because I asked the specific question, what happens to traffic counts and NDOT has predicted a 34 percent drop in traffic count through - on that segment when the bypass opens.

Frankly, I think it will be larger than that. I think there will be more of a diversion than just 34 percent of the traffic, but that's what's driving the conversation with Henderson and Boulder City is what do we do from a commercial standpoint to ensure people still come into town and we're positioning to hopefully lead that effort quite frankly. We'll talk about that this afternoon.

Diamond: Well, we're right there.

Stoldal: There is also an upside. When that opens, that's going to - a lot more people are going to use that way to go from East to West, I mean that's going to open up a whole bunch of people that are going to be coming too. Peter we're on item seven.

Barton: Yes, we can talk about the History Relevance Campaign just as an update we brought to you, I believe last April - March or April, we brought this to you. You endorsed this. This is a national campaign

that has right now over 100 endorsers from national organizations, including the State Historic Preservation officers, AASLH, historians, the Western History Association and of course Nevada is represented in this.

And it turns out that there is three states that are actually leading this initiative and trying to get it on the National Agenda, and that's Kentucky, Idaho, and the State of Nevada.

So I was invited back to Washington last month and we presented this concept to the organization of State Representatives. Each state in the Union has an office in Washington, DC, in the National Governor's Association - in the building that co-located with the National Governor's Association.

We have 20 of the key states, roughly 20 key states come out and listen to our presentation, which was overwhelming positively accepted, we're been asked to come back in February, a lot going on in February to give them some real guidance of how specifically we can use this campaign.

How can Governors use this campaign to help drive economic development, because it's all about jobs and we heard that repeatedly across the board, on both sides of the aisle that right now the focus is on jobs and how history education and the relevance of history education, not for history as dates and people or events, but for the skills that it brings in able to do research and decision-making skills you know as you vet information that you read in trying to determine let's separate the truth from the fiction.

All of that we think are essential components to this campaign. The goal is to be able to present this to the National Governors Association at their meeting next summer. We think we're on track to do that.

Before that we are going to take it also to the National Chamber of Commerce because it's the National Chamber of Commerce that's largely driven the STEM initiative that you hear about everywhere, science, technology, engineering, and math, and we need to get their buy-in we're told to add the relevance of history education to that pallet before we take this to the National Governors.

All of that's kind of under way, this band of State Historic leaders have been meeting in phone conferences. There's a meeting in San Francisco, which I will join by phone to further discuss how we move this campaign forward.

So it's just a little information and just a little bit of state pride that for once Nevada is actually leading an effort, rather than trailing in an effort.

Barber: That's great.

Barton: Personnel report, I'll just give you a couple of updates and we are going to be holding interviews for the long awaited position of museum director in Boulder City on December 15th. So we hope to have a section made there before the end of the year.

Actually we've got a list that has a number of very strong candidates on it. So it would be very, I think interesting process of selection.

We learned this morning, just this morning as I entered the room that Deborah Stevenson, who is the education curator at the Nevada State Museum has announced her retirement next March 1st. Unfortunately, we lost a very good part-time security office at the State Museum today who's resigned to take a full-time position.

Aside from that, we continue to recruitments as vacancies come up. There's a couple of new individuals here at this museum, we have - through actually the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, we have a new IT professional person, who's been assigned to southern Nevada, because there are so many users, both at tourism and more users than that even through our museums here in southern Nevada.



So we've now got an onsite presence, we're housing that person right here, so it's a new IT professional. We have a new museum attendant out front here at this museum, and we've got a recruitment that has just closed or will close this week for a new part-time store person here in Las Vegas.

Stoldal: Questions, comments. As a tangent, who would like to, after this meeting today take about an a half an hour, 40 minute tour of behind the scenes of the museum here? One, two, okay, so that is three, four.

Speaker: Just for the record, I'm sorry to hear about Deborah Stevens, she's done an amazing job since she's - and the visibility that comes out the Nevada State Museum has - you know it's just been great, so she's going to be missed.

Stoldal: All right, we're going to take a break for lunch it's here. We'll return about 12:30?

Barton: It's already one o'clock.

Stoldal: Well, that was a fast lunch. How about 1:30 we get back here.

Barton: Okay.

[Luncheon break.]

[crosstalk]

Stoldal: We're back in order the Nevada Board of Museums and History for Thursday, December the 3rd. We are now on item 7D, Public Relations Report, Felicia Archer.

Archer: Oh, that must be me. Well, you have a couple of pages there of some interesting information. I hope interesting information for you, to show a little bit about what we did. This is by no means everything, but it does give you an idea of the kind of exposure that we've been getting.

My thanks to you sincerely Commissioner Stoldal. I kind of alluded to it earlier, but I know that you've been behind some of the stories that we've had recently, now in your new position, and we appreciate that.

We have the honor of being in round-up stories, and I think that's helpful in larger media, so that people do learn that the Las Vegas, the Nevada State Museum in Las Vegas is here and has great things to show, and has new things to show.

I wanted to respond to one of the comments earlier about the digital presence, and I think that that really is a tremendous opportunity for us going forward. We're making progress, as you know, our website went up. We still have some challenges with it, and they are - you know the answer I always say on that is it's complicated, because our website is tied to two other divisions.

So we are little dependent on what happens in those divisions, before we can make the kind of permanent changes that we need, but I do think that our website will help with - when we were talking earlier about the attendance, and what excites the next generation, I think our window to the world is the website.

The other thing that we need for those of us who don't get our information from the web, and that's not a lot of people, but there are people like that and someone who might see something and spontaneously decide to come and that's brochures. I really like to see us move forward with some brochures that are current and accurate, and logo compliant, and all of that. And we don't have that right now. So with the combination of the digital presence, and virtual exhibits as you were talking about, I think all of that will be great, and we're moving in that direction.

So one of the things in the what's ahead there that I set out is that Peter Barton did an interview with -

on travel.com, which is shared with Armed Forces Radio, and that's coming up, we're waiting to hear more about when and where but that promoted the museums, they had a specific audience that they were interested in. And as we tend to try to do, you can imagine is to expand someone's attention and perspective, when we are called about one museum, we try to share the story of many more museums, so that happened.

And I think that's about all that I really want to take you time up with in addition to the report, and if you have questions, I'm happy to take those.

Stoldal: Questions please.

Timmons: For the record, this is Anthony Timmons. Felicia who manages the social media accounts for the museums?

Archer: The museums have individual accounts on Facebook, and Periscope and Twitter, we have overarching division of museums website - or not website, accounts, Facebook. And then each of the museums does it differently based on, as Peter was saying, the staffing at that particular museum.

In some places we might only have one person and in others we may have more than one. But there's no one with the skill to do that. In yet others, we have many people, and they do a really job at that.

So it just depends by museum.

Timmons: Yes, because it seems really - again, Anthony Timmons for the record. It seems real spotty to me. I'm on Twitter a lot, because I have to for work. So I'm looking at trying to see the tweets that come from the Museums, and again it's just really kind of sporadic.

Archer: Twitter is not the Museum's strong point at this point. And I would say there may be a number of reasons for that, more - less sporadic is Facebook. You'll find more information there. Twitter is a little bit different, and I don't know, do you want to speak to that at all Peter about people tweeting about the museums?

Barton: I don't know enough about - we're out of my comfort zone here.

[laughter]

Archer: I think that there are people at each Museum who could tweet, and we could do that with a strategic focus. We aren't there yet, and part of the reason we aren't there yet up to this point has been you would want to direct someone then to your website, because they would want information, and we hadn't been able to do that until this last quarter.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. I would once again ask for a ten-year strategic plan that we look at digital marketing and how we can strategically help these individual museums and hearing that we have one or two people, my suggestion without having studied it, and we try to generate as much user-generated content as possible, so by creating hashtags and ways for the actual guests to be our voice is going to more effective than that one employee.

Archer: Sure.

Schorr: And that's something that we can strategically do, implement with signage and take all of the burden and pressure off of the boots on the ground.

Archer: I think that's absolutely valuable. We're at a point now, where I think we need to move in that direction. We weren't before. We are now, and when - back to the website discussion, when we finally wrap up the other agencies and can take down those bad links, I think you're aware that we have some - we have some issues with links on the web that continue to go someplace that they

shouldn't go, or they fail.

And when that happens, we'll be in a much better position to communicate strategically.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. And before I joined this Board, I was with my ex-girlfriend and her son, and we wanted a family-friendly thing to do, and we found the railroad museum, and the website was fine, it was obviously incredibly basic, but it showed the time and information and there was so much great content, that I'm sure I put on Instagram and my Facebook, and it was such a great moment, that I think it's something we should really leverage.

Archer: That's terrific. That's terrific.

Stoldal: Claudia is there anything from the Department that you can add to this discussion.

Vecchio: Yes, so just for those of who may be new on this, tourism does a lot - not a lot, the website that Felicia is talking about is managed and administered by our web master who is in the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs, and it's - I still think it's in lousy shape.

And I saw it yesterday and I was dismayed by the links that didn't work, and I haven't been looking at it. So I talked to our marketing director, and I said this is - this has been a two-year process. This is ridiculous.

And so we're going to outsource that site to somebody who is beholden to deadlines, and to make that happen, because I'm embarrassed by what we're conveying for the rest of the Department. You know shame on me for not noticing this a lot sooner. But I was just looking at it, and it was horrifying.

So yes, I don't know that we're even at a place, but can I do this, I told - I've committed to this before, but we got a new web master on and it seemed like things were going well and they're not.

So we're going - we'll make that happen. I think there's been a lot of good advancement that we've had a lot of discussion with each of the agencies, but we're nowhere where we need to be. And we do a lot of user-generated content through tourism, a lot of tweet - we do a lot of tweeting, a lot of Instagram, a lot of just a variety of social media. And as we need to, I mean Caitlyn can help tweet out whatever it is that you want her to tweet.

Archer: We do that.

Vecchio: Yes, so you know - so that can help as well. The other part of that is...

Stoldal: Do you have a person that just handles the Facebook and certain amount of...

Vecchio: Yes, that's Caitlyn.

Stoldal: Okay.

Vecchio: So she's our millennial social media director, and she does a - she's really active in all things social media.

Archer: Everything that I put out goes to Caitlyn, Caitlyn Godby is her name. And Caitlyn does social media for the whole Department, well she does the Division of Tourism.

And then if there's something from the other Divisions that I send her that peaks her interest, she will incorporate it into that along with Chris Moran, and they've been really, really good about that. We work very closely together to promote things. But I think that's different than what you're asking for as opposed to where I am promoting the retail side, exhibits, events, activities, that sort of thing, we want to do something that is a little more comprehensive.

Vecchio: Yes, well UGC stuff is really important, and it's very much the direction that we are going in our - in marketing, but we're not anywhere close to where we need to be with your website.

And as people use the websites less and they are more directed to Facebook, I would encourage you as you're tweeting or whatever, guide them to your Facebook page, because that's going to be as important to these people as the website.

Archer: That's been the only tool we've had for a long, long time is to guide them to Facebook. Each of the individual museums has a Facebook account, and for the most part, except for those exceptions that I was talking about, they have been really good about using that to communicate to their audiences in this interim when we have not been able to use a website, and it's been several years.

Also, our Friends' Groups have Facebook pages. They don't tweet as much, but they do use their Facebook pages to comment and engage socially and we take great advantage of that with the Friends' Group pages.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. So that would be the Nevadasouthern.com, where it says Friends of Nevada Southern Railways is that an example of the friends?

