

LAS VEGAS-CLARK COUNTY LIBRARY DISTRICT  
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING AT  
THE SAHARA WEST LIBRARY AND VIA ZOOM  
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2024

\* \* \* \* \*

[Meeting began at 5:04 p.m.]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right, everyone, we're going to get started. I'm showing we're at 5:04. Then we'll start with -- Eboni, want to do roll call?

MS. NANCE: Chair Waugh.

[No heard response.]

MS. NANCE: Vice Chair Rogers.

TRUSTEE ROGERS: Present.

MS. NANCE: Trustee Jiron.

TRUSTEE JIRON: Here.

MS. NANCE: Trustee Whiteley.

[No heard response.]

MS. NANCE: Trustee Foyt.

TRUSTEE FOYT: Here.

MS. NANCE: Trustee Benavidez.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Here.

MS. NANCE: Trustee Sanchez.

[No heard response.]

MS. NANCE: Trustee Dutkowski.

TRUSTEE DUTKOWSKI: Present.

MS. NANCE: Trustee White.

[No heard response.]

MS. NANCE: Trustee Jimenez.

[No heard response.]

MS. NANCE: And we do have a quorum, Chair.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Thank you.

MS. NANCE: Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Thank you.

Let's have everyone stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

[PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. We'll go to our second item, which is public comment. Do we have anyone, Eboni, signed up for public comment?

MS. NANCE: Yes, we do. So the first person I'm going to call up will be Karl Larsen for Agenda Item IX.B.5. Please remember to state your name and your address for the record.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And then let me just read the instructions. Topics raised under this item must be limited to the matters on today's agenda. Anyone wishing to speak during this time must sign up on the roster provided prior to the public comment period. The sign up must include the commenter's name, legal address, and the agenda item that is being commented on.

The public comment period at the Library District Board meetings shall be limited to a maximum of 45 minutes total for both periods of public comment. Remarks by speakers during

public comment period shall be limited to three minutes each. A speaker may not transfer time to another speaker, although the Chair has the authority to grant additional time to the speaker.

Anyone wishing to submit a public comment via e-mail under this item must send an e-mail to boardcomments at lvccld.org. The e-mail must include the commenter's name, legal address, and the agenda item that is being commented on. E-mail comments are limited to 500 hundred in words in length and will be included in the minutes of the meeting. Any comments which do not state the commenter's name, legal address or exceed 500 words in length shall not be considered.

So Eboni, we'll go ahead and turn it over to you to call the order for those who signed up for public comment to the microphone.

MS. NANCE: Karl Larsen.

MR. LAWSON: My name is Karl Larsen, 3255 Mustang Street, Las Vegas, 89108. I'm here for IX.B.5, the presentation, discussion and possible Board action regarding venue use fees.

My name is Karl Larsen, and I am a President of Signature Productions. Signature Productions was incorporated in 1989 as a 501(C)(3) nonprofit community theater company. The company was started to give the community quality, family-friendly entertainment at an affordable price. In 1995, we contracted to use the Summerlin Library and Performing Arts Center. I believe that we are offering something the community tells us they want and

need. For example, we have brought to the Summerlin Performing Arts Theater almost 100,000 patrons in the last eight years.

I met with a staff member the other day in the Programming Department for the Library, and he repeated that rental status was the only thing we could be. I came away with the feeling that we were not important to the Library and in turn not important to the community, who have repeatedly told us to continue our shows.

I thought I understood that the Library Mission Statement was to bring to --the community together to share information, attend programs, experience personal enrichment, and connect with one another. I believe that Signature Productions fits well into that mission statement. We have a huge patron following and are a positive force in bringing patrons to the Library.

In conclusion, I would like to -- I would ask, how is the Library fostering family-friendly entertainment? Signature Productions brings in thousands of patrons, thus helping to fulfill the Library's mission and the community needs. And if the Library operates solely on taxpayer money, why the big push to raise fees and make it harder for us and the smaller companies to provide the community with quality family entertainment? I hope this is not an attempt to get rid of the theater.

I would ask if anyone in the Board has attended any of our shows, I won't ask you to hold up your hand, but I'm sure it would be no, that you have not. And I personally invite you to come and

see either Little Shop of Horrors, which runs for the next two weekends and A Christmas Carol, which opens and runs in December. We would be happy to provide seating for any Board member or staff member to share what we do.

Please keep the theater open to all at a reasonable fee. The requirement to pay one half of the venue price a year ahead of the show, and then say that the deposit is nonrefundable is a poor way to welcome renters to the theater and to the Library. We have been good renters and feel we add a great deal to the community. Thank you for your time.

MS. NANCE: Next will be Jeff Tidwell for Item IX.B.5 as well. Please remember to state your name and your address for the record, please.

MR. TIDWELL: Thank you.

My name is Jeff Tidwell. The address is 1420 South Monte Cristo Way, Las Vegas, Nevada 89117.

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Board today regarding the proposed fee increase for the Performing Arts Center at the Summerlin Library, specifically. As the owner of ShowTix4U and Cur8, an online ticketing company and event management company based here in Las Vegas, we service numerous clients that use that facility, and so I am deeply invested in the vitality of our local arts community.

The Las Vegas-Clark County Library District's Mission is to nurture the social, economic and educational well-being of people

and communities. A key component of this mission is fostering environments where individuals and groups can pursue their aspirations. The Performing Arts Center serves as a vital platform for emerging theater companies and showcase their talents, thereby enriching our community's cultural fabric.

Increasing rental fees poses a significant barrier to new performing arts companies. These organizations often operate with limited budgets and rely on affordable venues to present their work. Elevated costs could deter them from utilizing this space, leading to fewer performances and diminishing the cultural offerings of our community.

The Performing Arts Center is more than a venue, it's a community hub that brings people together. Affordable access ensures that the arts are accessible to all residents, regardless of socioeconomic status. By maintaining the current fee structure, we uphold the Library District's commitment to inclusivity and community engagement.

Local theater productions contribute to the economy by engaging neighborhood audiences who support nearby businesses. Additionally, these performances offer educational opportunities, inspiring creativity and critical thinking among attendees, particularly the youth of our community. Restricting access through higher fees could inadvertently stifle these benefits.

In conclusion, I urge the Board to reconsider the proposed fee increase for the Summerlin Library Performing Arts Center.

Maintaining affordable rates aligns with the Library District's Mission and supports the growth of our local arts community. By doing so, we ensure that the arts remain a vibrant and accessible part of our community's social and educational landscape. Thank you for your time and consideration.

MS. NANCE: Caitlin Shea. Please remember to state your name and your address for the record.

MS. SHEA: Hello. I'm Caitlin Shea, 7524 Enchanted Hills Court in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Okay. So when I was visiting your website, I stumbled upon your Mission Statement that my colleague Jeff has just read, but I think it's important to share that, you know, you're saying you're nurturing the social, economic and educational well-being of people and communities. What a powerful mission and what an important piece of our community. The District is also committed to building these communities of people so that we can pursue our individual and group aspirations.

When reviewing the proposed increases to venue rental fees to outside groups, it seems that these are counterintuitive to the mission you've set forth, and rather limiting to creating access for important cultural and artistic endeavors for these individuals and groups.

As a lifelong Nevadan and a child who was raised on reading and going to the Library every week, I am also a proud member of the nonprofit sector for 15 years, fundraising and

advocating for causes like the Library.

It is my belief that now more than ever, we are called to be the leaders, to build community, be in partnership with trusted groups like Signature Productions and support each other in a world that has never been more divided or divisive. By creating opportunities for the arts and culture to flourish in your state-of-the-art facilities, you are automatically creating social, economic and educational opportunities for people of all ages in Southern Nevada.

Signature Productions has proudly hosted shows at Summerlin Library and Performing Arts Center since 1995. We have hosted guests of all ages, all abilities, all economic backgrounds. The current proposed increase is 20,000 more than what we already pay, and as a nonprofit with zero paid staff, completely volunteer-run, that is nearly crippling when you're trying to plan and build these beautiful shows to share with the community.

Every dollar we raise from ticket sales and our donors gets put back into these shows, no one is taking a salary, and all of us are working for free. Many nonprofits and volunteer-run organizations like Signature Productions utilize and rely on these beautiful community theater spaces that you provide within the libraries to present arts and cultural opportunities that often Southern Nevadans may not have access to.

As we know, access to these opportunities are limited, so



when you, the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District, has the opportunity to host, promote and encourage these artistic presentations, you are making good on your commitment and your mission to serve Southern Nevada.

Theater storytelling, it is taking the beautiful words and stories from the books that you have on shelves across the 25 libraries in our community and breathing life into them. It's creating space for important discussions, brings transformative access to those who live in the neighborhoods where your libraries are, and most importantly, it is a gift that you get to help deliver to our community. Thank you so much for your time.

MS. NANCE: Chris G. for Item IX.B.3. Please remember to state your full name and your address for the record.

MS. GIUNCHIGLIANI: Thank you.

Members of the Library Board, Chris Giunchigliani, 1717 South 15th Street, Las Vegas, 89104. Item III.B. It's regarding Lundy Elementary School on Mount Charleston.

First of all, thank you for having it only as a discussion item because I see that Mr. McLaughlin, the Facilities Director from CCSD sent in a lease agreement for you to take a look at. I think it's rather ironic that that was already put to this point before your Board has even ever discussed this issue. I have a parent -- couple of parents here that will be discussing.

First of all, our community when we finally got the school district to come to the mountain told them straight out the parents

there do not want an addition of two classrooms to the library. They ignored us, flew in Katie Williams, who was residing in Nebraska for a special -- for a meeting at the CCSD, where she made the motion to not repair the school with the insurance money that they got and instead to pursue looking at adding two classrooms to the Library.

In the state of Nevada, to be a school, you have to have a sick room, and you have to have bathrooms that are accommodating. Your septic system that you currently have in place would not handle the accommodations of any additional. We were willing at that time for a short-term, month-long period of time to divide our meeting room where our Town Board meets into two classrooms if that was what was get our kids back up.

Unfortunately, the District drug its feet. They didn't even contact parents until early -- late September, early October. The kids had already been in school for almost two months and the parents rightly said I'm not yanking my kid out again for something that's temporary that you all have never even known about to even divide that room up.

It will impact our library programming. We have a very wonderful library program up there. People drive up from town for reading time. I mean, it's just a marvelous program and this would interrupt it completely. There's no sick room, the bathroom's inappropriate, the insurance liability has not been addressed.