Archer: Um-hmm. And in the north we have the Friends of Nevada State Railroad Museum. I'm not - I don't think Carson City, the main museum has one.

Schorr: Would it be offensive to our friends if we gave them advice on the layout of the website? Is it time for a refresh? I just don't that it gives I think we could probably enhance what a potential user would think of the experience, if we modified - updated the website.

Stoldal: Are you - our website?

Schorr: Specifically Nevadasouthern.com which is what comes up when you really search for the Railroad Museum in Boulder City.

Stoldal: But that [inaudible 00:12:39] to our friends, correct?

Vecchio: Yes.

Stoldal: The friends have control of that, which is a whole separate issue unlike the rest of the museums, the two railroad museums have a separate organization which we don't control that is sort of their membership group.

Vecchio: But can we...

Archer: Influence?

Vecchio: Influence their...

Archer: You know I have a couple of thoughts on that. One is that we are very fortunate to have the friends group. Their age tends to be much older than the market that we're talking about using this.

So the fact that they actually are on there is just really yah! And so we're very grateful that they have some resources in order to be involved there, that's been helpful.

Schorr: Yes, Seth Schorr for the record. And that's why you know I wanted to make sure that we don't - that we are sensitive to that. We don't want to be offensive. But I have to tell you that if the people that we - the people that we want to be speaking to are people my age with kids. You know people in their 30s and 40s. And that website actually be a turn-off. You almost - I'd rather have no website than something that makes it look like it's not an exhibit worth driving the 40 minutes to.

Stoldal: What's the information that's on that website that we don't have on our website? I mean is that...

Schorr: The information is accurate. It's just not a very compelling website, and I think that we - from a design perspective it could just be a very - it could be a very different simple design. I mean it looks like a [inaudible 00:14:16] it's just is a very soft [inaudible 00:14:20] a website that doesn't make the experience seem professional. The website isn't professional.

Stoldal: Where I was going with that is, is the changes that we're upgrading our part of the Nevada Department of Tourism, our website, can it not incorporate the things that are - that drove you to that site.

Schorr: So that would search engine optimization. I just typed in Boulder City Railroad Museum, and this is what comes up, and that's the - you know whoever has the best optimized search is where the user is going to find themselves.

Speaker: On the meta text.

Archer: We have a couple of problems and one is you hit the nail on the head. If someone searches for that museum, they're probably going to get links to all that bad information. And that's what I was trying to convey. Is that, if you go to Google and you search for any one of our State museums, it's going to pull up the old links that we can't seem to get taken down. And that's been a great frustration.

Stoldal: Felicia, is that one of the things we're charging this person to do, or is this...

Archer: Yes, absolutely.

Stoldal: Okay.

Vecchio: I didn't so if you could - I'm sure Chris knows that but if something else somebody else can do...

Archer: We talked - I think we talked about that in the last Board meeting, just so - I wanted to come back to you to let you know that. You know I went back, and I did check with the webmaster and tried to see if there were other things.

One of the problems that we had, and I think I explained to you the last time Commissioner Schorr, is that we are - our website had been hacked. So if you're new and you didn't know we had been hacked, it infected my computer, and then when I would do something I'd infect somebody else.

And it had been actually taken over. So that was the problem with nevadaculture.org. The museums dot, the NAC dot, and I think the Indians are on their separate one, but it was a great problem for us for a long time. And the reason I say we moved forward is we now at least have another website up that appears as opposed to going directly to that thing.

But if you go to Google, all those links are still active, and my understanding is that that won't change until the Nevada Arts Council brings their site up. I asked about that this week, and their estimate is May.

Vecchio: Oh good God, that's ridiculous.

Speaker: Oh wow.

Vecchio: Okay. Well, I'm glad I know about this.

Stoldal: Well I think what we need there - we're going to put our March agenda an update on this particular topic. I know that we have at least three if not more members of this body that have some background experience in this area, and so I - let's think about how we could we could use the expertise of our - I think quite frankly our three newest members who all have a skill set that is beyond some of us [inaudible 00:17:26].

Barber: This is Alicia Barber, just that optimization thing, they're different than the broken wings thing. You're right, Seth, I mean I'm looking at it, you put in Boulder City Railroad Museum, which is often how people will look for it because they might not put Nevada State - whatever.

And so you get the Nevada Southern site, then you get Trip Advisor. Then you get Vegas.com, Wikipedia, a YouTube video, Vegas for locals, the Facebook page for - you know like you don't even get to our...

Archer: And that was the second part of what I - my response to him was that. So we want to get those bad links out of there, so that they don't appear when we do...

Barber: But those aren't bad links. Those are other websites.

[crosstalk]

Sarah: I just looked for Nevada State Museum, this is Sarah for the record, but I just did it because I was curious. And so I do get a picture of the building here, but then when I click on it, it takes me to the culture.org, it doesn't - it's not the website for the museum. It's just a general...

Archer: Right, right. Or you get something that says oops, that page - it says Travel Nevada, and it says oops that page doesn't exist.

Stoldal: Well, Alicia, I think maybe one of the issues is those are all good sites, vegas.com, etc. But whether their links - that the sites that they're linked to, they send - actually one of those links are really good.

Archer: So we are prime for opportunity here, that's a great spin. We are prime for opportunity to make this better. And step one in making this better is to help us to take down the old site, so that the links don't take you there.

Then once that's out of the way, you focus on exactly what Commissioner Schorr and Commissioner Barber are saying, and move forward with what we want it to be, where it will appear and drive it where we want it.

Stoldal: Claudia, you have a plan that you're...

Vecchio: I do now. I really didn't know we were in as bad a shape as we are. So I'll fix this. And by the time you guys meet in February, we'll have a plan.

The other thing that - with you know there's SEO and SEM and that we can do organic search optimization and we can do paid search optimization. And we do a big paid search optimization program with tourism, and I could ask them and I will do - to add key words that will drive your search. And so that's - you know we can help out with that piece, because that's not inexpensive, to have as many different entities as you do drive the search.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. And that's critical, even at this time of the year, people will type in Santa train, and you want them going to Nevada Culture, and not that other website.

Those Nevada Culture sites are very professionally well-done site. So we - compared to the other one.

Archer: But nobody is trained to go to that site yet. That's - you know we're just...

Schorr: It's a much cleaner site.

Archer: Yes.

Timmons: Anthony Timmons for the record. And then of course until they are on top of Member Schorr said, you always do your tweets, your Instagram, I mean we have so much material, so many exhibits here

in this museum, they just lend themselves to Instagram. It's crazy. And then you tag that back to your website through digital media as well.

So yes, it just - it layers on itself, and that's how you eventually get that pointed in the right direction, to the right website instead of the all broken...

Stoldal: I would hope that those that have the skills necessary can be thinking about drafting an item for our agenda, what we should specifically be talking about in our February meeting.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. I just - I want to throw out there, I don't know if it's inappropriate, but you know as soon as this month for this 2015 Santa train, if we had a hashtag, whatever we want it to be, Vegas Santa Train, the data boost - start generating content immediately, because right now there is only one post on the Instagram for the Railway Museum.

Stoldal: In spite of all of that, we sold how many tickets?

Barton: It's virtually sold out. I don't...

Schorr: But what a shame to not have those people post, because that would impact Q1 sales for next year.

Archer: The only other thing I would add to this discussion is that if you look at Travel Nevada, and the Division of Tourism, how many staff do you have Claudia?

Vecchio: The entirety?

Archer: Yes.

Vecchio: 25 or so.

Archer: So the Division of Tourism has 25, and the Division of Museums and History has me.

Vecchio: Oh well, in the PR world.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. I really mean to clarify that I think what I'm suggesting should take all the pressure off you, and I appreciate how much you must have on your plate, and I think it's our responsibility to guide the - to guide this effort from a strategic position to take the pressure off of you, that's what my main...

Archer: I understand, yes I understand. And I share that I guess is what I would say to you. I share that, the frustration level of being one person, I've been here four years, one person four years, trying to drag this little thing as a tugboat. I call myself the tugboat, you know the tugboat trying to drag the organization into that direction.

And back to what you said earlier, the staff has been at three-quarters levels, and doing all of their work and we're asking them to do more. And in some cases where you have vacant positions even, so I'm not saying that as an excuse, but I want to frame it that the people at the museums are doing their very best by accepting additional work, and this as part of their job.

And then I've been working very - very hard to try to get them coordinated and make it a consistent message.

Stoldal: Well, they're challenges that we all face, whatever the industry is and the television industry, we went through this for five years, trying to convince the reporters, the anchors, and the photographers and all the news gathers that there is something called Twitter, and Facebook, these are all wonderful tools.

And they were too busy with their other job, which was gathering the news, standing there doing live reports. And to do all that - it literally took, and these were not seasoned folks like me. These were

younger folks in their 20s that knew about all this stuff, but they already had a full-time job, so the transition and we're going to have to move a lot quicker within the museum system to deal with this issue. Otherwise, our attendance is going to continue to go down.

Barber: Alicia Barber, I think what Seth is saying too is that have the consumers, you know have the audience do the job for you. And so totally passive on the staff part. I mean, it could be like at our museums, have like - like what you saw? Hashtag dah, dah, you know post about it. Have a selfie station, you know whatever.

Like you can do stuff where you set up something so minimal, but then it just gets those visitors to think about it, and they're going to say like oh yeah. Like hashtag whatever, you know and they would do it. So that could be something that could be done right away. It's like every museum has a sign that says something to the effect of tweet something whatever and here's your hashtag.

I mean it would do something. If it did one thing, you've spent what ten bucks on a sign.

Ostrovsky: This is Bob Ostrovsky just for the record you know. We have a one-woman band here, it's tough. I mean I just tell you when you do that, and I agree we should do that, but it might take off my - put on my private industry hat, and part of what my company does is manage social media for clients, big clients.

You've got to monitor what's going on on Twitter, and on your Facebook page, I mean you've got to respond to negative stuff, as well as positive stuff. So it's a commitment, I think it's a commitment you've got to make. But it's not easy.

Archer: And we have had situations where someone has posted something - someone - and I'm talking about staff where someone has posted something and it was interpreted differently in the public, and we did have to respond and apologize.

Stoldal: Well, clearly it's - we're not going to resolve the topic today other than to say we need to move it up to the very top of our list. I know February an awful long time between now and then, and it would be nice if we could just throw the switch and have something happen.

Do you have a sense of the deadline, Claudia, that you're going to put this person to, as far as...

Vecchio: No. And I really think this is an outsource situation as opposed to an internal situation.

Stoldal: Okay.

Vecchio: So that would probably be around February when that could happen. And not that that person will working at it, but that person now has another family situation's come up, so he's out of the office for at least two weeks.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. And it certainly addresses in February but I think - I just want to make sure that my point is clear. We can come up with a solution that would impact all the museums, and that's by creating a hashtag marketing campaign and it could be the same one for all six museums.

The Facebook page is great. There's amazing pictures from last year's Santa Train ride. There's people in costumes. If those people knew to push a hashtag, it would be already out there on Instagram and on their Facebook pages which would have more significance and more reach. I guess I'm unfamiliar with who is responsible for that. Who would be responsible for putting that campaign together in a very simple way and then implementing it across all the museums and not on the individuals at the museums.

Stoldal: Nobody.