Let me just put it to you this way. The District got

reimbursed \$1.5 million to fix their repairs. The building itself, in its own hired engineer's report, said the facility is safe and structurally sound. They have ignored all that. They have not -- never voted to close the school, they just simply have not opened it. And then they internally decided that it was unsafe without any documentation, no OSHA review, nothing. So no one's been able to get into the facility.

Two new Trustees -- one was just appointed for the next -- until January and this -- the new Trustee coming in, Lydia Dominguez are planning on putting agenda items on to have Lundy move forward. So it's premature for you to even talk about this lease agreement.

We appreciate that you wanted to be open to the community, but there's no place for PE, there's no place for the bathrooms. It's wintertime for five months of the year, the kids can't go any place and there's no place for them to go. The map in your backup information shows a building added on to the side. You have to look at where the three washes come in and where they flooded last time around. You actually put your building at risk as you know how well -- Mr. Watson knows quite -- how well the damage that was done, but luckily it was only minor. You were able to clean up the flooring and no books were really destroyed.

So we're still back fighting with the District. We ask you -- thank you very much for considering this, but we do not want your facility. We have an over \$10 million asset one block away that

should be reopened for the students to be able to come in. So that's my testimony. And so if there's any questions, I would appreciate them, but if not, thank you very much for your attention.

MS. NANCE: Brenda Talley for Item IX.B.3 as well. Please remember to state your name and your address for the record.

MS. TALLEY: Thank you. Brenda Talley, 326 Echo Road, Mount Charleston.

And just to continue a little bit wvote,what Chris was saying, at the meeting when they voted it down with our own District -- our District's Trustee that should, you would think represent us, she was the deciding vote and she wasn't even eligible at that time to hold that position, so we are asking the Board to reconsider that.

At that meeting, Brandon McLaughlin, the facilities director went over the two possibilities to open and repair Lundy or the two classrooms on the Library option and he stated that they could utilize the general obligation bond funds to revise their 2015 Capital Improvement Plan to repair the existing school at an estimated cost of \$6.8 million. There's only been two official bids; one for 1.5 million that the insurance company paid and the other for 4.5 million. That should have been resubmitted to the insurance company and as far as we know it was not.

And Option 2, he stated would be about 1.4 million and later in the Minutes -- and I did, I think, provide you with the letter with their -- with the quotes from the Minutes. He then later stated

that the District would still need to properly remediate and potentially demolish the unsafe structure of the current school site for an additional \$7 million. So that would be a total of \$8.4 million, which is more than it would cost to repair the school.

Parents don't want the classrooms there; they will not send their kids there. We ask the District, okay, if you put the school -- the two classrooms, you're going to add the gym because we have -- Chris said five -- we have five and six months of winter. The other day -- this morning it was 20 degrees. The kids can't be out there doing PE.

They have -- the District does not have an inclement weather policy for winter. They have one down in the valley for hot days for the kids down here in the summer, but there's nothing about what happens with transportation. If they don't build the school and they take them down to the valley -- the state highway plow does not run before the bus comes. The county plow that goes to the subdivisions runs after the bus comes.

It creates chronic absenteeism because the parents can't even get the kids to the bus stop on the highway. Even if the state plow ran, the bus doesn't go up into the subdivisions. We have to plow our driveways, but if the plow hasn't come, we can't get done. And we're talking about steep mountain roads. I have slid off. Probably everyone that lives up there has slid off. It's not safe.

But mainly we don't want to lose the programs we currently have at the Library. We have someone that teaches

sewing. I teach painting. We have the reading classes for the little kids. But it's not -- two classrooms --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: We're at time.

MS. TALLEY: -- don't make a school. It's not equal and equitable facility and our kids deserve the opportunity -- the same equal and equitable opportunity as all other kids in the valley.

MS. NANCE: Joy English for Item IX.B.3. Please remember to state your name and address for the record as well.

MS. ENGLISH: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Vice Chair and Board Members. My name is Joy English, 3997 Mont Blanc Way, Mount Charleston, Nevada 89124. And I'm here to speak on the same subject, the partnership between CCSD and the Library District to add on the two classrooms to the existing library in Mount Charleston.

I appreciate the time to speak with you. I do not have prepared remarks, but I want you to know that I'm a 52-year resident of Mount Charleston. My son, who is now 50, went to Lundy Elementary School and he couldn't have had a better education and a better place to go to school. They walk to school; they walk in groups. They play in groups, inside and outside.

I want you to -- this is kind of my big emotional thing, but this is how I am. I don't know if any of you have elementary aged children, but can you for one minute put yourself in the place of a child who's going to spend six years of their formative elementary school sitting inside two classrooms? As already mentioned, they

can't go outside.

Now if I had a six-year-old, and I used to, he needs to have energy, he needs to be able to release those energies. He needs to run around; he needs to yell. This kind of activity is necessary and it's part of their development, but it doesn't belong in the Library. It's just not feasible.

I welcome any questions you might have. And like I said, I don't have the technical expertise, but I certainly have the experience as a past parent. No questions? Thank you very much.

MS. NANCE: Lance Earl for Item IX.B.5. Please remember to state your name and your address for the record.

MR. EARL: Good evening. My name is Lance Earl, 8333 Granite Mountain Lane, Las Vegas, Nevada 89129. I'm here to speak on the Item IX.B.5, which is the proposed venue fees.

I also am associated with Signature Productions, which provides musical entertainment -- musical shows at the Summerlin Library. My wife and I have been involved for many years. Our children have been involved in that as well, and that's the library that we usually go to, to check out books.

The one thing that I would request is it's interesting that we're being asked to present our views, our opposition to this before we have even heard the presentation. I have pulled from the website, the three-page summary of what is to be anticipated to be the presentation. I'd respectfully submit that the information that has been attached for us to review and assess as to whether these

fees are fair or whether why -- how they were reached is simply inadequate.

And I would -- my request to you is going to be that you not decide anything tonight; that you put this -- that you continue this for another time in order to allow me and others to be able to look at the underlying information which is generated to propose -- make these proposals for the fee increases.

You'll notice on the third page there's this spreadsheet that shows different venues. I'd respectfully submit that the way in which that's being assessed -- in fact, let me take -- go back. In the -- in this third paragraph and the fourth paragraph of the agenda items, it talks about how there's been an assessment done of 17 local organizations spanning government, educational and commercial venues, with a low to high range, cost of venue and services compared to library rates, and overall findings show that costs are under value. And then they look at how -- they discuss how library taxpayers subsidize private use, and it says a detailed comparative analysis to the community assessment is included.

We often talk about this being -- I respectfully submit that particularly with Summerlin Library which has facilities for shows that no other place does in Clark County, you're -- we're being asked to compare not only apples and oranges, but apples, oranges, pears and bananas because many of the things that are in that summary do not apply to the shows that we're doing to Summerlin Library.



The commercial venues that are identified in that summary are ones that are in the Downtown Art District and frankly are not stages, they're often just open spaces. A couple of them -- I looked today, Majestic Theater is closed permanently. And so some of the analysis is -- I would submit is inadequate and incorrect to make a reasonable decision.

Several years ago, the Library included -- I'll be one second. Several years ago the Library raised the rates to a point where we could not make -- we could not perform and for two years we didn't.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: We're at time.

MR. EARL: I'll just say the math was incorrect and when that was adjusted and when it was realized that the math that justified that increase in fees was incorrect, the fees were adjusted, and we were able to perform again. I respectfully submit that we should have additional time to review the underlying analysis. Thank you.

MS. NANCE: Deborah Earl for Item IX.B.5 as well. Please remember to state your name and your address for the record.

MRS. EARL: Deborah Earl, 8333 Granite Mountain Lane, Las Vegas, Nevada 89129.

I am a fourth generation Nevadan. I grew up here and really enjoyed going to the Library and I was a beneficiary of many of their services. I have been a Board member; I'm also associated with Signature Productions for over 20 years. We rent the theater

in Summerlin Library two to three times a year to showcase our productions. We have a wonderful partnership with Summerlin Library, and we have enjoyed -- and our experience has always been very positive.

For the past 15 years, I've been the House Manager for Signature, which means I'm there, I get to hear the people when they come out for intermission. And during one of our shows, the comments that I hear are so positive. We're able to bring Broadway-like quality family entertainment to our patrons at an affordable price. Many of our patrons are seniors on a fixed income. We have been a fixture Summerlin Library for almost 30 years and have developed a community of theater lovers that continues to grow.

The cost of our productions very often exceed the revenues we collect from ticket sales. We rely on grants and private donations to keep Signature really, barely afloat. Any increase in your fees would force us to raise our ticket prices, but our research has indicated that if we raise our ticket prices, people are going to stop coming to our shows and we won't have the revenue. In short, we would be forced to find -- if these increases come into effect that you're proposing, we would be forced to find an alternative venue or stop producing shows altogether.

But in addition to providing a forum for actors in Las Vegas to showcase their talent, our productions provide an opportunity for high school students and young adults to train and

learn about all aspects of the theater included backstage -- including backstage teching, lighting, sound, props, et cetera.

I'm not sure of your rationale for raising the costs of the theater rentals at the Library. If it is because your costs associated with theater rentals exceed what is collected, please give us further details tonight. Are you considering your cost of theater rentals across the valley, including rentals where you don't collect any fees against the revenues collected? If you only consider your costs against rentals where current full fees are collected, are you still having to subsidize these rentals? If so, how much? I'm hopeful that we can get an answer to some of these questions tonight.

I love community theater. I'm hoping to be able to continue as a Board member of Signature and work to accomplish your mission statement of nurturing peoples and communities and providing the community where people can enjoy affordable theater. I respectfully request that you do not raise the rental fees at the theaters. Thank you.

MS. NANCE: And Michelle M. Please state your full name and your address for the record. And she's speaking on Item IX.B.3.

MS. MUEHLEISEN: Hi. I'm Michelle Muehleisen, 4477 Yellow Pine Avenue, Mount Charleston, Nevada.

Talking about the Library permanently hosting the school, I would request that you please don't do that. A temporary thing, it's great. We need a temporary place for Lundy. We'd like to reopen Lundy. Unfortunately, at the library with two classrooms,

there is no place for the kids to run, especially -- we're supposed to get snow this weekend and so there would be no place for them to exercise for PE. There's no kitchen, there's no -- full-fledged kitchen that they would need. There's no place for the nurse to be at.

And so I appreciate you guys offering the library on a temporary basis. There has been talk about you guys temporarily doing it and then CCSD asked to put two classrooms, just attaching it to the library. And it'd also be kind of awkward having regular citizens -- most of them -- the few that live up there are great, but we have visitors all the time. And so our young ones being in contact readily with just anybody coming off the street or coming up the hill, their security -- I don't know how secure that would be. So that is all I have to say. You have a great night.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. That concludes our public comments.

We will go to Agenda Item No. V, which is Executive Session to discuss litigation budget and labor issues. If necessary, this will be a closed session estimated to require up to 45 minutes. In this session will be a briefing from our legal counsel. And do we have a motion to go into executive session?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

[No heard response.]

All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. We will go ahead and move into Executive Session. I'd just ask everyone else to clear out of the room.

**[EXECUTIVE SESSION; 5:36 p.m. to 6:10 p.m.]**

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. Welcome back. In my haste, I was scanning on my iPad, and I did not -- I inadvertently skipped Agenda Item Number III, which is Board action to accept the proposed agenda. So let's go back to that item and do we have a motion to accept the agenda as presented?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

TRUSTEE FOYT: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. Motion carries. We have our agenda.

Now we will go to Agenda Item No. IV, which is approval of the proposed Minutes. First one is -- do we have -- the Finance and Audit Committee meeting that took place on September the 9th, 2024. Do we have a motion to accept those minutes?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

TRUSTEE WHITE: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any questions?

[No heard response.]

All right. All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. Motion carries.

Second item is the Minutes from the Special Board Meeting on September 24th, 2024. Do we have a motion to accept those minutes?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

TRUSTEE FOYT: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any questions?

[No heard response.]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

Motion carries.

Do we have a motion to accept the Regular Board Meeting Minutes from October 10th, 2024?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Second?

TRUSTEE WHITE: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any questions?

[No heard response.]

All right. All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. Motion carries.

Now we will go to Agenda Item No. XI, our Chair's Report.

I'll turn it over to Executive Director Watson.

DIRECTOR WATSON: That is going to be for the Library District -- Las Vegas-Clark County Library Foundation presentation by Chair Felipe Ortiz.

CHAIR ORTIZ: Thank you. Good afternoon, Board of Trustees. Thank you. I won't take too much time. You have a long agenda. Thank you, Dr. Rogers, Director Watson and everybody else.

First of all, let me apologize for not making the last meeting. I had a death in the family, so I totally lost track of time. A lot of good things happening. My name is Felipe Ortiz with the Las Vegas-Clark County Foundation Board. With me is Fred James, who's the Treasurer. Just a quick report. On the Board is Michelle Sanders, Fred James is the Treasurer, Michelle is the Vice Chair, Nicole Rogers, the secretary, Pamela Graham, Shannon Bilbray Axelrod, and then they voted in Vicki Gaska, who's HR director for TLC Casinos downtown; they own four casinos. And then getting

voted in on Tuesday is Jorge Cervantes, who is the retired city manager for the City of Las Vegas; also a retired engineer. And so he'll be coming on the Foundation Board to help us raise money. And so that's who we have, new members.

Going forward we made a commitment to become self-sufficient; to try to find a funding source so we can continue with operations. So that with that we can also find money for the programs that Director Watson and the Board approves.

We also voted to have an event jointly in November of next year. We'll give you hopefully, in about 30 days, a date and what type of event that's going to be. So you all are invited to attend, and the idea is to raise money. For the public listing out there, you'll be invited.

We had a discussion on the Bookstore Agreement. That's still something we're -- they gave us a presentation. We are also going to be meeting with Director Watson and legal counsel -- your legal counsel to go over and renegotiate the agreement between the Foundation and the Library District. The last one, I think was dated 2/09 and so it's time to revisit it.

We have a commitment with you. You're tied to us for the next seven years because the New Market Tax Credits. My understanding that the Library District Foundation has helped bring in about \$21 million to help build libraries and help to sustain the continuance of operations for the libraries. So we are really, really working hard to become self-sufficient. We're looking at funding.



We voted on creating a separate website so that we can go after some money.

My commitment is the next four months just to hit it hard every day. Why? Why? Why? I want everybody to realize that November 5th, that was Election Day, right? That was a defining moment for libraries, a defining moment for this Library District and for this Foundation. One, we're here -- the Foundation and the Library District is designed to help improve people's lives.

The defining moment is this, Washoe County voted down their bond to give more money to build more libraries. They didn't vote for it, so they're not expanding. In fact, they're going to be laying off if you look at the news; it's a matter of public record. Henderson Library District also voted down an expansion of libraries. North Las Vegas voted down about ten years ago, the expansion of libraries.

The defining moment is this is a library district that believes in expanding its footprint, expanding its place to those communities that don't have the computers, that don't have the resources; that the space is somewhere where they can improve their lives. And our job as a Foundation is to assist you with money and -- for the programs that you guys develop. And I'm fully committed, our Board is fully committed, and I really do believe that November 5th was a defining moment for this library.

The other part of that is that we're going to increase our population by 300 to 600,000 in the next ten years. Most of them

are going to be in the counties. This city of Las Vegas really can't grow that big. Henderson, those prices of houses are 500,000 and up. That population can afford to get their stuff and pay for the fees 20 and 60 and \$100. So it is that your population that's going to need the service. So with that, that's what we're doing.

We're really working with hard. I meet with Director Watson about every three weeks to go over his ideas and tell us what he would like to see from us. Our job is to help you find the money and work hard also to capitalize on as many projects as we can. And we're going to work real hard to do that.

With that, thank you again for believing in us. It's a relationship that -- well, this relationship has been around since 2/09. The prior Foundation, I can't speak to that, but this relationship and then we're committed for seven years because of the New Markets Tax Credits. And then we're committed to help you raise money very quickly.

And so with that, thank you. With me, Fred James, our Treasurer who's very competent and capable. And Director Watson is an ex officio Board member who sits on the meetings and he -- so he's well aware of everything that we do.

I'll entertain any questions. If not, thank you, thank you. And for those listening, we're going to come ask you for money, donations; by tickets, by events. That's going to happen pretty quickly here. Thank you very much, Director Watson and Vice Chair Rogers.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. Fellow Trustees, I'll open it up to see if you had any follow up questions for the Foundation.

TRUSTEE WHITE: No questions.

CHAIR ORTIZ: Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Well I did. I just wanted --

CHAIR ORTIZ: Oh, please.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Yes.

CHAIR ORTIZ: Thank you, Dr. Rogers.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Well, I did -- I just wanted to say certainly, we look forward to hearing back from the Foundation and certainly welcome you back once you've met with Director Watson and we have a development plan in place because we certainly want to see how we as Trustees can collectively support that vision of making sure that we all leverage our professional networks and our skill set to bring in as much resources to support our unmet need and to move the vision forward and have a Library support and serve the community. So thank you for the partnership.

CHAIR ORTIZ: Thank you for those kind words and absolutely we will come back with that. Thank you very much, Dr. Rogers. And thank you very much for the few minutes this afternoon, okay?

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Thank you.

All right. So now we'll move to Agenda Item No. VII, which is the Library Reports.

And I will turn it over to Executive Director Watson to start

with his report and then see if there are any questions for the subsequent report.

DIRECTOR WATSON: Thank you, Vice Chair Rogers. Before I start my report, I wanted to just show the Trustees, if you haven't had a chance to see it, as well as the public, the video that we created in the launch of the license plate that launched on October 14th, 2024.

[Video Playing]

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: You know, these young folks do not know what Knight Rider is. Just so you know. I know my son would not know what Knight Rider is.

DIRECTOR WATSON: Trustee Benavidez, you know they're bringing back all these things, right?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Okay.

DIRECTOR WATSON: They may be bringing Knight Rider back, so. That's a good one though.

So before I move on, I wanted to thank Branding and Marketing for their great work in the in the video, but also the star, our branch manager for the Windmill Library. Stand up, Theron.  
[Clapping].

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: He's our David Hasselhoff. There you go.

DIRECTOR WATSON: So I'm glad we're bringing some laughter into the meeting. So the license plate is available to the -- to everyone. This is going to be something that we've launched

statewide and that the Library District is going to be receiving portions of the funds to help support our Summer Challenge. So this is -- that was the initiative that we selected and shared that with the DMV. So I wanted to say that.

The next -- the other thing that I wanted to say from the last meeting, we were going to the Vegas Chamber meeting the following day, after our last Board meeting and I mentioned that the Library District was a finalist for Large Business of the Year. So I wanted to just share with everyone that we have been recognized as the Vegas Chamber 2024 Large Business of the Year and received that award on October 17th. [Clapping].

The other things that I'll say is my report, as always, is submitted with all of the meetings -- most of the meetings that I have attended and the work that the Library District is doing. Again, wanted to as always reiterate my thanks to the staff for their contributions; all the teams, all the work that we -- that we're doing to support the community day in and day out.

And now I'll take any questions from the Trustees regarding my report.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any questions?

TRUSTEE FOYT: Will you send me a copy of the video we just saw?

DIRECTOR WATSON: We will send that to all of the -- Director Betsy Ward will work with Eboni to get that sent to everybody.

TRUSTEE FOYT: Absolutely charming, absolutely.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And then I'll say to my fellow Trustees, you know, the remaining reports from all the respective areas are listed. Does anyone want to call out any other reports or have any questions about the reports?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Seeing none, I move to accept all the reports in its totality.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. Do we have a second?

[No heard response.]

All right. All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. Thank you. Motion carries.

Going down to Agenda Item No. VIII. We have nothing under unfinished business.

Now we'll transition to Agenda Item No. IX, which is new business. And then as we look at the consent agenda, does anyone want to pull any items from the consent agenda before we ask for a motion to approve them as presented as a batch?

[No heard response.]

Okay. Hearing none, do we have a motion to approve the consent agenda items?

TRUSTEE WHITE: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any questions?

[No heard response.]

All right. All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. Motion carries.

Next is our regular agenda item, which is number -- is B.

The first item is discussion and possible Board action to amend the Board's public comment policy.

Jerry, are you in a position to talk about the change to the policy for public comment? If not, I can just --

COUNSEL WELT: Sure. The -- yeah. The -- basically what's happened is we are obligated to have the public comment policy that is set out in the statute. And some time back in developing the procedures, the District rewrote the policy, but in doing so, they sort of bifurcated how we do -- regarding public comment regarding both the agenda items and non agenda items.

And although it doesn't specifically conflict with the statute, it is certainly ambiguous and it's not very clear and it's not clear to the public. So all we're asking in this case is to remove our own separate policy and instead to just refer to the Nevada Revised Statutes 241.021 and 035-1 and still be in compliance and it's basically what all other government agencies do.