Schorr: Nobody.

Vecchio: Well, that's our responsibility though, as the Department. If we want to put together a hashtag, if we want to put together a social media campaign you know Caitlyn could do that, and she's very good at that, and it could be a focus of hers for the next however long. And then ultimately, it's Felicia's responsibility as the public information officer to make that happen.

But in terms of putting it together as a campaign and the [inaudible 00:27:59] and all that, we can do that.

Schorr: Right.

Stoldal: Thank you for your great report.

Timmons: Really quickly Felicia, this is Member Timmons. I'm a one-person PIO too, so I feel your pain. So I know exactly what you're going through. Even though you and I are peers in the public relations, well I just got an email from the business press wanting to do a story you know and you're trying to coordinate everything, so I totally - I understand where you're coming from and I totally can emphasize with you.

Archer: Thank you.

Stoldal: Renee.

Diamond: Renee Diamond. And then there is the added complication for those of you who are new to the State processes that if you want to contract out as a State agency, you all who are executives call somebody.

We have to have parameters and then depending on the value of the contract, we have to go to Board of Examiners, we have - so you can't like do it tomorrow, it's the - as far as I was concerned when I ran a State agency, the most frustrating thing was that process of contracting.

It just was endless and had a lot of requirements and you get so frustrated, because you know what's wrong, and you know somebody that can fix it, but you can't always use that person, and you can't depending on the contract, you can't just call them and say do it, even if you have the [inaudible 00:29:44].

Stoldal: However, we did call somebody and we can do it. Let's move back to item 5C consideration for scheduling a Board Planning retreat, draft agenda, selection of a facilitator and expenditure of private funds to cover the cost.

Peter handed me a note that says I spoke with Kendall Hardin. February 2016 is wide open. The cost roughly \$5,000 to \$7,000.

Speaker: That's what you guessed.

Stoldal: So we can now move forward if we want to put a little bit more details on this, do we want to pick a date? February 8th is a Monday, do we want to go early in February.

Diamond: That's was the veterans.

Stoldal: What's that?

Diamond: The veterans, Renee Diamond, didn't Peter have that week with the veterans.

Barton: That's...

Stoldal: The next week is February the 15th the pre - post Valentine's Day week.

Speaker: And there's a federal holiday in there too right?

Speaker: Monday.

Speaker: President's Day. The Monday.

Stoldal: February the 22nd. Isn't that a holiday also or...

Barton: It's Washington's birthday but it's celebrated the week before.

Stoldal: Okay. Do you want to try the week of February the 22nd? And if so, well let's pick a location first.

Speaker: Ely. Just kidding.

[laughter and crosstalk]

Speaker: In February?

Diamond: You're hallucinating.

Barton: Mr. Chairman, for the record Peter Barton. I suggested to Kendall that we'd probably do it in southern Nevada, and I think her fee was somewhat based on not having to travel to the north.

Stoldal: Oh, all right. Would we do it off site or at a - in a room like this? I'll leave that open to the Board - well, first of all, is Las Vegas acceptable? I presume you weren't talking about Lost City or Boulder City?

Barton: Well, somewhere that she wouldn't have to incur travel and lodging.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. Las Vegas has my vote, but I found that any retreat I've done, when it's in a hospitality suite environment, it's often more comfortable and we get more done than when it's in a Board Room environment. And if we do it midweek, there should be plenty of - it could even be less expensive to rent a hospitality suite in a hotel than in an environment like this.

Ostrovsky: For the record, Bob Ostrovsky. Everyone should remember this is a public meeting, so wherever you go, you have to have adequate space for the public. Whether anybody shows up or not is another matter, but you have to have the adequate place for them to sit.

Speaker: Yes, I mean you have to notice an agenda, just like a normal meeting so you know it is a notice meeting. In my experience, I mean when you say you know Board retreat and stuff, I mean I don't know you might have a couple people. I haven't - I haven't seen large numbers generally show up, but yes, I mean it has to be publicly accessible and not behind a locked door and you know, somewhere where the public can show up.

Stoldal: Seth I tend to agree with you in the sense that whenever we have one, when we met at the TV Station or at the place, it just didn't work, it was better if we moved off site.

Speaker: [inaudible 00:33:27]

Stoldal: First of all, is that - is Las Vegas with...

Speaker: Sure.

Stoldal: Is the week of the 22nd, earlier in the week, like a Tuesday, Wednesday, or a Wednesday, Thursday.

Speaker: I could do a Tuesday Wednesday.

Stoldal: We have a Tuesday Wednesday, which is 23rd and 24th.

Speaker: 22, 23.

Stoldal: 23rd and 24th.

Speaker: 23, 24 yes.

Timmons: This is Member Timmons, what time would we go to just because I actually teach in the evenings, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday.

Stoldal: I would suggest we get - we start at eleven o'clock, that we ask our brethren from the north to come down the night before, so we can get a good start at eight...

Timmons: And go up till about four or so.

Stoldal: Something like that, yes.

Timmons: Okay, then it's fine.

Speaker: I would suspect Sarah won't be able to attend, given mid-week days.

Stoldal: Yes. Yes, this is not something we just listen on the phone. And hopefully just as an aside, Peter, if we could figure some way to get the minutes of that meeting or whatever is recorded, if we can get that turned quicker than - so we can go over those things.

All right, so we're looking at the 23rd and 24th, eight o'clock in the morning until four in Las Vegas, a site to be determined, but tentatively here.

Speaker: Right.

Stoldal: Is that...

Vecchio: I'll be out of the country, but I can get somebody who...

Stoldal: Oh, we'll be out of the country...

Is there somebody that could represent you here?

Vecchio: Yes.

Stoldal: Okay. What country are you going to be in?

Vecchio: That's the China trip.

Stoldal: Okay. Or we could all go with Claudia.

Vecchio: Yes, come stay with me.

Barton: I'm voting for that.

Stoldal: So then the next - so do we want a motion on that? I think we probably need a motion which would entail setting the date, the place, the time and authorizing Peter to begin the process to develop the contract. Do we want to set a dollar figure that Peter could go up to? Just thinking out loud.

Ostrovsky: I can make a motion. We move that we have a Board Planning Retreat, scheduled in February 23rd and 24th of 2016, is that right? To be held at this point at the Las Vegas State Museum. We can always change the location of where...

Stoldal: Well actually we may just reserve some place, they've got great places.

Ostrovsky: Well, I can make it broader, then meet at the Springs Preserve.

Stoldal: Okay.

Ostrovsky: As opposed to just the museum. We're part of the preserves so we could still do it here. And that we engage the services of Kendell Hardin, it's H-a-r-d-i-n, by the way I have her Resume I can pass around for people to look at, to be the facilitator, and I would request that we authorize an expenditure for the total cost including the consultant travel - and travel expenses and other related costs not to exceed - I'm kind of looking - I was going \$15,000, not to exceed.

Speaker: I think that's appropriate.

Ostrovsky: With air fare and hotels and then authorize them to do that and report back to us on the actual expenses, staff report back on the actual expenses. And to further require staff to require a written contract under the State rules that apply, whatever those are, with Kendell Hardin.

Speaker: Just so you know though, by my calculation, it looks like the financial report wouldn't be until the day of or after the meeting, because the next meeting, I mean this would be the next meeting right, this February meeting we're talking about.

Okay, and then as far as the contract, normally you sign it after the Board approves it. Would we have an issue, I mean I guess the Board can authorize.

Stoldal: I was hoping to authorize Peter Barton to sign - to execute it on behalf of the Board.

Speaker: If that's allowed under your use of the funds, I'm not sure.

Speaker: I don't think there's a policy against that.

Stoldal: We could change it to Peter and/or myself...

Ostrovsky: And/or Bob Stoldal, Chairman of the Board.

Stoldal: Just in case there was any feedback.

Speaker: Because I think he normally signs it as the administrator on the top, I sign it as to form, and then you sign it for the Board I think. So normally we all three sign it anyway.

Diamond: So Renee Diamond, question. So this is exempt from the Board of Examiners' requirement.

Speaker: Because it's being - use private funds. And I don't know about the RFP process but I'm trusting that Carrie's an expert there and she knows what required if it is.

Edlefsen: Statutory - we've got a statutory exemption from NRS 333 - purchasing...

Speaker: Okay, for the private fund use.

Edlefsen: For the private fund use.

Speaker: Okay, so then that exempts it from an RFP completely, but we'll still do a contract to make sure the State is protected.

Edlefsen: Exactly.

Ostrovsky: And the motion to clarify that, this is private funds budget expenditures that we're authorized.

Diamond: And that we're exempt.

Ostrovsky: That would be my motion.

Stoldal: One of the better and longer motions we've had.

Ostrovsky: Yes.

Diamond: Second, Renee Diamond.

Stoldal: Second by Renee, further discussion. I will only ask - further discussion, hearing none, all those in favor say aye, [ayes around], those opposed? Motion carries.

I would ask that everybody read over the topics that Peter and Bob have put together and send to Peter your thoughts so we have a strong digital element, social media element, whatever the order, the priorities that you think that - they're all great, but we're only going to have two days, so we can only have so many of us, so put the priorities that you think are the most important.

And if you get those off to Peter by the close of business Monday, so we can get those taken care of and move forward.

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, Bob Ostrovsky. And if there's items you think we should just strike like if you decide museum storage is not appropriate for this, at this time, we already do it, strike it. Because - ask us to strike it, because we'll try to hone it down into something that we think is manageable for discussion.

Stoldal: Who would like to be on the committee that I'm going to appoint to deal with this, to deal with the agenda, after Peter gets all these things to work with Peter. Bob's already on that committee.

Ostrovsky: Right.

Stoldal: Alicia is on the committee. And Stoldal is on the committee. So Peter once you get all this stuff, if you could send it to the three of us, we will simply communicate with you, not with each other. And then we'll get a draft out of the agenda within the next couple of weeks.

All right, move to item 7E which is the museum reports for the first quarter of 2016. The first is Nevada Historical Society in Reno. You've all had a chance to review, are there any questions you have. Sherry are you still on the line?

Sherry: Yes, I am.

Stoldal: Any questions of Sherry regarding the report? Sherry is there anything you'd like to highlight to make sure the Board knows about it.

Sherry: Right now, this is Sherry for the record. We have had Systems in Space visit our site twice, and they're still trying to finalize [inaudible 00:42:30] so we have half of the contact shelving back on, so it's one part of [inaudible 00:42:39].

Stoldal: Any questions for Sherry? Let's move then to 7 - oh, I'm sorry, questions.

Ostrovsky: Bob Ostrovsky. Define - what account is that paid out of?

Barton: It was paid out of their State budget account 2870.

Ostrovsky: Which is - normally would be used for what?

Sherry: Just building maintenance.

Barton: Building maintenance, it was under the maintenance category.

Ostrovsky: That's what it's - so the fine is paid out of that.

Barton: Yes. And the Board paid for the cost of the repair for the contractor System in Space to restore the

occupancy sensors.

Ostrovsky: Okay.

Barton: Mr. Chairman, Peter Barton for the record. We're withdrawing item A under this item, 7E1(a), we're withdrawing at this time.

Stoldal: I'm going to need a motion.

Speaker: Why?

Barton: It's get - again, for the record, Peter Barton, it's complex. I guess I - Carrie do you want to try to do the 30 second version of that?

Speaker: Is it the funding?