So it's -- we still will have public comment; people will be able to comment both at the beginning and the end. We will still attach to our Minutes if people ask to attach their e-mail. We'll actually broaden some things by giving the public more information as to how they can do public comment if they can't personally attend.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. Fellow Trustees, any questions?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: No questions, just a statement. I think it's important that we do mimic those governmental entities as City of Las Vegas, Clark County. So unifying it to -- so that constituents know that whether they come to a library meeting or they go in front of a City Council or a County Commission that they can follow the same rules. So I agree and I would move to --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: You want to read the recommended action?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Sure. Motion to amend the LVCCLD public comment policy by replacing the existing text with public comment at meetings of the Board of Trustees of the Las Vegas-Clark County Library District shall be received and recorded consistent with Nevada Revised Statute 241.021 and 241.035. So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

TRUSTEE JIRON: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any questions?



[No heard response.]

All right. All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. Motion carries.

Back to our next item for discussion and possible Board action of a new and revised Code of Ethics and Conflict of Interest Policy. And Scott, I believe you're going to lead the discussion.

MR. ABBOTT: Yes, good evening, Members of the Board. Thank you for allowing me to present this item tonight. Scott Abbott for the record; outside HR Counsel for the Library District.

Just by way of background -- and I know this is in the agenda item, the District currently has in its personnel policies and procedures manual a conflicts of interest and gifts policy. And due to some recent interactions with the Nevada Commission on ethics, it was highly suggested and recommended that the District revisit its policy with a view toward revising it and modifying it.

And so what you have before you for your review and potential approval tonight is a draft of a new Code of Ethics and Conflict of Interest Policy that I drafted. I will tell you that this is an amalgam based on considerable research that I conducted looking at well over 50 policies of a similar nature throughout the country, for not only other library districts but other municipalities and public agencies.

And there are certain common elements and certain recommended components that those policy have and those have been incorporated in the draft before you tonight. I'm happy to give you a summary of it or if anyone has any particular questions, I know it's a fairly extensive and as I called it to Executive Director Watson, a fairly robust policy, but it's something that in this day and age where ethical rules, especially for public officials and employees can be somewhat murky, it's important to give as much guidance as possible.

COUNSEL WELT: And I would just add, Scott did a great deal of work on this. We went through, I don't know, two, three, four iterations of it, taking apart piece by piece with Kelvin's input, as well as mine and Scott's. And the aim was to try to take care of the ambiguous parts that we've been operating under previously and to give the staff and the Trustees some direction within the policy so that it would be clear. So I'm real pleased with what Scott has accomplished. I think it is really a comprehensive ethics policy.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. Any questions, Fellow Board members?

[No heard response.]

And my question is, is there a -- what's the frequency when employees need to revisit the policy? Is it like an annual acknowledgement that they are aware of the conflict of interest policy or just up on hire? If that's been discussed.

COUNSEL WELT: If Jeff would -- is Jeff there?

MR. SERPICO: For the record, Jeffrey Serpico, HR director. Yes, upon hire employees are educated on the policy and then sign an acknowledgement. Under this policy, not only upon hire would that happen, but if you're involved in any kind of purchasing, if you're a manager, you would do that on an annual basis. There'd be policy education; you would reread and resign.

Right now, the only folks who resign every year we put in place almost two years ago is the administrative team; every year as part of their evaluation process will review and sign the Conflict of Interest Statement.

So yes, annually for all of the staff who do any purchasing and management and for everyone upon hire.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay. And then I had another question. As an example, so if I'm -- have a gala and I want to invite someone from the District, give them a complimentary ticket to attend the gala -- ticket is like \$100 ticket. So how does that play out in the current policy?

MR. SERPICO: In the current policy that --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: I'm sorry, the proposed --

MR. SERPICO: Oh, I'm going to defer to Scott so he can answer that.

MR. ABBOTT: There is a procedure that's memorialized towards the end of the policy that if anyone believes there is a potential conflict of interest that they can go to a designated individual to have that concern addressed and hopefully resolved,

or at least determined. And it's kind of three-part because this policy draft does apply to everyone within the District, including members of the Board. So it will apply to all of your executive level employees, all of the Trustees and all of your staff.

In the case of staff, if they believe there is a potential for a conflict of interest, the procedure requires them to elevate that concern or question to their immediate supervisor, which will then be elevated to the Human Resources Department. That, to my understanding, is what the existing policy in the way that it works has addressed this issue.

In addition, if it is a potential conflict on the part of a senior level executive or the executive director, that would be -- or a Trustee for that matter, that concern would be advanced to the General Counsel, Counsel Welt and the Chair of the Board for determination. So that policy is embedded within this particular policy, and it's specifically -- if you want to look at it yourself, it's Paragraph 13 -- Paragraphs 13 through 15 of the policy on page 7.

COUNSEL WELT: Also, to answer that, that specific example, if you look at the bottom of page 6, tickets to community or industry-related events which may provide the opportunity to build working relationships within the community and promote the interests of the District are not prohibited even if the amount exceeds the \$100 limit placed in there. That's hopefully to get -- to take care of the chamber dinners, galas, all the things that we all get invited to and are given complimentary gifts.

MR. SERPICO: And that is correct on the current staff process. It follows basically the current staff process. That process went in place maybe two years ago and I did include that process and some notes in the last two Board reports, I believe because it had been requested.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay. If there are no other questions, do we have someone who's willing to take the lead on the recommended action?

[No heard response.]

Do we have a motion to approve the proposed Code of Ethics and Conflicts of Interest Policy, effective January 1, 2025?

TRUSTEE WHITE: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

TRUSTEE JIRON: I second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any unreadiness or questions?

[No heard response.]

All right. We'll call for the vote. All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. Motion carries.

MR. SERPICO: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: We will go to our next item, No. III, which is for discussion only regarding a possible CCSD partnership at the Mount Charleston Library.

MR. VINO: Good evening, Trustees. My name is John VINO, General Services Director. I'm going to read the background of this. As they mentioned, it was discussion only. We're just trying to put forth where we are right now and look for Board direction.

The District has met with CCSD to discuss their request to explore a strategic partnership at the Mount Charleston Library and CCSD's desire to lease a portion of District property to erect a structure to house a school. The development site would include approximately 1,250 square feet for an expansion plus a playground, for the primary use of CCSD and local students.

The need for this partnership is a result of the current school, Earl B. Lundy Elementary School no longer being available due to severe damage caused by the storm on August 21, 2023. CCSD will utilize the leased portion of the Property, the Development Site, to erect structures to house a replacement school.

To fully understand the impacts and requirements of the proposed project, the District has agreed to a feasibility study to be done by CCSD. CCSD will hire an architect to conduct a feasibility assessment on the impact and code requirements an expansion might have on the property. The District has agreed to meet for a preliminary discussions. This is certainly an on-going process.

We've included the possibility of a Ground Lease, MOU language and terms are available for review in the form of a draft

Interlocal Statement of Intent. That's not an interlocal agreement, that's just a Statement of Intent that -- if we were given permission to proceed the local would be drafted on.

We've also included for your review a letter from the Mount Charleston Community to the Board of Trustees, dated October 4, 2024. While it is early in the process, if the project does go forward, an Interlocal Lease Agreement would be brought before the Board for discussion and approval.

If you didn't get a chance, I do have a -- and it's -- okay. So this is what the plot of land looks like now, and that is the preliminary proposal by the school district; the new construction with a playground.

I'm happy to answer any questions. I wasn't going to read the supporting material; it's pretty extensive. Again, I'm happy to answer any questions that I can to help the Board understand or give direction.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Chair, do we have anybody from CCSD here to present their side or what their understanding of why this is even proposed?

MR. VINO: They had their Board tonight, so I believe they're actually presenting to their Board the same issue tonight.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So doesn't that mean we're kind of jumping the gun -- if they're presenting it to their Board, how are we getting it on our Board on the same time?

MR. VINO: They're -- I mean what we're presenting to the

Board is, is the Board interested in pursuing a strategic partnership with CCSD. If you're looking for specific information as to why Lundy is closed and the information you heard tonight, that's not within my jurisdiction to tell you what needs to be in that school. And if that's the questions you have, we certainly can look for that, but my jurisdiction is whether the Board is interested in leasing and working with the school district.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: And this isn't directed to you, this is more --

MR. VINO: No, no.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: -- to the Board. I think it's -- the question is being asked, will we sit at the table to talk with CCSD staff about this. But they -- the CCSD staff hasn't even presented it to their Board, so if they are to be denied tonight at their Board, this would be even a moot point for us because they're not -- they wouldn't even be asking to sit at the table.

MR. VINO: Just as a clarification, I believe they brought this to the Board, and it has -- they have permission to pursue this with -- they've been given permission to approach us. Past that and what CCSD is doing in terms -- it might be just the terms of what we're requesting. So our intent -- the intent that I wrote and has gone before Counsel for review is the minimum requirements that we would want to even talk to CCSD, which includes, you know, full drainage, full utilities, full -- you know, everything that we would require -- I'm not saying we would move forward.



If you give us permission and this is something we want to pursue, we would pursue those terms with our attorney and an interlocal agreement that would come back to the Board in full, including insurance and indemnity and everything that would go with it.

TRUSTEE FOYT: But isn't it rather presumptuous of them to already have a contract that they'd like us to sign?

MR. VINO: No. No, they don't. I mean, this is strictly --

TRUSTEE FOYT: Well, it --

MR. VINO: They provided a general lease in terms of what it might look like in terms of what they would be willing to give. I didn't agree to that. I didn't approve it. We asked --

TRUSTEE FOYT: Right. Well --

MR. VINO: -- at that time for --

TRUSTEE FOYT: -- I knew you didn't, but --

MR. VINO: No, we asked for a Statement of Intent, right? That's the first thing that the Board would have to look at, Director Watson would have to sign. And even then, we're not tied. You know, it has an effect clause that states that even though we're saying, hey, we're -- we'll look a little deeper. Really, this just is allowing us to look a little deeper at the project. It does not tie the District into moving forward with it at any time.

Basically we're saying, if the community needs it and I'm not really speaking for either side, just for -- as a matter of clarification -- that these are the requirements that we as a District

would need to be met before we could even consider this type of partnership. Like, you know the intent requires, you know, the flood control, District to sign off and -- the building department to sign off. Fire department, they have to bring in their own utilities. They have to bring in their own septic and bathrooms. Anything that would affect us like if the parking lot needed to be increased, the school would be responsible for that.

TRUSTEE FOYT: But it's with --

MR. VINO: That's all I can bring forward.

TRUSTEE FOYT: But it's within the power of this Board to say --

MR. VINO: You're not interested --

TRUSTEE FOYT: That's right.

MR. VINO: -- or, you know, take the next step and we'll look at it at the Interlocal -- and that's really all we're looking for is to get, you know --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And I see from where you present on the background like at Bullet 1, CCSD will hire an architect to conduct a feasibility assessment for the impact code requirements. It seems like that's a little premature for them to be incurring expenses for them to be on our land without this Board saying that, you know, we are interested --

TRUSTEE FOYT: Yeah. I don't see --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: -- in --

TRUSTEE FOYT: -- evidence of our interest, to be honest.

I think we've been pleasant to them, and I think we've listened to both the residents as well as the school district, but I find it presumptuous that they're -- they would like to move forward beyond what we as a Board have approved to progress. Do we want to progress? Personally, I don't. I'll go on record.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Chair?

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Yes?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: My personal opinion, I don't think I have enough information. I kind of feel we're putting the cart before the horse, especially since the school district hasn't gotten direction from their Board.

At this point, I would move to hold this item if this is -- we can revisit this at our next meeting; it would be after the fact of them having the school district meeting and see what comes about from that meeting that we can then utilize to make an educated decision on what's in front of us. But as of right now, I don't feel comfortable moving forward with this.

TRUSTEE WHITE: I agree.

TRUSTEE FOYT: I also feel that perhaps we're going to look like the bad guys to the parents because I think the school district kind of has said to them well, you know, if you insist, we'll put something up on the mountain for you again but we're not going to fix the school. You're not going to get your own building and then we look bad if we say oh no, no, we're not doing this.

And some of the earlier stories that they were spinning

with the parents and the community outrage about this threw it all on our backs. It was not them being, you know, the heroes, it was like they looked around for somebody that would pick it up and carry the ball for them.

I believe the community personally, financially is impacted by not having the school building up there. Their property values without having a school in the community. The taxation level doesn't change, it's still -- but anyone who has undeveloped land in that area is going to be impacted by its valuation as well as those who have homes.

And there's an increasing number of people that wish to live in such an environment and are in a position to work from home. And without a school up there, you're never going to have -- you're going to have people without children and that's not really a full community. It's unfortunate, but I don't want to see it be we're the bad guys in this situation. I think if we were ever going to have a time to say, mm-mm, don't want to do this, this is not productive; if it isn't at this meeting, it needs to be at a meeting quite soon.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And I would concur with my fellow Board members that I don't think we have enough information about this project. And I think what I would want to see is maybe from your perspective and conversations with the school district, could you share from your understanding what would be the approval process in terms of like what tasks would need to be approved? And if so, in what sequence?

MR. VINO: If you, you know, told us to go ahead with it, the next item would be for the Director to sign the Letter of Intent and again, we would move forward with telling the school district to start getting their information together for a true interlocal lease.

The only work that's been done, just so that I had something to show you was the Exhibit B, so we understood what the school -- the original thought was that it somehow would be attached to the Library, but that had too much interaction. The only way it even would ever work, and even at that level would be if it was an independent building. There's no interaction between library staffers or library patrons. The school is its own building; it just happens to be on our land. We would be nothing but more than a landlord at that point. So our interaction is more of a landlord, you know, as it's -- in a strategic partner sense.

I think as the statement of intent list, we have a list of things we would require the school district to do or to go through. Every -- all the requirements that would be required to, you know, get deeper into what -- you know, do we have the utilities? How would they bring utilities in? What would the building department require? Zoning changes that might be required?

This -- we haven't gone very deep because really this is an attempt to just bring this information to the Board so that they understand, and we get some guidance on the Board's feeling as to whether this is something you want the District to proceed with. So I'm good with --

TRUSTEE FOYT: And do they have -- have they ever addressed the fact that they own their own land up there? There's land other than what the --

MR. VINO: I --

TRUSTEE FOYT: -- former building.

MR. VINO: Yes.

TRUSTEE FOYT: In other words --

MR. VINO: I don't know the full extent of what the school district's thought process is, other than, you know, we've heard a lot from the community, and you know, we're learning with everyone else. I mean, our intent really was to try to do something with -- you know, when we were first approached, we felt there was a community need and certainly it was really just our intent to pursue it, you know, can we help?

So now -- now it's -- we've heard from the community and we're just giving the Board both sides of, you know, the way we see it as well to try to get some direction.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: It seems like it would be reasonable to maybe have a representative from the District maybe come and do a formal presentation for what motivated them to sort of want to enter into a partnership with us so we can get a better understanding as a Board. And I think we would be in a much more informed position to be able to give an opinion or make a vote in terms of what our interests would be in a partnership.

MR. VINO: Right.

TRUSTEE FOYT: How long ago did they come to us?

MR. VINO: This is about 30 days. It's --

TRUSTEE FOYT: No, no, no, no, no. This has been going on longer than that. I'm just trying to -- in other words, after they -- after the flood --

MR. VINO: Oh.

TRUSTEE FOYT: -- and our library was down and how -- are we talking about a year or more?

MR. VINO: Not that they've been dealing with us. They --

TRUSTEE FOYT: It's been longer than 30 days.

MR. VINO: Well not with me. It might have been --

DIRECTOR WATSON: Probably about three months.

TRUSTEE FOYT: About three months.

MR. VINO: Yeah.

TRUSTEE FOYT: It's interesting --

TRUSTEE DUTKOWSKI: Vice Chair Rogers, if I enter -- if I may make a contact -- a --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Please.

TRUSTEE DUTKOWSKI: -- comment here?

I agree with the idea of getting more information. I just have -- am having trouble fathoming why they would want to use our -- the Library District's property. Like the other Trustees have said that there's other properties available. I'm just wondering why they want to entertain -- they want us to become landlords.

MR. VINO: Well, I certainly can get the school district

here.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: I think that would be helpful to invite them to do a presentation at our next Board meeting.

MR. VINO: It wouldn't be a problem. I can invite them.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Now I know this is for information only, so -- for discussion only.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Chair, if I may? I just want to --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Yes.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: -- make a statement. As a public Board, I feel it's our responsibility to work with other Boards, right? If these are situations where we can kind of help each other out and if this was kind of a last resort, I think we would all be on Board with it.

Unfortunately, I don't think we're all on the same page, and when you're looking at this particular community and the community itself is saying this isn't what they want, that's where I feel uncomfortable. You don't want to put something in somebody's backyard when you wouldn't do it in your own. And if this isn't something that that their community itself isn't, you know, requesting I feel very uncomfortable with, you know, moving on.

So my motion would be to hold this item for 30 days. We can revisit it. We can invite CCSD staff to come out and if we have more questions for them, we can move forward with that.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: I agree.

COUNSEL WELT: It doesn't need a motion.



VICE CHAIR ROGERS: No.

COUNSEL WELT: It's just a matter of directing staff what to do.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Yeah. We just -- we'll add it as an agenda item and invite them. And I would say we want to make sure we convey that -- as you said, as public entities, we want to be collaborative and cooperative where it makes sense. And so we just want to get more information from them to better understand what this would entail so we can make an informed decision.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So, question. Since this was a discussion item anyway, we weren't directing staff to do anything anyway, right? So it's kind of like it will stop here. We won't give you anymore --

MR. VINO: Correct.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: -- work than you already have on your date --

MR. VINO: No, it --

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: -- until we move on to the next step.

MR. VINO: That's exactly what we were looking for. This was our letting you know that the school district has reached out. We did very preliminary, you know, just enough to get the Board information that we felt you guys needed to give us direction. So this is what we were looking for just, you know, you need -- we'll have the school here. We won't move forward with it. No further

direction. We'll just, you know -- we'll get you the information you need.

DIRECTOR WATSON: Trustee Benavidez, and that's why we included the letter from the community as well. So that --

MR. VINO: Right.

DIRECTOR WATSON: -- the Trustees have full knowledge that this is what's happening, this is what the community is saying because we're hearing one thing in these preliminary conversations with the school district staff.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Right. And I just want to thank those residents that came out from Mount Charleston. I know it's a long drive for you and we appreciate you coming out. We couldn't recognize you during public comment but thank you for coming down and speaking out. As you can see, we did hear you so thank you so much.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. Thank you. Can we move on to the next item?

[No heard response.]

All right. We will move to Agenda Item B.4, Discussion and possible Board action regarding authorization to negotiate and execute the purchase of 1.22 acres of land with a 1,372 square foot dwelling located at 185 S Vegas Street, Good Springs, Nevada for future relocation and expansion of the Good Springs Library.

MR. VINO: So John VINO, General Services Director. This is something that's come up kind of quickly on us. We have a

trailer out in Good Springs. It has been a long-term trailer. It doesn't have running water; it doesn't have bathroom usage. We were looking to replace it this year, within the same square footage, Interestingly, we're a tenant of the school district for this particular building, but the property next to us has become available.

So a little bit of background and then I do have a small presentation for you. Funds are allocated in the Capital Projects Fund to purchase and replace the Goodsprings Library Trailer. The 1970's trailer has no running water or sewer and has reached the end of its useful life. The current 600 square foot trailer resides in the parking lot of the Goodsprings Elementary School. The District was investigating replacing the trailer with a similar trailer or modular style home.

We became aware that the adjacent property is currently for sale. The property consists of 1.22 acres of land with 1,372 square foot dwelling. It has water and restroom facilities. The property is listed for sale at \$374,900. We believe this site would better suite the District's need to offer expanded services and programming to the Goodsprings' community now, as well as, into the future.

The District has commenced its due diligence for the possible purchase including an appraisal and title search. The property would require a conforming zoning change to be used as a public library. The change of zoning is supported.

Motion to auth -- and then the motion would be the

motion to authorize staff to negotiate and execute the purchase of 1.22 acres of land with a 1,372 square foot dwelling located at 185 S Vegas Street, Goodsprings, Nevada, for the future relocation and expansion of the Goodsprings Library. The purchase price -- their current asking price is \$374,900.

And just to give you a little better idea of -- obviously Good Springs is located -- this is our trailer located in the parking lot of the Good Springs Elementary. This is the property that's for sale. You can see our trailer in the upper left, so it is the property just -- really just adjacent to. It includes a separate garage and a modular home that has -- eventually has two entrances and exits onto two -- onto Vegas, as well as San Pedro.

There is a little better picture of it. Some aerial views.

TRUSTEE FOYT: We would need to put in some parking; pave some parking.

MR. VINO: Yeah. We would have to do -- you know, we would have to do two things -- three things, really. We would have to address rezoning, we would have to address ADA and we would have to adjust the change of use.