Edlefsen: Well, partially it's the funding. Well the [inaudible 00:44:06] site has been able to accumulate many computers that have been recycled basically after other computers in the Department have been replaced.

They're operating on Windows - Vista and XP, and they're having some compatibility issues. These computers however have not been on the State inventory asset list prior to just recently, and in that if the Board were to fund these computers, would have difficulty going down the road and asking the State to replace them on the replacement schedule without the State saying well the Board of Museums purchased them last time, why can't they replace them this time.

So we want to be very careful about how they're funded and how they're purchased, especially a large amount of computers like this, particularly when they haven't been on the asset list and we want to be very cautious about not opening up any opportunity for the State to - who should be paying for these to not pay for them.

Barber: So it's Alicia Barber. So do we know if - how close they are on the replacement list, because I was there yesterday, they're bad, I mean they're slow, they're not compatible with the programs.

Do we know when they might get replaced, because they really need that.

Edlefsen: We can work at replacing some of them in the next - in the upcoming biennium. The problem is they weren't purchased for historical society. They were purchased in other areas of the Department previously. And when those computers were replaced, the IT Department recycled them and upped them so that they could be used for volunteers for research, for whatever.

It's a very large amount of computers, compared to the computers that they already have that the State is replacing and has on the asset list.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. How many computers?

Edlefsen: Um...

Barton: Nine?

Edlefsen: They're requesting nine, but that gives them a total of 16 or 17 computers. I have to - I have to comment that there are no other museums who have research libraries, who have that many computers.

Barber: I thought they were going to replace, they weren't going to add those in addition. Weren't they going to replace the ones with Vista with newer computers, right? Wasn't it a replacement, not...

Edlefsen: Well, that's what they're asking to do.

Barber: Right.

Edlefsen: But down the road, they will need to be replaced again.

Stoldal: Well that's [inaudible 00:46:42] how many does the State have on the books, formally that the State has purchased?

Edlefsen: Off the top of my head I believe there are eight.

Stoldal: Eight. So the State thinks in their system that they are responsible for those eight and would replace them.

These are ones that have been sort of refurbished and...

Edlefsen: Right.

Stoldal: So the issue is not whether we have \$9,000. The issue is some way to move those nine onto the State books so to speak?

Edlefsen: Correct. They are on the asset list now.

Stoldal: And if you can't - if we can't do that, will you be coming back to us at some point maybe and asking the Board for funds?

Edlefsen: Possibly.

Stoldal: Okay.

Vecchio: Well, Peter it's all based on this replacement schedule, and unfortunately the last time around, we didn't properly ask for the right number of computers for this last biennium. Somehow this particular location got missed.

Stoldal: Okay.

Vecchio: So it will - I've talked to our IT guy who manages all the IT, and so he's going to be sure that it's on this next biennium request. Nine computers is a lot, but based on the age of these computers, I don't think we're going to have a huge issue getting them put on there. This technology is definitely a focus.

Stoldal: I think the whole issue of systems running on XP is going to come up at the next session of legislature.

Vecchio: Totally.

Stoldal: So that's how we count the votes in Clark County.

Speaker: The XP.

[crosstalk and laughter]

Vecchio: And then the other issue is we can't - we don't want to go around the process, because if you go around the process [inaudible 00:48:23] you really open yourself up, and in two different ways, and neither one of them is in the best interest for the Agencies.

Stoldal: Seth, does that...

Schorr: Yes, no I understand.

Stoldal: Okay, thanks. Please.

Diamond: Renee Diamond just a question. Do you ever go to interim finance on computers?

Barton: It's not recommended.

Vecchio: Yes, it has not historically been something that they would favorably look at. We could determine the tenor of the...

Barton: The other - I'm sorry.

Diamond: Well, the reason I asked is when I ran a State Agency, and when I came in, there were all kinds of problems like that. And we had computers that didn't belong there or anything, and what administration advised me to do was to go to interim finance, at that time, Senator O'Donnell was like a computer right there and he understood it, and I'm sure there's some equivalent person now, and so I'm just suggesting that maybe that - because it speeds it up of course.

Vecchio: They will ask why we did request [inaudible 00:49:38]...

Barton: The other challenge if I may, Peter Barton for the record that we face is that these are - the State's basic policy is we give a computer to a staff person. So here's another situation where we're the square peg trying to fit in the round hole of state government. They don't fund computers for research libraries; they just don't normally do that.

So we've got a dual challenge that these are old, they weren't on the inventory. And now suddenly we're going in and saying gosh, we need nine computers for the public to use. Those kind of things generally - you get resistance.

Stoldal: I do have a sense you'd like us - you to work this out amongst ourselves, rather than us getting - jump in the middle.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record, and I - in that earlier in this meeting we talked about having to maybe think differently in terms of fundraising and sponsorships, and if we're asking people for money, it's good to know and tell them we're asking for it. And if we do end up asking donors for money, that's a very compelling and clear thing. A computer for research. If you believe in research, if you believe in academia, that's something that's real easy to quantify.

I don't know that that's the answer for this problem, but it seems to be a really good example to what you brought up earlier in the meeting.

Stoldal: I appreciate it, thank you.

Barber: I'm sorry we'll do the - this is Alicia Barber. Yes and again this is sort of anecdotal, you know me being there. Again, I didn't think that online was just for the public.

But I just - for us to think about in general and maybe it's a retreat a little bit too, but I think truly the historical society and places where the public is coming in to do research, like for searches you know, like doing a search, other catalogs and it takes like four minutes for the search - something that should be done like this you know.

I know that there was a - we had a discussion a little earlier, I don't remember what happened to it, was at the historical society about trying to get Ancestry subscription, you know something like that to actually be there for the public to use, and this historical society.

I mean that is a very appealing kind of thing to have in a historical society for people to be able to go into genealogically research themselves, and utilizing Ancestry, which is a very expensive subscription.

Anyway, it's [inaudible 00:51:51] to kind of think about I guess would be the museums, or the historical societies that do offer public research and historical society is just the one I'm most familiar



with.

So I'm sure this is an across the board problem with computers, so I totally get it. But just to think about. That is an amenity, you know, that's something for these computers that are for the public is something that - you know it's something that's a special category that I think this deserves special attention.

Now in this particular case I understand that that [inaudible 00:52:16] but it's just something we haven't really talked about too much. And that's how a lot of public libraries are getting a lot of people to come in and utilize those services, is because they offer you know things that people can't get a personal subscription for.

Okay, sorry Bob, thanks.

Stoldal: Sherry, anything else.

Sherry: No, that's it for now.

Stoldal: Okay, great thank you. Please, Doris.

Dwyer: Okay, this is Doris Dwyer for the record. On this OSHA, I don't know if this is for Peter or for Sherry or both, but okay, on the OSHA, so the fine has been paid.

Now, was this work that was to be done on November 19th? I mean did that fix the - at the very bottom, item H under OSHA, I mean is it work - I mean is it working?

Barton: Not completely, I think we just heard Sherry say that it's - they haven't quite resolved the last of the issues.

Dwyer: Okay, so that - sorry about that.

Stoldal: So what happened with [inaudible 00:53:20]?

Barton: I think that's - Sherry that's what you said, right?

Sherry: Yes, half of its done.

Dwyer: So how does that affect OSHA, I mean is there timeline?

Sherry: No, there's no timeline for the OSHA. We've adhered to their rules and regulations and the system is - you know the section that's not working is locked down to prevent any potential hazards. So we're done with the OSHA [inaudible 00:53:47].

Dwyer: Okay, so it's just a repair problem, not an OSHA problem.

Sherry: That is correct.

Dwyer: Okay.

Stoldal: All right, then let's move onto the Nevada State Museum in Carson City. Is Jim on the line?

Barton: I don't believe so.

Stoldal: Since Jim's not on the line, questions for Peter. We've got - there are no questions, there are two action items, I'll take a look at the report first, seeing no questions, let's go then to 7E2(a) review, possible action on a contract with the Columbia Machine Works of Oakland, California to accomplish repairs to Coin Press 1 at about \$19,692, Peter?

Barton: Yes, for the record, Peter Barton, and there's a slight alteration of that contract value, it's \$19,942, it is

\$250 more than listed on the agenda. The contractor did not possess a valid Nevada Contractor Business License, and rightfully he is passing that cost to obtain that along to us. So the contract value has gone up \$250 to \$19,942.

And this is a contract to repair Coin Press Number 1. The Coin Press produced 6,000 medallions for the sesquicentennial and it's had some very large orders for third parties including our contract with New York Mint.

That production has taken a bit of a toll on the Coin Press. We've noticed some imperfections in the productions recently. So the smart thing to do is take it out of service, and we have the - you know if you know Coin Press Number 1, it was built by Morgan and Orr in Philadelphia. They were the manufacturer of the Coin Press in 1869, came out to Carson City in 1870, and by 1878, it developed a crack, and rather than send it back to Philadelphia, the superintendent of the Mint went to the Virginia and Truckee Railroad in Carson City to their machine shop, and said can you guys fix it? And the V&T said we can, they did.

And when the Coin Press returned to the US Mint, instead of having Rogers and Orr as the manufacturer, now it said V&T Railroad Machine Shop 1878 Carson City. History has a way of repeating itself.

When we determined there were imperfections in the production, and the quality wasn't what we wanted it to be, we called the machine shop at the Carson City Railroad Museum, and said do you guys know this stuff. And they came up and Chris DeWitt, who is the Shop Superintendent, who many of you know did a very simple thing, he took a flashlight and went around it, and sure enough the light came through and we determined there were cracks in some of the portions that take the tonnage of the press.

Columbia Machine Works has done work on the Coin Press previously, very satisfactorily. So we reached out to them based upon a scope of work that we initially provided, courtesy of the Railroad Museum, and that's resulted in this contract, which you have before you today to repair it and hopefully get the Coin Press back, up into production we would hope by early next Spring.

Stoldal: And they changed the plaque.

Barton: I'm sorry?

Ostrovsky: And how about the warranty from the original manufacturer.

[Laughter]

Ostrovsky: Peter this is Bob Ostrovsky. How much revenue are we losing with this thing out of service for three or four months? A lot?

Barton: We had to delay some production on the New York Mint Contract, they understand it. We haven't lost that work, but it certainly has delayed obviously the production of the revenue.

Stoldal: Was this built into the budget?

Barton: No. No.

Speaker: No, it was not.

Stoldal: [inaudible 00:58:13] you ask a question in a negative way. With the massive amount of stuff from the New York Mint in the sesquicentennial we didn't think it was going to break?

Barton: Oh we did, I mean we certainly, we worked into the contract with New York Mint that there would be times that we thought we would have to take the press out of service to do either routine maintenance

or maintenance that we couldn't predict, all of this type of failure.

Stoldal: Is that where the money is coming?

Barton: It's coming out of the revenue that the Coin Press generates, yes.

Stoldal: Okay. And how much is - I mean how much of this - is this happened while we're making 25 percent? 10 percent?

Edlefsen: So we're at - Carrie Edlefsen for the record. We're anticipating, we budgeted for \$63,000 roughly in revenues from the Coin Press. To date they have reached almost 50 percent of that.

Stoldal: So roughly a third of it's going to go to repairs?

Edlefsen: That is correct.

Barton: But you have to amortize that - for the record Peter Barton, I think over the - you know it's been at least 10 years since we've done any sort of costly, heavy repair on it.

Stoldal: Okay. We have - Renee.