We've talked very preliminarily with the change to the Commission. I mean, my next step would be to go out and have our architect and engineer look at it before we would, you know, get too far down the road. You know it's -- for us, it's -- we might -- the biggest issue would be potentially the floor going in and making it ADA accessible. You might have to put a ramp out. It has

some pretty good parking; I'm sure we'll have to expand on it.

I mean, that's kind of -- it would be written in the contract that we would -- the purchase would be subject to zoning -- a zoning change a use change. Certainly the county -- not county, Planning Commission cannot say yeah, it won't be a problem. They could tell us that there's -- you know, it's what people go through. We have an attorney that does this quite often and, you know at Title 30 they can ask -- they'll probably ask for some landscape buffering for some of the residential areas. You can expect some lighting and some parking.

But the difference really is, is that I can change the trailer for -- if it's going to cost 300,000 to change the trailer, we wind up in a 600 square foot trailer again, without running water and without -- this gives us the opportunity -- even if we didn't do a lot for five years, you know, we probably can take down a wall to create a kids area, create a community garden out back. There'd be some -- a lot more programming opportunities with 1300 square feet.

More importantly, with the Jean Airport coming in and -- if that goes through, ten years down the road at 1.2 acres, this can go away, and the District has the opportunity to put a more substantial building on this site. So not only does I think it help us immediately to get into the -- to this, but I think there's some long-term potential for us, you know, just having it in our portfolio.

TRUSTEE WHITE: So I'd like to say that this is the home of my favorite historian for the state of Nevada, Liz Warren and her

husband, Herman. So we just want to -- I would like to see this handled in the best way possible. Liz is no longer with us, but she would be lobbying, she would be in here right now, forcing us to do the right thing.

MR. VINO: It's an interesting opportunity and the only reason I brought it to the Board so quickly is well, I don't want to really lose it because it is on the open market and I'm just asking the Board permission, you know. So we would definitely do our due diligence. Like I said, I've already talked to our engineer.

The biggest issue -- and luckily this house is raised would be -- you know, in terms of use for public, we would we have to make sure the floor has adequate support. But again, on a modular home that would just be reinforcing or shoring up the floor. Not a big deal. It already has water; it already has the utility. It does have an ADA access ramp, but I don't think that would meet commercial code, so we probably would come in and do a nice ramp in the front.

We would do what the county tells us to do to get our, you know, our zoning change, but I don't think it would be extensive to the point where it doesn't make it worth the investment to the District, but we would have that in the contract price that if it does make -- doesn't make sense, we would -- you know we wouldn't just proceed with it.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Chair? Is this on a septic?

MR. VINO: It has -- yes, it has its own septic.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Okay. So if we were to turn it into our library, does that mean we have to upgrade?

MR. VINO: No. Most of what -- we actually have -- Enterprise Library is on a septic tank, believe it or not.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Okay.

MR. VINO: So it's not un -- you know -- they would have to make sure -- again, that would be part of the county making sure it's -- but to be honest we would probably have left septic -- you know, this now has multiple bathrooms and washing machines and things along those lines. So the day-to-day use would probably actually go down for us, but it is part of kind of our due diligence to make sure.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Perfect. And one last question. I know Good Springs is a small community. Have you been able to maybe reach out to any of the residents and kind of feel out what the support would be?

MR. VINO: We'll certainly meet with -- we meet regularly with the Citizen's Board. So yeah, I have reached out to talk to them. I haven't -- just time wise, I haven't had a chance to get too deep into it, but we will do a presentation as soon as they have us.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Will you let us know what their feelings are on that as well?

MR. VINO: Absolutely. Yeah. It'll be in my -- you know, as this progress, it'll be in our Board report. I'll keep you updated and maybe we have a Board meeting out there in a couple of

months.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay. Do we have a motion to authorize staff to negotiate and execute the purchase of 1.22 acres of land with a 1,372 square foot dwelling located at 185 S Vegas Street, Good Springs, Nevada for future relocation expansion of the Good Springs Library. The property is currently listed for sale at \$374,900.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

TRUSTEE FOYT: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any questions?

[No heard response.]

All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

All right. Motion carries.

MR. VINO: I'll thank everybody. Thank you.

TRUSTEE FOYT: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay. Our next agenda item is presentation and discussion and possible Board action regarding venue use fees.

MR. McNALLY: Hello. Vice Chair Rogers, Board of Trustees, Director Watson and Counsel Welt, good evening. For the record, Matt McNally, Community Engagement Director.



I oversee seven administrative departments, and my background is 25 years of working in the arts and entertainment industry. I hold a master's degree in drama from the University of California, Irvine, and I've worked for small professional theater companies, I've worked for the Disneyland resort, and I've worked for managing a multimillion-dollar production show on the Las Vegas Strip for nearly a decade.

Joining me tonight is Programming and Venue Services Manager Ryan Neely and Sherry -- Project Manager Sherry Walker.

In June of 2024, the Library District Board of Trustees adopted a new venue use policy. Now, this policy will take effect on January 1st, and it governs the use of 17 conference rooms and six performing arts centers. One major policy change relating to fees is that all rental costs are now due -- or will now be due prior to a customer using the venue.

Tonight staff brings before you proposed venue use fees for your consideration that support the new policy. There's multiple caveats to the fee structure, so if you're able to hold your questions until the end and there's a good chance, I'll probably answer the question as I move through the presentation. But at the end, I'll be happy to flip back to any slides or help answer any of those questions for you.

And before we begin talking about any proposed changes, I wanted to note that current venue fee rates will be honored for all existing commitments and any commitments made prior to

January 1st of 2025. The venue use fees proposed tonight will take effect on January 1st if you -- should you approve it and all commitments thereafter. Some user groups, depending on dates of their rental use may not experience any change for up to one year.

So the Library District provides two ways for the public to use our venues. First, anyone can use a meeting room and performing arts centers completely for free if they qualify for partnership. The criteria presented here was adopted by the Board of Trustees in the new venue use policy and under a partnership agreement the Library District provides free use of the venue. We also provide technical staff, security, marketing, equipment, rental costs and administrative and programming support costs. The partnership arrangement is that the Library District provides the space, and the partner provides the free public service or a free public program that benefits our customer or the community. Now users that do not qualify for partnership may still use venues independent from the Library District as a rental option. Under a rental agreement, the event is not considered a Library District program. The views expressed and other information presented are solely those of the producing entity.

So a rental user is not bound to keep their event open to the public. They can charge for tickets, they can solicit, and they can fundraise. Rental users are very, very different than partners. They're usually businesses, political groups, religious users, private celebrations and fundraising opportunists. These groups use the

Library venues as a platform to primarily accomplish their own objective or mission.

Each year, the Library District conducts about 30 to 35,000 programs, of which about 2600 are rental uses. Now all venues are open to the public seven days a week during regular library hours and performing arts centers -- they also op -- the performing arts centers can also operate outside of our regular business hours.

Rental use brings about 113,000 customers to libraries annually for people to come and attend an event, and our total -- but our total programs brings about 750,000 customers to all of our programs

Rental use of the Library District venues has always been a service driven model. Estimated expenses to operate our venues exceed revenue. Library District revenue acquired through venue fees only accounts for approximately 10 percent of the estimated costs. Currently, the fees that we collect for labor, so technicians and security, they don't even offset the actual cost for that labor.

The Library District further invests in the venues with operating supplies, small equipment and transfers to a capital projects program to help purchase things like lighting, sound and AV equipment, projectors, curtains, pianos and other expensive items that the venues require.

So to better understand Library District fees, staff conducted a community assessment. The details of this assessment are provided in your background materials. A local

analysis identified 17 comparisons in government, education and commercial sectors and the organizations are included here in purple.

From that assessment, staff identified a community cost range and average cost and made individual comparisons in the categories; they're identified in orange. Overall, our costs are under market value. Quite frankly, we're among the most cost-effective option in the community.

From an internal venue occupancy study, I know that our venues operate anywhere between 60 and 70 percent of all available hours. And we also discovered that in addition to the base rates, other venues charge additional costs for things like deposits or loading in and out of a venue or equipment that is used in that venue, all of which we actually include in our base fee. So this makes it much easier for customers to understand what they're getting and not feel as they're being continually up charged when they use our venues. Our approach is very transparent to the customer.

Staff identified four goals when developing this proposed fee structure. Please keep in mind that these -- please keep these goals in mind, I guess, as you -- as I take you through the presentation. That being said, you'll discover that proposed venue fees remain at the very bottom of the community range. Costs for labor need realignment since they were last updated over ten years ago. The Library District is not profiting from any of the proposed

fees, and the approach is not a commercial cost recovery model, but rather it retains the service driven model which the Library District is known for.

The Library District heard from past public comment that equity and accessibility to theater rental use is a major concern for our rental user groups. With these goals in mind, I don't anticipate decreased usage for three reasons. First, the proposed costs remain extremely competitive. Second, most rental use of our venues are for conference rooms. Users renting these spaces rarely encounter any types of labor costs. And third, although performing arts centers do require labor, any decreased use of these spaces would be offset by additional Library District programming and services and other groups wishing to use the venues.

So in alignment with our goals, venue base rates would remain the same at \$30.00 an hour for a conference room and \$40.00 an hour for a performing arts center. And while using a venue for longer than eight hours is possible, it's not encouraged. You can see from the community ranges that they're quite broad, but our venue rates remain at the very bottom of the range from our community assessment.

Another goal was to create greater equity for rental users to access the venues and in our community assessment we discovered that 9 of the 17 venues had a daily rate to use that space. So staff recommends adding a daily rate for more effective use of our Library District venues. Groups using the venue for eight

consecutive hours would actually see a cost savings of \$20 per day compared to our current fees.

The venue use policy allows a rental user to secure a venue for up to 75 days. Staff estimates that most rental users complete their agreement or complete their use of a venue within 17 days. Users renting a venue for longer periods would incur a different daily rate; however, both rates remain well below our community assessment.

The 17-day time frame was chosen so that a user group may in essence have three weekends of continuous use with two weeks in between that use. That time frame then allows other rental users access to the venue within the same month unless the premium fee is paid.

So we have two labor costs to assist customers with the use of venues. You can see from our current rates that these costs -- as I said earlier, the costs haven't been updated in over ten years. Staff identified the midpoint within the salary grade range for the position or the contracted service. The average hourly cost is all inclusive of salary, benefits and taxes. And at the existing rate, the taxpayer currently subsidizes labor for private rental use of our venues.