Diamond: Renee Diamond for the record. So I think I've asked it before. We signed the contract with New York Mint, we sell products of the Coin Press in our individual museum stores.

How long has it been since we've done a cost analysis? Silver is I think up - no, down, okay. Our wear and tear on old things, I'm now an expert on old things.

[laughter]

Diamond: Wear and tear and maintenance has to be going up. Do we really - have we ever done like a projected cost analysis?

Barton: For the record, Peter Barton. We have, and I know this question came up two or three meetings ago and I wish Jim [Barmer] were here, because I know he had exactly when it had last been reviewed, it's been a few years, and it's timely.

Diamond: I'm sure it is.

Barton: I'm sure that we do it again. The cost of silver is usually not a - I mean for the New York Mint contract they provide the material. So we factor that pretty much out of our third party contract. We have them provide the silver. We get a fee that ranges between \$9 and \$15 per press.

Diamond: So Renee Diamond again. It seems to me that it's been the same amount for a number of years, a long number of years. So I can't believe that that could be accurate.

So I guess what I'm saying is it maybe time before we continue to sell them for a below cost - the ones that under contract of course we don't have any more until the contract is over and we go to sign a new contract, we have no influence over - but we certainly have some influence over what's sold in the stores.

So I would say that maybe for some future meeting we might want to come up with a current cost analysis and a...

Stoldal: Why we don't just get sort of an overall update on the press at the March meeting just to get some idea of the - the money that we projected as revenue from the Coin Press, did we allocate that to be spent in some way?

Speaker: That's generally - well, that's generally allocated to be spent out of Coin Press expenditures, which can

vary between maintenance, between the cost of the silver to purchase for minting the medallions.

- Stoldal: But weren't we using some money from the revenue of the Coin Press to fund other programs or other...
- Barton: How is that money mapped?
- Stoldal: Yes, how is the money mapped?
- Speaker: Some of the money from the Coin Press is mapped into the administration budge, which does - which does support the sales and promotion position.
- Stoldal: So this will be reduced by like \$20,000.
- Speaker: Yes, the cash will yes.
- Speaker: Can I make a motion?
- Stoldal: Please.
- Speaker: I make a motion to approve the contract with Columbia Machine for repairs on Coin Press Number 1 in the amount of \$19, - I just lost it, thousand...
- Barton: 942.
- Speaker: Thank you.
- Stoldal: Do we have a second?
- Timmons: I have a question.
- Stoldal: Please.
- Timmons: Quick question, this is member Timmons for the record. Is the person who actually operates the coin press a staffed position, a paid position?
- Barton: The Coin Press operator is Ken [Hoffel]. He is a volunteer. When he's producing medallions for contractors, we do pay him a stipend for his time, because it goes above and beyond operation for the museum, which is one day a month. If we have to bring him in four days a month, we pay him the other three days under a temporary services contract.
- Timmons: Is it less than \$30,000 a year, I would assume?
- Barton: We don't have it - it is.
- Timmons: Okay, just curious.
- Stoldal: We have a motion. Do we have a second.
- Dwyer: I'll second.
- Stoldal: Doris, you have a second, Doris has the second. Further discussion on this contract? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye, [ayes around], those opposed. Motion carries.
- Item number 7E2(b), review and possible action to accelerate salary against the MDTF position, sale and promotion representative from budgeted Step 1 to Step 4, at an increase of \$2.48 an hour. This would have no impact on the current fiscal year. Peter?
- Barton: For the record, Peter Barton. This is a position, a half-time position that this Board, well it's been a Board position for over 30 years at this point. It's been vacant for a number of years.

We approved the filling of this position a year ago. We did not fill it in fiscal year '15. Recruitment's been conducted there were 11 candidates that were interviewed. One candidate came way over the top in terms of qualifications and experience and normally positions that have been vacant are and are back in the budget, are budgeted at step one. There are 9 or 10 steps?

Speaker: Ten.

Barton: Ten steps. Incremental steps that if an employee's performance, if an employee in the classified service, their employment is satisfactory, after completing the equivalent of 2,080 hours, they get a merit step increase. And there are nine of them up to step 10.

We normally budget at step one. This individual came in, has some experience in the Department of Tourism and Cultural Affairs and has worked as a temporary contract worker for the State Museum for some time, came in and actually requested a higher than step one starting salary which would be a bump of \$2.48 above what the grade 31, step 01 starting salary would be.

This Board, I thought it imperative this Board, since it's a privately funded position approve any step increase or acceleration in salary, because it does have an impact in the outer years. It was budgeted this year at \$33,943, and because we're starting a half year in, there's no - you know we'll still be less than that this year.

The delta in the next year would be - it's budgeted again at \$33,943. This increase would take that up by \$1,464 to \$35,407 annually. So it's impact is \$1,464 next year and there will be a commensurate increase in the years after that.

If this Board approves it. There's no guarantee that that will go through. It still then has to go over to the Governor's Finance Office Director for approval, through Claudia, and then it goes to the Governor's office for the Chief of Staff's approval.

These accelerated salaries are extremely hard to get. But I thought first step, we need to get your blessing on it, before we even take it...

Stoldal: Are you endorsing this? Direct [inaudible 01:07:38] approval.

Barton: I think that all things considered, having reviewed the applicant, the application, and the justification that this is a reasonable request.

Stoldal: I look for a motion.

Speaker: I make a motion...

Stoldal: Do we have a second.

Timmons: Second.

Stoldal: We have a motion, we have a second. Claudia?

Vecchio: This brings up a challenge for the Department, because I just denied exactly the same sort of a thing, although this is privately funded. I denied the same thing for the Arts Council, because of the impact that it has long-term on the 50/50 split with Tourism and the Arts Council.

So you know all - I'm going to have to have a good explanation for the Arts Council. And...

Stoldal: But this is - is the Arts Council funded privately?

Vecchio: No, but if it's - if this truly not a State funded, it's a privately funded, that's the explanation, but I just - I just denied the same thing.

Stoldal: Gotcha.

Speaker: Can you explain what you mean by that 50/50 split?

Vecchio: Yes. So there is a - in the Museums and History, there is a 50/50 split for all operational costs between lodging tax and private fund, private general funds. Sorry, between lodging tax and general funds. And it's the same with the Arts Council, for the [inaudible 01:09:10] it's a little different split.

But you know so every dollar that is being put in here or that is changed, it raised the amount that Tourism has to be in as well. So I'm holding a line on that, and so that's why I denied it from the Arts Council, and this would be a challenge.

The fact it's privately funded is probably a decent way to get around that.

Stoldal: Well, there's no 50/50 there is there?

Vecchio: There's no 50/50 here, it's 100 percent private funds.

Speaker: 100 percent privately funded.

Vecchio: Okay. Then does it - I wouldn't think I'd even have to see it then.

Stoldal: Well, that's great. All those in favor...

[Laughter]

Barton: I mean I want you to be comfortable.

Vecchio: It's good, it will be fine.

Diamond: Renee Diamond, one more question. So this position is for the store, right?

Barton: No, no. This position is a sales and promotion representative that would have a duty - primary duties to increase memberships to work the corporate. It's a Junior Development Officer.

Diamond: Okay. So my question is now that we have the job description, that how does this increased amount - do we have an equivalent position anyplace else?

Barton: We do not, and that's one of the things we have to - in the analysis that's required for the Governor's office we have to go through that.

Diamond: So that would be another thing that we have to [inaudible 01:10:49] Board, that future hires will have an argument for the hire about...

Stoldal: They don't have an argument. They tow the mark. I mean it's always - there's no guarantee. So we have a motion, we have a second. All those in favor - Peter?

Barton: Do we want a sidebar first?

Vecchio: If it's private funds it's fine.

Barton: It is 100 percent privately funded, it is.

Stoldal: All those in favor say aye [ayes around], those opposed? Motion carries, thank you both for the discussion. I mean like it's good to hear, I mean on the challenges that we all face, and the reality that we have to deal with.

Timmons: Hopefully the ROI won't be done on that position, it's member Timmons. I mean it's membership sales, it's all contributing to ROI, right?

Barton: True.

Timmons: Theoretically?

Speaker: To what? What is the...

Timmons: ROI.

Speaker: Return on investment.

Timmons: There's going to be some return especially if this person is selling [inaudible 01:11:48] sales, again member Timmons for the record.

Stoldal: All right, let's move down to the Railroad Museum, just down the street. Do we have anybody from the Railroad Museum here?

Barton: No.

Stoldal: Any questions for Peter on the Nevada State Railroad Museum in Carson City? Do I have an action item 3a, request to accept restricted donation pursuant to NRS 381.0075 of a collection of models known collectively as the "Richardson" models, procured through the generosity of the children of Jack and Margie Gibson to be a lasting memorial to their parents.

The stipulated restriction is that the collection remain intact and exhibited to the best ability of the museum to do so.

We bought this collation for \$40,000?

Barton: That's correct, yes.

Stoldal: Through the generosity of the children.

Barton: Yes. You may recall, for the record, Peter Barton. That Jack and Marge Gibson were 30 plus year volunteers at both the Nevada State Museum and the Nevada State Railroad Museum. Jack Gibson passed away, I believe a year ago. His widow passed away in September or October.

And they held a memorial service at the Railroad Museum, and at the time the four siblings got together and spoke with the museum staff and wanted to establish a lasting memorial.

Concurrently the collection of detailed scale models known as the "Richardson" collection of V&T locomotives. There's 16 models in that collection. It's been on loan to the Railroad Museum for just about 40 years.

About three or four years ago, and George Richardson passed away, his son then managed the loan and the relationship with the Museum for a number of years. His son passed away. So now it's the grandson we were dealing with.

The grandson came to us, and said I'd like to sell the collection. Do you want to buy it? And we went back and forth, and there was an independent appraisal done that the son wanted \$50,000, the appraisal didn't support it, and we kind of just both backed away into our respective corners.

When this offer to create a lasting memorial came about, Director Corbin suggested that perhaps this could enable the museum to negotiate successfully to procure the Richardson collection of models. A negotiation was undertaken and rather quickly came to an agreement on a \$40,000 number as opposed to \$50,000.

That the funds were actually donated to the Friends of Nevada State Railroad Museum, the Friends executed the donation or the purchase of the collection and what you have in front of you is a deed of

gift, where the Friends of Nevada State Railroad Museum are donating the collection to the Railroad Museum.

With the stipulation that was requested by the siblings that this collection remain intact and exhibited to the best of our ability in perpetuity.

So that's the restriction. We've agreed to keep the collection intact and exhibit it what's reasonable. I mean the collection if something deteriorates or interests change, this would still provide us the opportunity to move the collection off exhibit.

Ostrovsky: I have a question, this is Bob Ostrovsky, a question about the deed of gift language. About the ability - reserves a right if they're not exhibited to their satisfaction, reserves a right to pull them back, I mean, can you live with that.

We know what kind of problems that can raise.

Stoldal: Would it go back to the Friends?

Ostrovsky: Well, it says so long as any of the above-mentioned gifts and donors remain alive, they reserve the right to take back their bottles if they are not exhibited to their satisfaction. That's what the deed of gift says.

Speaker: That's unusual isn't it.

Speaker: Do we have the language here.

Barton: It is. Second paragraph.

Speaker: Oh, here it is, sorry I wasn't on the right page.

Ostrovsky: A little unusual.

Barton: It is. Let me wire Mr. Corbin.

Timmons: So even though we pay \$40,000...

Ostrovsky: But we didn't pay.

Timmons: Well the Friends paid.

Ostrovsky: The Friends paid.

Barton: The Friends paid.

Ostrovsky: The Friends paid. Our money is not at risk but...

Speaker: I mean they can take them back and then sell it? I mean, it's weird.

Ostrovsky: I don't know, it's just - usually when you make that deed, it's a deed in perpetuity, it's done.

Speaker: Yes, but I mean they gave the money to the Friends so that it was bought, right.

Ostrovsky: Right.

Speaker: So we - okay.

Ostrovsky: I mean they donated the money. I'm assuming that it was done for tax purposes or whatever. They made [inaudible 01:17:26] and it was purchased.

Barton: We're in a large debate over the Richardson collection. Okay, all right.



Speaker: The Friends donate it to the museum, then the family has nothing to do with it.

Speaker: No the family gave the Friends the money to buy it.

Speaker: Sure, but then they bought it and they donated it to the museum, the Friends did.

Speaker: So isn't the family out of the equation?

[crosstalk]

Diamond: I think it would be if...

Speaker: Yes, if the Friends purchased the title...

Ostrovsky: Yes, they're giving the donor the right to take it back, it's kind of strange.

Speaker: But they already gave it away, yes.

Speaker: But do they have to buy it back or can they just take it?

Ostrovsky: No, it doesn't look like...

Barton: He's going to join us momentarily.

Speaker: Okay.

Speaker: I mean I read it is there is some interest there that they're reaching in it.

Ostrovsky: We may be okay with that, I don't know, Bob Ostrovsky for the record. I mean it's not our money that's at risk. It's the Friends.

Diamond: Renee Diamond for the record. I don't ever remember us accepting a deed of gift of any kind of artifacts where it's as casually stated as not exhibited to their satisfaction.

Ostrovsky: I don't know what that means.

Diamond: Well, that's what I'm saying. It seems awfully broad and vague.

Barber: That's so vague. This is Alicia Barber.

Bradley: It certainly - we're still being recorded right, okay because all of a sudden there was movement. So Sarah Bradley for the record.

I mean it's certainly something that could spark a lawsuit arguably, because we don't really have a - you know what does their satisfaction, that's sort of maybe arbitrary, or it could be argued that way, and so of course, you could ask a judge to decide what that means someday.

I mean I have seen deeds of gift where there has been some stipulation put on it, but normally it's like not being sold or something like that. And so even in those situations, the person is reserving a tiny bit of ownership, because they're saying it's yours unless you want to do something we don't like with it, and then we get it back.

Speaker: Usually it doesn't even say that. It just says you can't sell it. It never says anything about taking it back.

Barber: But that's what that means.

Stoldal: But don't they face a challenge. They've already taken the deduction.

Barber: But that's what that means though. When they say provided you can't sell it, what they're doing is,

they're reserving the ability to take it back if you violate the covenant. I give this to you as long as you keep it forever. Once you try to do something else with it, I actually can take it back from you. So even though they don't say that, that is the effect of those other deeds of gift.

Stoldal: But there is a third party now, and that's the Friends.

Barber: Well, so it sounds like though the Friends are agreeing though to this. I mean I don't know who - okay, the donor or legal representative, is that a Friends person there?

Barton: That is the - that's the President of the Friends, Barry Simcoe, so they're agreeing any - from what I'm reading from this, the siblings gave the money to the Friends. The Friends bought it. The Friends are now donating it to the museum, and they're - because they're donating it and this is the language that they're putting in here, they're agreeing to this condition, the Friends are anyway.

Stoldal: But didn't the people donate the money to the Friends?

Barber: Um-hmm.

Stoldal: And took that as an IRS deduction?

Barber: Probably.

Stoldal: And so if they take this stuff back, do they have to un-deduct?

Barber: I think so. I mean that would be the question for their accountant, I'm guessing.

Stoldal: So they would have, there's a real foggy...

Barber: Yes, I don't know how that works. I've never done such a thing.

Diamond: So Renee Diamond for the record. I'm not impugning anybody's purposes or actions. I'm just asking as an agency of State Government, who's been on this Board a long, long time, I've never seen any kind of state - vague statement like this about somebody's satisfaction.

I've seen limitations for sale. I've seen limitations for exhibition. I've seen all kinds of other things, but I've never seen anything like this. And I'm wondering among our responsibilities, if we should be a party to something like this.

Maybe I'm about too late a week, but it looks...

Stoldal: Well, what if we voted no.

Barber: But they already bought it. They have it.

Stoldal: But if we - well, we're responsible for anything - for accepting the piece, and if we don't accept it...

Diamond: Renee Diamond again, for the record. We want this. We've had it for as long as I can remember. It's important - the exhibit is important to us. I acknowledge all those things. The Gibson's were lovely people. They gave more than lots of other people in terms of energy and love to this museum, and we recognize that. That's not the point.

The point is, can we be a party to something that says such a vague thing in the acceptance of the gift. I just have never seen it before.

Dube: How are we harmed? I mean, we're not out any money. I mean they're doing this to honor their parents. I mean I don't think their intent is to take it back, or they would have just taken it back to begin with, right? So what's the harm?

Diamond: Renee Diamond again for the record. We can potentially be harmed if a great, great grandson says oh, I don't like - you moved it from one side of the museum to the other. I'm no longer satisfied.

[Crosstalk]

Barber: It's in their lifetime. It says so long as any of the above-mentioned donors remain alive. So it's only the four.

Diamond: One of the kids.

Barber: So yes, Skip, Diane, Susan and Gail.

Dube: Mr. Chairman, Pete Dube again. So again, I'm not sure how we're harmed any, it's not our money. If they have an IRS tax problem, it's their problem, not ours. I think we should accept it.

Bradley: Sarah Bradley for the record. I mean what would happen is, if they decided it wasn't to their satisfaction, they would probably come to the museum and say this isn't done to our satisfaction, we want it back.

And I mean that would be the damage we would have, is they would come in and say give this back to us, you're not displaying it to our satisfaction. If we wanted to contest that with them, then we say no, no, no you know we think this is satisfactory for whatever reason.

Stoldal: Or we fix it.

Bradley: Or like Peter had said, what if something needs to be I don't know, replaced at some point, or something like that. I mean there could be a reason we take it off display, because we need to do something to it, and then we're intending to put it back.

So they could make that claim. The worst case scenario is then they just take it with them, and we don't have it anymore, and like you said it wasn't our money that paid for it anyway. You know and it's only then in their life, so it's not going to be a great, great grandson or anybody like that, it's just them.

I mean certain we could change it. I don't know that I've seen these. I mean I don't review all of them. I know Peter and I talked about some that he thought were questionable before and I've seen where they - you know they do reserve a right, but normally I think it's a little more clear than satisfaction, just because that's so vague and arguably if they say no, this isn't satisfactory, you moved it to the back of the room. And we say but it's still on display, you know, then we have a judge decide. Is it still satisfactory if we move it far from the door?

Stoldal: What's the purpose of this being on our agenda for a vote?

Barber: Well, because normally you...

Stoldal: To rubber stamp it?

Barber: Well, normally you accept deeds of gift. I mean you - so I don't know if it's a rubber stamp, I mean does the Board want to accept the gift with the condition that's listed.

Stoldal: So we have - Doris.

Dwyer: Well, what would be the implications of suggesting a tightening up of language? I mean it belongs to the Friends, right? It doesn't belong - they've already gifted it to the Friends.

Barber: Well, yes. So the Friends have legal title, they gave money to the Friends.

Dwyer: Yes.

Barber: The Friends purchased it and had legal title to it. The Friends gave their title to the museum with this stipulation, but the Friends are giving it with the stipulation that these four siblings - it's a little bit strange in that they're not reserving the right for the Friends to be upset. They're reserving the right for the four siblings to be upset about something potentially.

And I think they can do that as long as that's what the Friends wants to do. It sort of puts the Friends possibly in a position of receiving this money, paying for this...

Stoldal: Let me try another little something new to the room, that is also hovering over this, and that's to my recollection this is - I'm trying to look for the proper diplomatic terms here, Peter.

Did you see this before it was signed?

Barton: For the record, Peter Barton. I saw this before it was signed, but not before the - I was not privy to all the details of this before it was executed.

Stoldal: So there's another situation that occurred earlier. It seems to me that one of the things that we may have to address, since we have the authority to approve or disprove the gifts that we could also institute a policy that the director would need to be involved in accepting gifts of a certain amount - a certain dollar before somebody on staff signs or negotiates, and then the Director in the museum, where it has to live up to what that person negotiated.

I think there needs to be a clear rule that - well, this is terrible language.

Barber: Yes, this is Alicia Barber. And what you think about is you think about hypothetically speaking then, that would discourage the museum from putting any money into exhibiting it in some really cool, high-tech kind of way. Like whatever - any generic, whatever an artifact is. Because then you have invested money in displaying it at some really cool amazing way that you think will set it off the best.

And then if the donor says they don't like that, and they take the thing back, then you have spent a lot of money on trying to exhibit something, because it's not just the artifact, it's the story it tells, presented, and it might not be relevant in this particular case, it's displayed, I mean that display we can change, but if you put a restriction like that, you're kind of discouraging the museum then to put any investment into promoting it, doing some cool thing with that...

Stoldal: Just leave it basically the way it is right now.

Barber: I don't know, yeah, I mean I don't...

Diamond: So Renee Diamond again for the record. On the next page, it actually gives you the Nevada Statute.

Speaker: Right.

Bradley: I just looked it up, yes.

Diamond: That says any time there is a condition a Board to - so that says to Boards, us, pay attention.

Bradley: So Sarah Bradley for the record. I just looked up that Statute and I was going to read it into the record, just because I thought maybe it would be helpful. So it's NRS 381.0075, acceptance of gifts.

And so then it says any condition or restraint placed on any bequest, devise, endowment, trust or other gift made to the [inaudible 01:28:49] must be in writing. So in other words, if they're not just handing it over without a restriction, it has to be in writing, this restriction.

And then it says the administrator and the Board must accept in writing such a bequest devise, endowment, trust or gift before it becomes the property of the State of Nevada.

So the Board and the administrator both have to accept the gift with that condition, otherwise, it never becomes the State's property.

It doesn't talk about reasons to deny it, but I mean it does say you must affirmatively in writing agree to the terms.

Diamond: One second, Renee Diamond again. We don't know what the regulations though are for this Statute. It may be more specific in regs.

Bradley: I will check right now.

Barton: It's not in reg.

Bradley: Oh okay.

Diamond: Okay. So...

Bradley: I mean if it's...

Stoldal: All right, let's go over - please.

Timmons: Member Timmons for the record. My quick question is, are the stipulations in this gift deed actually turn the property over to the State of Nevada, because there's restrictions in this deed that don't turn the property technically in my opinion, but again, legal opinion I need to know, over to the State of Nevada, if they can claim it back?

Bradley: Yes, well that's how - that's what a restriction does. So I don't know if this helps, but if you think of ownership as a bundle of sticks, okay. So I have six sticks, I can give you ownership and keep back one stick and give you five, that's kind of what they're doing.

You still have legal title to it, but I have one stick still left, because if you do something that I've said you can't, I get to take them back.