The Library District only charges security fees if the rental use occurs outside of normal library operating hours, and that's because security is already on site during our regular business hours. So under the proposed hourly costs, you can see that the

Library District is not attempting to profit from labor. The proposed hourly rates are simply designed to offset actual costs. Security costs were provided by our contractor.

Now these costs are all listed at cost in the proposed venue fees and in the future each year staff will identify that average hourly cost and update the venue use fees in alignment with the new fiscal year to take effect beginning every July 1st. Updated costs would be reported to the Board of Trustees each year in the June Community Engagement Report. And this annual fee update will prevent the taxpayer again, from subsidizing future labor for their independent rental use.

To comply with ADA, the Library District pays for hearing interpreters at our own expense, even when a venue is used as a rental. Now, this occurs very infrequently; however, staff proposed that this payment practice be discontinued and instead the cost to be incurred by the rental user. Upon the Library District being notified, as required in the policy, staff would contract hearing interpreter services. We currently use ASL communication, which charges the Library District \$100 per hour, per interpreter.

Now all Library District owned pianos are tuned at least twice a year. Groups requesting a special tuning may do so at the current rate of \$150. This is the contracted cost that the Library District pays our vendor, and this fee remains unchanged from any -- from our current fees. These service fees are also listed in the venue use fees at cost and would be updated by staff each fiscal

year reported to the Board of Trustees in -- each June and take effect on July 1st each year should there -- you know changes increase or decrease.

So rental users abiding by the venue use policy would pay no additional fees from this point in the presentation, forward. A Library District Staff Task Force recommended changes to the fee structure to better help enforce the venue use policy for rental users who do not comply. Right now there are very few financial consequences to a rental user who violates the policy. This creates challenges for Library District operations and other rental users wishing to access the space. Noncompliance fees can help curb customer behaviors and meet Library District expectations and therefore, staff is recommending the following fees.

A rental user must complete full payment and provide insurance no less than 14 days prior to the first contracted use of a venue. Occasionally this becomes a real struggle. When a payment or insurance information arrives late, it hinders staff operations to help indemnify and protect the Library District. Concerns arise if the rental user is actually really serious about using the venue, or if they're simply holding the venue, which in turn prevents other customers from accessing the space. So staff is proposing a \$100 fee per day to help ensure compliance.

As an option, the Library District does offer insurance services through a company called Gather Guard. Insurance can usually be obtained within one hour of submitting an application,



so hopefully the -- no one's going to be put out by that type of fee.

An operational challenge that the Library District encounters are guests of rental users sitting in aisles or standing along the back walls of a venue and overcrowding a rental event. This violates fire code and occupancy expectations. Now the venue use policy now requires that the rental user group accept that responsibility of helping -- of managing attendance. So staff reached out to the State Fire Marshall for an expected violation cost and we were informed that the cost really varies based on the infraction. So should the Library District be fined for such a violation under rental use, this cost would be invoiced to the rental user group.

On very rare occasions we've had user groups damage venues, carpeting, walls, equipment, and other Library District property. The current fee structure only allows the Library District to charge a flat fee of \$50, no matter the extent of the damage or the cleanup that's required. So staff recommends that actual cost, including labor, be implemented as a fee to restore venues to the condition which they were provided should cleaning be needed or if damage occurs.

If a user group decides to leave large amounts of trash or property behind and the Library District has to remove those items, staff proposes a fee of actual cost to return the venue to its rightful condition.

Early arrivals, and especially late departures, are often the

most problematic situations faced. When a rental user arrives early or they depart late, it has a major impact on other rental users. It also has a major impact on staff scheduling in accordance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement and contracted security services along with the venue operations.

So staff recommends deterrent fees that encourages users to not arrive early, expecting access to a venue and that users vacate venues by the agreed upon contracted time. If a ven -- if a rental user accesses a venue early or departs late from the agreed upon contract, the base hourly rate would be applied per quarter hour for both the venue and the labor.

The venue use policy requires rental users to notify the Library District if an ADA accommodation is requested; Library District staff would then provide an accommodation. But if a rental user fails to notify the Library District and the Library District is fined for that ADA violation, that cost would be invoiced to the rental user.

A rental customer using Library District venues is expressly prohibited from using the Library District name or the names of individual facilities in any other way other than to specify the location of the activity. Now, rental users must create a separation between themselves and the Library District in things like marketing materials, social media posts and promotional items.

It's very rare, but when compliance with this policy item isn't achieved, the consequence can be very damaging to the

Library District. It can misrepresent the Library District, it can harm the Library District's reputation in our community, and it requires an incredible amount of staff time and energy to respond to customer complaints, and the Library District often incurs legal fees for counsel.

So when staff recognize that a customer is in violation of a policy, we inform the customer of the corrective action that's needed. And most customers, they happily comply. But for rental users who do not comply within 48 hours of notification, staff proposes a \$500 fee per day until compliance is achieved and cancellation of the rental agreement if it's not corrected within 120 hours.

Finally, when completing an agreement, the rental user assumes responsibility for providing a certain number of chaperones and ushers based on the age range and the number of minors and audience size, respectively. To a certain degree, we're counting on the rental user to provide adequate support for safe and effective operation of their event. Failure to provide this imposes added pressure on the Library District.

So the proposed venue use fees are outlined in a one-page document. Again, with your approval, lease fees would be implemented and effective beginning January 1st, 2025, through June 30th of 2025. Current venue fees would be honored for all existing agreements and any contracts or reservations made prior to January 1st, 2025. And staff will update the at-cost items prior to

July 1st, 2025, for a period extending through June 30th, 2026, as the new fiscal year approaches. Those are those at-cost items that I discussed in the policy -- or in the fee structure.

And this update process would occur automatically by staff on an annual fiscal year basis. It will be reported to the Library District Board of Trustees each year prior to implementation.

With that, I'd be happy to take any questions you may have or flip back to any slides if you need to consider any of that information.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Chair?

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Yes, go ahead.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So Matt, we are here again. I was I think maybe Foyt -- Trustee Foyt might be the only Trustee that was here when we had to do this.

MR. McNALLY: I wasn't here the first time --

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: You weren't?

MR. McNALLY: I -- no, it's been --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Ten years ago.

MR. McNALLY: It's been 11 years, so.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: It was --

MR. McNALLY: 12 years maybe, yeah.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: -- a nightmare. And I think it was because we waited so long, right? We waited so long to raise the fees and once again we're in that situation where we are the lowest venue cost and so of course everybody wants to come and I

understand the frustration when, you know, we wait this long and then we try to hike up prices.

With that said, I understand the need for this. But have you met with, you know, concerned groups that, you know -- I believe it's the lack of information. That's how I feel. I feel like if we were to sit down and explain to them -- a lot of them noted that they weren't aware of the fee cost; how much they were -- how much it was going to up. I feel like if we sit down with them, kind of walk them through the process, I would hope that they would hear, not necessarily against this, but maybe in support of it because I -- they understand as well that, you know, prices have to go up, right? That's the economy, that's how, you know, the world moves is prices go up for everything. But I think it's that we jumped the gun without sitting and giving the information and explaining it that I have a problem with.

MR. McNALLY: Yeah. With all due respect, that was discussed with the Executive Director, and we agreed that a public forum, a public meeting like tonight in a Board meeting would be the best place to receive public comment. We didn't want to show favor by including certain rental users and omitting other rental users.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: And I don't think -- it's the invitation -- even if it's a public invitation of the, you know, the Library is proposing these cost changes. It's a public meeting. Anybody can come and ask questions or see the presentation. I

mean, I know it's the first time for the people/organizations to see this presentation where I understand the frustration that comes, and I think that's why we're then put in a situation where we listen to these frustrations.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any other comments?

TRUSTEE WHITE: Yes. So earlier you said something about a partnership? Tell -- explain that.

MR. McNALLY: Yeah. So I'll look back right into my slides here. So there is a process in which groups can apply for partnership. Again, under that partnership -- what great partnerships are for the Library District is where we provide the space and an expert provides a program, right. If it meets these criteria here, which were adopted by the Board of Trustees at our June 2024 Board meeting, this is the criteria that staff use to evaluate what makes a good partnership for us.

It doesn't have to meet every single item within here; however, some of the big ones are we do ask that it be free and open to the public. We ask for like, no solicitation. When the Library District works with someone, we want to make sure that they're kind of a credentialed entity or an expert in that material right?

And then typically our partnerships are, you know -- we work probably, I want to say maybe 6 to 12 months in advance to develop those partnerships. That allows us to effectively market the program, it allows us to adequately plan for staffing for venue

use. But anybody who qualifies for that type of partnership use can come and use the Public Library for free.

And so where the venue use fees differ is that, again, the groups are different; they're charging for tickets or they have -- they are soliciting for fundraising or they're doing things that don't usually meet the partnership use criteria.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Matt, can I ask a question? I recall from when we had to do this years ago, we had two scales; was it like a non profit -- if it was like a nonprofit entity, it was a different pricing than if it was a for-profit entity, if I recall that right.

MR. McNALLY: Yeah. So I wasn't here, I think, when venue fees were last approached. We did -- the task force did consider different fees for nonprofit or government or commercial or fees or partnership rates and it became a thing where when you do that, it starts to become very confusing to the public, which you know -- like which rate do I qualify for? It's challenging to verify that status of, you know, the different entities.

It's really kind of inequitable to members of the public who are not officially structured as a nonprofit and then we offer this partnership model where everything is free. So having that difference of, you know, paying for the -- you know, paying a rental and having it be your program versus partnering with the Library District and making it a free program, that's a very easy message, I think, to understand.

TRUSTEE FOYT: I thought your presentation was very

comprehensive. It really laid it out well. And as you said, costs have gone up that we can't absorb them entirely.

MR. McNALLY: Yeah. And again, we're not trying to profit off of those costs. So a lot of the costs are used just to manage facilities. And right now, you know, where our costs are, the taxpayer is subsidizing, right, the use of Library District labor for their private rental use.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any other questions, Board Members?

TRUSTEE FOYT: Remind us how many venues we have?

MR. McNALLY: It is 17 conference rooms and six performing arts centers that fall under -- that currently fall under the venue use fees and our rental policies.

TRUSTEE FOYT: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Yeah. And I would agree with my fellow Trustee that I think it was a very comprehensive, measured approach to you know, how do you adjust fees to allow you to recoup, you know, those costs that have gone up, while not profiting. And, you know, my organization, we're going through a similar exercise and it's very painful and it's very challenging to transfer, you know, those real costs to those frequent users and who have limited budgets.