So normally when we think of giving, we think of you give everything, and now it's yours to do whatever you want with. Here, they have said we will give this to the State on this condition. So because of that, they're keeping back just a tiny piece of the ownership. Legally, the State's the owner. Legally, the State's responsible if we accept it. But they have retained just a tiny little piece and if we violate that condition, then they have the right to take it back.

Timmons: So member Timmons, it's almost like a lien holder on a vehicle or a mortgagee on a house kind of situation.

Bradley: I wouldn't say it's that strict, no.

Timmons: Okay.

Bradley: Legally, we would say the State still has ownership. This is more common I'm thinking like with houses, I don't know, I'm going back to property class, the first year of law school.

But basically, it's like you would say this is your house. Like the house we had - the house we have, you know you get a life estate, you can live it in for your life, but somebody else owns the fee simple.

Here they've given all of it, but there's the - we call it - basically it's something that can happen if we violate the condition. So I don't think - it's not even as strong as the other.

Stoldal: What they're doing is not illegal.

Bradley: No.

Stoldal: The question is do we want to accept this, and if we don't want to accept, what do you think would happen, Peter? If we ask for a rewrite.

Barton: I don't know that that's possible. Greg are you there?

Corbin: I'm here. Wendell and I are both here.

Stoldal: So I don't know how long you've been listening, but there's clearly a lot of angst regarding this sentence that says, if they are not exhibited to their satisfaction, it's loopy-goopy. What happens if the Board says no we're not going to take it with that stipulation.

Corbin: If I could just say - Greg Corbin for the record. If I just encourage the Board not to over-debate this. Okay, I've heard the comments that were just made that it was poorly written and it's vague, and it may be.

The family, the four children just wanted to make sure that the collection as it is now displayed, stayed in some form of display here at the Museum, and that more importantly that I stayed intact. So I apologize for the vague open-ended language that might be in the restriction, but don't read anything into it, please.

They just wanted to make sure that after 41 years that the Museum had the collection, that it stayed here on display, such as we have it now, and that more importantly it stayed together. So there is little or no threat that the collection is ever going to go anywhere, that it's ever going to be taken apart. It's an important part of this Museum.

And Wendell wants to - Wendell.

Huffman: This is Wendell Huffman, the Curator. I'm the one that actually wrote that deed. It's a lot tamer than the paperwork that went between them and the Friends. That was really open-ended. The one thing that I wrote into this was that this basically ends when the last of the four children dies.

At that point, they do become our property. This is not an open-ended lease that goes on forever. Anyway, I think we did the best we can, or that we could do. I don't know what would happen if you turned it down. We'd have to go back to the Friends and if they would - I just don't know what would happen at that point, that's all.

Dube: Mr. Chairman, I'm comfortable enough to make a motion that we accept the restricted donation from the Friends for the Richardson models.

Schorr: Seth Schorr, I second.

Dube: And that's Pete Dube who made the motion for the record, sorry.

Stoldal: And Seth Schorr with the second, further discussion? Hearing none, all those in favor say aye [ayes around], those opposed? Renee Diamond.

Diamond: I'm going abstain on this.

Stoldal: You're going to what?

Diamond: I'm going to abstain.

Stoldal: I'm not sure you can.

Diamond: Okay, then I'm going to vote against it.

Bradley: Okay, yes, I was going to say normally you don't abstain unless you have a reason to and you have to say what the reason is, so you're best to yes, vote against it, I think.

Stoldal: So do me your favor, would you raise your hands of those who are in favor. Those that were opposed - Renee do you oppose?

Diamond: Yes, sorry.

Stoldal: Okay. Please let the record reflect.

Ostrovsky: Mr. Chairman, Bob Ostrovsky. Following up on your earlier comments, I think we should when we review our policies, which Board meeting is that, I'm not sure, we think about creating the policy. So museums have guidance in the future about what limitations we want to see in these gift deeds.

Bradley: And I would say yes, it's an important legal question, and I understand that we want to accept things, but we want to be careful that we understand and we're comfortable with the terms and [inaudible 01:36:11] Board approves it.

Stoldal: Wendell and Greg I appreciate your efforts in this area, and I hope you understand what the Board is trying to do, and you kind of got caught in the middle there with the Friends and the family who have been part of, as you pointed out to Alicia, a contributor for a long time to this, but I would also - I mean it would help if Peter was able to be in the loop before the loop was closed.

So the motion was approved. It's a done deal. And we'll move forward. But I think we'd like to get a policy that releases a certain amount of dollars that Peter doesn't need to be involved with everything that comes across the transom.

Corbin: I understand that, and I certainly - at least on my part, I apologize for any inconvenience this has caused Pater or the Board. But this is truly a big, big significant victory for the Museum to have secured this collection after 41 years of being on loan.

And yes, we did us the Friends in an effort to expedite the acquisition with the grandson, who was the legal owner. He had been for the past several years threaten to take that collection away from the Museum, feeling that he could benefit financially from it.

And after 41 years of being on loan, it was just too important of a collection to let get away from us. The gifts and children saw this as something that they wanted to do and the names in honor of their parents. It was a win/win for all of us, the Museum, the Gibsons' children, Jack and Marge Gibson who is being honored to and the owner, the legal owner of the collection got some amount of money. It isn't what he wanted, but he got it, and he was happy with it and everybody was happy.

Stoldal: Greg, I appreciate thank you.

Corbin: On our end, we're thrilled that we can finally put this to rest.

Stoldal: Great, thank you so much. I really appreciate your help and your understanding in getting the collection, and understanding the challenges that we all face.

Let's move on if we can - we're running a little behind time here.

Bradley: I've just got one more thing. Greg?

Corbin: Yes.

Bradley: Thank you for all your years of service to the State of Nevada, you're retiring?

Corbin: Yes, 34 and a half years with the museums, long enough.

Bradley: You have a month left, well congratulations on retirement.

Speaker: From all of us.

Bradley: Thank you for everything you've done, it's the first bullet here, I don't know if this came as a surprise to everybody, but I didn't realize that was happening soon, anyway Happy Holiday Season.

Corbin: Thank you.

Stoldal: Let that be an echo from the entire Board for all the work you did in getting the Boulder City Railroad up and successfully running all the challenges that you were able to overcome, down in Boulder City, you set that on the right track, pun intended.

[laughter and moaning]

Stoldal: And all the work that you have done and let the models be a positive as we move forward that's just a way to end your career getting those models secured for the people of the State of Nevada.

So thank you and I'm sure you couldn't just make it a full 35 years, 34 and a half, well maybe there's some magic to the [inaudible 01:39:51] system.

Corbin: Thank you for your comments. Appreciate it.

Stoldal: Let's move on now to item Boulder City. Speaking of Boulder City, Nevada State Railroad Museum. Any questions?

Let's move onto the 4A, report on the stakeholder's group meeting which - there are two elements here, is there an update Peter that you have on this?

Barton: Well, the stakeholder meeting I was just - and I think Mr. Ostrovsky and the Chair spoke to this a bit earlier. It was conducted on September 17th, Felicia Archer joined us, there were 35 to 40 participants. It covered a broad range of elected officials, community leaders, business leaders from both communities and it was an opportunity to talk about the Museum and the context of the opportunity that is presented when the I 11 project completes and the restoration of the rail link beyond railroad pass into Henderson and ultimately into Las Vegas is completed.

As you know, and Greg I think is still on the line, Greg was relentless in his efforts over many, many years, well over a decade, probably onto two decades in working the angle that NDOT had inappropriately abandoned that crossing at railroad pass and thus we still had a right to make a claim that the rail line be restored, the creation of the highway or the new bypass makes that possibility manifest.

And when that line is reconnected, we have an immediate opportunity to lengthen the rail excursion by some amount and to be able to potentially negotiate the Union Pacific Railroad, who is a designated service operator on part of that line to run even longer excursions to create a number different marketplace.

We demonstrated the fact that the Museum's history is - speaks for itself in terms of its strong growth in the first 10, 15 years that it's been up and running. And then basically we were asking for consideration because here again - well, let me back up, what's needed for the Museum to go to the next level is more facilities.

We've talked repeatedly about the 192 square foot Museum Store that accommodates three people at a time and the rest of the potential customers have to stand outside, that there's no waiting room. There's no place, there's no central focus for visitors with they come to the site to get information, to get their ticket and wait for a train.

We want to create that larger visitor center. We've been back to public works through the capital improvement program for well over a decade, seeking that type of improvement there. There's little chance that that's going to happen in the near term. The State's bonding capacity for new projects, for



public works projects is extremely limited.

So we need to look for other opportunities, or other partners to help us expand. We believe there is some capacity in Boulder City to help us, and perhaps even in Henderson.

So that was kind of the purpose of the meeting. Here's what we've done, here's an opportunity and here's how we need help. We just wanted to test the water, if you will and see how that - how that looked, and I owe a huge debt of gratitude to both Greg and to Kate Hemmingway, whose really been absolutely phenomenal behind the scenes and out in front of the public in promoting the Museum and in its success.

So that's where we were and that's what we did in September. We've been back as I say, I met with Greg and the redevelopment officer for Boulder City last week and we pursued some additional conversations.

We've engaged the State Public Works Board to help us because what I need to go out and sell a concept is a pretty picture, you need that pretty rendering that you can go out and say well here's what it looks like, here's what it would do.

So the Public Works Board has agreed to take some of their funding from another project and bring on an architect from Las Vegas to do those renderings for us, that contract's been executed, and we're continuing the dialogue now as to what exactly we want the program of this expanded facility to be, hoping that by the time, the next capital improvement program rolls around, we might have a commitment for some funding, because those projects that go before the Governor, and before the Public Works Board that have some funding have the opportunity to kind of muscle their way to the head of the list, at least historically, that's been the way it's worked.

So that's what we're targeting. We're continuing the dialogue and we'll hopefully have something to show for it in the next couple of months.

Now, you know as we look at possible funding sources, we're looking again at what Boulder City might contribute, perhaps what Henderson might contribute, what other entities might contribute. One of the areas that we had hoped to focus on was the NV 150 license plate funds, but I think Bob may report on that a little bit later in the agenda.

Ostrovsky: I will.

Barton: Tomorrow. So that's I have on that. On item b under this agenda item, I don't know that there's much we can say other than we're pressing forward. I don't Sarah if there's anything we should say.

Bradley: Well, I mean it's - I mean if they want to know what the lawsuit's about, I mean it's a public Complaint, and we have filed an Answer. So a Complaint was filed against the Museum, regarding a person who broke their wrist allegedly at - while riding a small scale train. And so they filed that, we were served and we filed an Answer in the case. So basically, that's kind of where we're at. We'll let you know as things progress.

Ostrovsky: This is Bob Ostrovsky for the record, I mean there's nothing out of the normal course on this case, like any other slip and fall.

Bradley: Yes, I don't think so. Probably we'll get down to financial questions, because obviously I think they probably want the money that we are willing to give, and so they'll have to be some re-thinking probably on both sides, perhaps, or we may go to trial on it. So I guess we'll see.

I don't think they want to go trial, and I mean I've never done it. I'd be excited but - anyway, so we'll just see, but I think it's just on there just so that you know that this lawsuit is pending - I mean I don't think it's anything that's going to hit the newspapers or anything like that. It was a broken wrist, the

person is fine, you know healed and all of that.

Stoldal: We're onto item number 5, East Ely review of the approved interlocal contract for joint operations, the ticketing, the revenue sharing, Peter?

Barton: Yes, Mr. Chairman, for the record, Peter Barton. This is a revenue contract that we brought before you a couple of years ago with the White Pine County, whatever their name is there, White Pine Historical Railroad Foundation and the City of Ely, because Ely actually owns the assets and the designated operator is the foundation.

The terms of the contract are under Section 6 on page two of eight, under Consideration. That the foundation will reimburse the State two dollars per adult ticket. Payment will be no later - well, payment will be on a quarterly basis and the term of the contract not to exceed \$30,000, we have to put a number on a revenue contract before we can take it to the Board of Examiners. That's the primary consideration.

There's some resource sharing in terms of volunteers, and who provides the tickets, and how we kind of mesh our operating hours with the foundation.

This contract went before the Railroad Foundation Board and was approved, it went before the City Council and the City of Ely and was also approved, both of those parties have signed off on it.

It comes for you not as a matter of signature approval, but inasmuch as you do approve the fees that are collected, this fee is consistent with the last contract the distinction here is - the last contract had a guaranteed minimum of \$3,500, we've taken the minimum off, but we're now earning revenue from Ticket One.

So before I mean yes, you have \$3,500 minimum that was for the first 700 that we got no money for. At this point we're earning revenue from Ticket One. We're getting that revenue on a quarterly basis as opposed to an annualized basis.

This was a little bit of an accommodation to the Foundation. The impact in the first year, what was the revenue on that last year, do you recall it was \$13,000 and change, which was really a windfall and the foundation made a good argument that they were being harmed by the amount of the transfer based upon that guarantee. We took the guarantee off we'll earn two dollars from the first ticket.

So it seemed like a reasonable approach, again, it's before you not as a matter of a signature approval, but as a matter that we think it might be prudent for you to endorse the fact that we've set that fee at two dollars.

Stoldal: Is there a motion?

Timmons: I made a motion to approve the contract as presented.

Schorr: I second the motion, Seth Schorr.

Stoldal: We have a motion, we have a second, further discussion? Do you think we can have this finalized in time for our meeting in Ely?

Barton: It's - it will go before the Board of Examiners next - well we'll submit it to the Board of Examiners on Monday. It goes to the Board of Examiners in January.

Stoldal: Okay, can we hold off the final signing until [inaudible 01:51:01] any further comment? All those in favor, say aye {ayes around}, those opposed? Motion carries. Thank you Peter.

Barton: Item b under that Mr. Chairman is some really good news. I got a call from Director Sean Pitts one day about oh four, five months ago, I think it was in early July, he called and he said you just never

know.

He said there was a visitor who came here about six years ago and he remembered this individual, this Holmes-Henry, having visited and spent a half a day at the museum and had gotten very interested in what the museum does.

We were notified a few months that we were in the Estate and we didn't know what the value of that way until a check arrived about three or four weeks ago, for \$48,000 with no restrictions, for the Museum.

This one because of the amount, because it exceeds \$20,000 I think is the threshold, it actually to go actually before the interim finance committee to approve it, you don't have to approve it, IFC has to approve it, and it's on the agenda for February 11th, and I've never seen IFC turn one down.

It's kind of - it's almost an embarrassment when you have to go and do these, not so much for us, but for the committee they go like - what are we going to tell you, no? It's unrestricted, it's money coming to the State. We're not going to tell you no, but that's the way the Statute is written and that's the story on that. Just an incredible...

Stoldal: It's not an action item for us, it's just information.

Barton: It's not an action item.

Stoldal: Great.

Speaker: That's great, so be nice to everybody. It's the lesson.

Barton: That's the core message, yes.

Stoldal: Item 6 which is the Lost City Museum, another one with great treasures. Questions?

Speaker: They do a great job on social media by the way, they're really good at it. Just saying.

Stoldal: It's always is - when I look at the number of membership figures, I mean it is such a unique facility with the wonderful history that ties into New Mexico, through the whole southwestern United States, a real opportunity.

Barton: Mr. Chairman, while I'm thinking of it if I may, if you turn to page three of their report, the Museum revenue and expenditure chart, I just wanted to get a barometric pressure test from you all. Is this what you had hoped to see, we made some changes to this chart to accommodate that you could see full year data in terms of revenue, expenditures and gross net percentage on the stores? We made that significant change which came about at your request. Is that helpful?

Stoldal: Very.

Diamond: Mr. Chairman, Renee Diamond. I was going to comment at the end of the report how much I liked it. We of course have to remind ourselves that often payment for merchandise is not in the month that sales show up.

So it's a fluid process in that respect and as my retail merchant husband used to remind me, do not look at it month to month, do not look at it week to week. It's like the stock market.

At the end of the year if you made money, you're in good shape. So I think we'll - by next July we'll have a good sense of it. But it's so much easier to understand.

Barton: Okay.

Timmons: Mr. Chairman?

Stoldal: Yes.

Timmons: I'd just like to make a quick comment, this is Anthony Timmons for the record. On page six, first bullet, I was very impressed by the donation of 20 boxes of three ring binders, 60 [inaudible 01:55:07] of petroglyphs, as a rock art person, I would like to recommend that the museum is able to digitize that collection, and I would definitely help.

I'm doing the same thing at Red Rock, so I'd like to volunteer if they need any help digitizing them. I think that's pretty impressive. That's the biggest collection I've seen donated in quite a long time. We received quite a bit of it at Red Rock, but that surpasses anything I've seen donated. So I'd love to - if I can help or get that digitized, that would be awesome.

Stoldal: Do we know that area? Is this Lincoln County? What area of...

Timmons: It's probably - oh what is that area called Gold View, I would assume.

Stoldal: Gold View.

Timmons: Because there's a lot of stuff out at Gold View and [inaudible 01:56:07], I'm assuming, but I'm not 100 percent sure. But still that can be a great treasure again, this member Timmons. That could be a great treasure for the State to have as a digital record to share.

Stoldal: Good.

Timmons: In fact, again this is member Timmons, we've probably got lots of boxes at Red Rock we could donate to the Museum as well. We've got quite a few collections that we could donate that we don't have space for.

[crosstalk]

Stoldal: You don't have room for them?

Timmons: We don't have room for them, and we're getting more and more. Nancy Weir just gave us a huge collection of binders that we're digitizing and then we'd like to find a home, maybe potentially at the Nevada State Museum or something for those.

Stoldal: Well, we could take a tour, and see if we can find a...

Timmons: Find a spot, find a shelf.

[laughter and crosstalk]

Barton: Thank you. I'll pass that forward.

Timmons: Thank you, that's awesome. I think that's great.

Stoldal: Seven, Nevada State Museum, Las Vegas. Do we have the Director here?

Barton: I think so, incognito there.

Stoldal: Any questions for Dennis.

Speaker: Keep up the good work the last few months [inaudible 01:57:20] good work. Congratulations.

Stoldal: If you haven't seen the collection from the Bally's, from the Tropicana, you really should see what's downstairs including I think - have you set [inaudible 01:57:37] I think we have a world record number of rhinestones.

[laughter]

Diamond: And men's dance [inaudible 01:57:45].

Barton: Was that Guinness Stout?

Barber: So Dennis, this is Alicia Barber. Do you know what to attribute the increase in attendance to over recent months?

Dennis: No.

Barber: Do you have a theory?

Dennis: The only theory that we've got is that it's increased over there, so it increases over here. Because we don't have that many more people coming directly in [inaudible 01:58:07] so it's just [inaudible 01:58:12] luck.

Stoldal: I think the exhibits have contributed to the things that you've been putting up, I think reinforces...

Dennis: Well we do. We have some of the most unique and interesting exhibits [inaudible 01:58:26] in town.

Stoldal: So I think it may be probably be a combination of all of those.

Barton: If you do look Mr. Chairman on page three of their report this solidifies what I had said earlier about this recent trend in attendance. July was 227 percent of last year. August 187 percent. September 159 percent. I don't have October and November in here, because we were trying to produce these reports on a quarterly basis for you.

But you know and that trend may have slowed down a bit, but still it's pretty impressive when you see.

Schorr: Seth Schorr for the record. When was the Museum built, open?

Barton: November 2011.

Schorr: And Springs Preserve?

Barton: 2007, May of 2007.

Stoldal: A large part of this Museum is here because of Governor [inaudible 01:59:22] and the bond issue that was [inaudible 01:59:26].

Item 7A update concerning the real property located at 711 South Seventh Street. Who will do that?

Speaker: Emily. I mean I sent a letter that...

Stoldal: Do you have [inaudible 01:59:43] so we know what you're talking about?

Speaker: Oh yes [inaudible 01:59:46].

Timmons: We talked about it last meeting.

Speaker: Oh okay, good. So I don't have any update from the last meeting. I mean we sent a letter to their attorney. I haven't received a response. So I think we're just sort of in a waiting pattern, which is what I think we'll be in probably until we're notified that something changes. I mean we could send spies over to...

Speaker: We did.

Speaker: To make sure...

[crosstalk and laughter]

Speaker: That there's evidence of life there at the home, but I mean...

Stoldal: I'm going to pose as an encyclopedia salesman.

Speaker: That's it. So yes, you know the attorney at least is aware that we are planning on asserting our ownership when the time is right, and you know his thought was that he's puzzled why we would care you know if we can't sell it.

Stoldal: But we can. All right, we have come to the end of this part of the agenda.  
We start tomorrow morning at nine o'clock. What time do we need to get out of here for the folks who are heading north?

Speaker: Not until [inaudible 02:01:06]. Well, our flight is 6:45 tomorrow.

Stoldal: Tomorrow, when do you have to be at the airport.

Barton: We want to be at the airport at 2:00, because Happy Hour is at 2:30.  
[crosstalk and laughter]

Stoldal: Other than Peter, what time do we...

[laughter]

Stoldal: What time is the plane.

Barton: 6:45, so we should be out of here by 4:00, 4:30, but I don't think that's a huge problem with what we've got left.

Stoldal: No, but whenever we have a shortage and we have a lot of time, it fills - it expands to fill the time, so a lot of important things on the agenda tomorrow, including committee reports and our annual Board policy review. And Bob Ostrovsky will bring us up to date on the Nevada Cultural Affairs Foundation.

Ostrovsky: Yes.

Stoldal: In connection with the license plate - the sesquicentennial license plate. Any last questions before we go? Those are going - Dennis is going to take you on a tour, if you haven't - Peter?

Barton: Just one other item. So it's 3:40, so we'll try to leave probably at 4:15, does that sound reasonable, Brenda is 4:15 good? So we're going to the downtown Grand thank you Seth, and we'll get checked in. For those who agreed to go to dinner, we're going to Triple George, the reservation is at 6:45. So I know it's long walk from the downtown Grand to the Triple George, but I think we can do it. And how many are going to join us for dinner, let me just make sure we've got the numbers right. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven...

Ostrovsky: I'm going to try to make it.

Barton: Okay, I hope so. So we've got a reservation for eight. It's looks like we're good, eight people at 6:45.

Speaker: Great, 6:45.

Stoldal: And where's valet parking.

Speaker: It's at the Grand.

Barton: I think we should try to be out of here, if that's reasonable, do you want to go 4:30, I don't care. It's not like we're a long way from the hotel. And lots of cowboys coming into town.

Stoldal: The meeting is adjourned until tomorrow.

Barton: 8:15 in the lobby, so watch that [inaudible 02:03:41].

[crosstalk]

*[The Board of Museums and History adjourned until December 4, 2015]*