And I know that it's also equally challenging trying to balance, you know, how those costs are currently subsidized, which can create other compliance challenges based on those sources of



funds that we want to certainly make sure we insulate ourselves as an organization as a public entity can be challenging.

I did want to just ask you -- a clarification. I know you mentioned about some of the average days of the event is about 17 or usually --

MR. McNALLY: We feel that most user groups actually complete their rental uses within 17 days. And we felt that 17 days -- as we looked at the calendar -- from some of the public comment that we've received at past Board meetings of just trying to create equity within a calendar month, right? Multiple groups could be able to get into a venue for -- within the same calendar month.

And then a 17-day rental period would -- you know, if you started on -- you could start on a Friday, Saturday, Sunday, one weekend, have that week; another Friday, Saturday, Sunday, have another week; and then finish up on a Friday, Saturday.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: So is it accurate to interpret it that if someone rented it for 17, 21 days that it's not exclusive that they have -- it's -- I mean it's exclusive access to the space for consecutive days, but more so that the intent is that the space would still be made available during their non-event periods?

MR. McNALLY: No. Under the daily rate they -- right now our current practice is if you -- we may have certain contracts that could go for let's say -- well the new policy would allow for up to 75 days of continuous use, okay --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Uh-huh.

MR. McNALLY: -- but it doesn't require a person to use any certain amount of hours within that time period. And so even though the venue might be used for two hours, or four hours, or six hours, that becomes very difficult for the Library District to program it with other -- with that rental users' groups' items in the space.

And so that's where the daily rate kind of comes into effect, right, because really the community can't use the space if it's being occupied by another rental user group during that consecutive use period.

TRUSTEE WHITE: How many 17 days can I have in a year or 75 days?

MR. McNALLY: There is no limit to the amount of contracts that you would -- that you could do. Staff -- if approved tonight, staff would work with legal counsel on our Performing Arts Center Rental Agreement so that multiple users of the same group can't rent for 17 days and then rent for 17 days again and rent for 17 days again to extend that into a longer rental contract; there would be a cooling off period, probably. And that would need to be discussed with legal counsel still.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And then the other question that I had regarding the noncompliance rates that you shared, what was sort of the baseline or rate sources that you referred to come up with those rates?

MR. McNALLY: Yeah. Unfortunately, in our community

assessment, there were no policy noncompliance fees for us to make a comparison to. So these were really generated from the staff task force that was assembled to say how can we better help enforce the policy from a financial standpoint so that hopefully, you know, that that motivates people to agree to and follow the policy that the Board approved unanimously in June.

And again, you know, if you follow the policy, you'll never pay any of those types of fees.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And then the last question is, is there consideration, you know, after a vote is conducted to -- for a process to maybe socialize to our heavy users, how we came up with the fee increase, you know, since it wasn't done prior, but maybe there could be a process in which to do that?

MR. McNALLY: I'd be happy to speak with the Executive Director and come up with a plan.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: I suspect that that will probably get be a lot of parties to --

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Chair? Your presentation was not public, correct? Like as of -- I mean, obviously until now.

MR. McNALLY: It is now.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: I'm saying nobody was able to access your presentation until today, correct?

MR. McNALLY: Correct. We're interested in hearing what the Board would like to do and if that's something that you would like staff to do, I'd be happy to strategize with the Executive Director

to share that.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: I would like to propose to the Board to table this to our next meeting. It would give Matt 30 days to organize an open house meeting, have a public setting where organizations can come in and kind of digest the information that you gave us as well. That would be my proposal to the Board.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Well, let's state that in a motion and see if we can get a second on that.

MR. McNALLY: If I may make a comment, I don't believe that there is a December Board meeting. The new venue use policy does go into effect January 1st, so that may require calling a special meeting, you know in December. Or us continuing the existing rates with the new policy that's in place just to advise you.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: I mean, it wouldn't preclude us from starting these cost adjustments in February.

MR. McNALLY: Correct.

TRUSTEE WHITE: So -- and if what legal decides upon?

MR. McNALLY: I'm sorry? I don't understand the question.

TRUSTEE WHITE: If what legal decides about 75 days, will we be able to vote again after that?

MR. McNALLY: I believe that you could -- as a Board, you could make a motion and choose to vote whenever you would like to vote.

COUNSEL WELT: That's correct.

MR. McNALLY: But there's no -- the -- sorry.  
Counsel Welt?

COUNSEL WELT: Oh, yeah. That's correct. I mean, it's a policy. You can change the policy anytime you want. You just have to apply it to the people who've already signed contracts, so.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And so I know we have a Trustee that put a motion on the floor to -- and I'll just restate it to simplify it. It would be to postpone voting on this rate change until the December meeting to give time for us to maybe do a town hall or something with some of our users to sort of orient them to the fee change, to get feedback, and then bring it back to the Board for reconsideration in December.

COUNSEL WELT: Yeah. Technically, that'll be a motion to table.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay. Just a motion to table will be sufficient, Jerry?

COUNSEL WELT: Yes.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay. Do we have a second?

TRUSTEE WHITE: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any discussion?

[No heard response.]

All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

Okay. That --

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: But we can ask staff to add that open house meeting, right? We can direct staff -- okay.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay.

COUNSEL WELT: Sure.

MR. McNALLY: Okay.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay.

MR. McNALLY: Thank you very much.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Thank you.

Okay. Next agenda item is to Discussion and possible Board action to approve Resolution No. 2024-04 related to the New Markets Tax Credit and Nevada New Markets Jobs Act transactions for the West Las Vegas Library Project.

MR. CABIAS: For the record, Floresto Cabias, Chief Financial Officer. The New Markets Tax Credit program provides federal funding to support capital projects and underserved communities, including the historic West Side and the West Las Vegas Library Project.

In March 2024, staff closed a New Markets deal that generated \$6.5 million towards construction of the new library. And since then staff has continued to pursue New Markets funding under both the federal program and the state of Nevada's program, known as the new -- the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act. And the resolutions before the Trustees today contemplates a up to \$25 million contribution that will be made to the Foundation -- the

Library District Foundation in order to participate in the program.

The Library District is the sponsor of the West Las Vegas project and in the previous transaction, the Foundation served as what's called the leveraged lender. And earlier today, the Foundation Board of Directors met to approve its own set of resolutions so that the Foundation can once again serve as the leveraged lender in the upcoming transactions.

From there, the Foundation will contribute those funds to an investment fund that's created by the New Markets structure. And then from there that investment fund will make a loan to a nonprofit corporation. In this case, that's the West Las Vegas QALICB that will use those funds to spend on construction of the new library. It's the QALICB that actually owns the Library -- the new library for a seven-year compliance period before title eventually reverts back to the Library District.

Also earlier today that West Las Vegas QALICB approved its own set of resolutions in order to serve as the title holder of the new library, as has been the practice in previous transactions.

I wanted to highlight that contribution from the Library District to the Foundation because at the time of preparing the budget for Fiscal Year 2025, which the Board of Trustees adopted in May 2024, the anticipated expenditures for the West Las Vegas Library Project was approximately \$8 million in the current Fiscal Year 2025, which isn't high enough to cover the cost of this contribution per the resolutions in order for the Library District to

participate in the New Markets Program.

The Library District cannot spend more than the budget that was adopted by the Board of Trustees, so staff intends to bring an agenda item to the Board of Trustees at the December meeting in order to seek approval to amend the Fiscal Year 2025 budget, raising the amount of expenditures possible in order for the District to make this contribution to the Library District Foundation.

And for the Trustees' information, staff is anticipating a return on investment in participating in this program of \$7.5 million, which is funding that will, again, go towards construction of the new West Las Vegas Library. That would be \$4.4 million coming from the Nevada New Markets Job Act. Again, this amount wasn't budgeted in the prior fiscal year for this current fiscal year because staff was not aware of the District's eligibility to even participate in this new program.

This will be the first time that the Library District has applied and may receive funding under the Nevada State Program. And we've been doing diligence since then and we're continuing to do diligence to verify that the Library District and the West Las Vegas QALICB is eligible to participate in the Nevada program. We're confident in our chances of getting approved and receiving those funds and we're even more confident about the separate Federal New Markets Program, which we've consummated before in prior transactions, including for this West Las Vegas Library Project. The federal layer is expected to generate \$3.1 million in



funding for the West Las Vegas Library Project.

And again, the resolutions before the Board today is very similar to the resolutions the Board previously approved to close the original West Las Vegas Library transaction in March. The only difference would be the incorporation of the Nevada State New Markets piece.

And with that staff is recommending that the Board approve the resolutions to authorize staff to continue moving forward with executing transactions needed in order to close New Markets deals for the West Las Vegas Library Project.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any questions?

[No heard response.]

And my only question is, do you know the timeline in which we will know whether we were awarded those?

MR. CABIAS: Yes. We are working closely with the Department of Business and Industry and expect to receive verification shortly, probably in the next few weeks. Definitely before mid-December because these transactions are anticipated to close in -- from mid-December to mid-January, so we should have a -- the notification and an answer shortly.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. Any other questions?

[No heard response.]

All right. Do we have a motion to approve Resolution #2024-04 relating to executing NMTC and NMJA transactions for the West Las Vegas Library Project?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

TRUSTEE FOYT: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. Any questions?

[No heard response.]

All right. All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. Motion carries.

Our next discussion item is also -- Floresto will be leading it. Discussion and possible Board action regarding the engagement of Ballard Spahr LLP in connection with the New Markets Tax Credit and Nevada New Markets Jobs Act transactions for the West Las Vegas Library.

MR. CABIAS: Thank you.

As discussed, the New Markets Program, it involves participation and support from a number of different experts. The District has previously worked with special counsel, Kutak Rock in closing these transactions. Crescent Growth Capital is our consultants; they are facilitating all of these transactions.

And another partner that needs to be engaged would be local counsel. You know, this firm would provide a local opinion that verifies the District's and the QALICB's eligibility to participate in the state and federal program, and they would also provide a tax

opinion that's needed to close these transactions.

Another partner I'll mention for the Trustees' information is Novogradac and Company, which provides financial and other advisory services in support of the transactions. Earlier today, the Foundation also approved engaging of Novogradac, so that's another important member of the New Markets team that's needed.

Today, staff is recommending that the Trustees engage Ballard Spahr to provide the local opinion that I described. The firm comes well regarded. They're a national firm that has expertise in these types of complex transactions under the New Markets Federal Program. But probably even more important for the Library District, since this is our first round with state funding, Ballard Spahr has experience with the Nevada New Markets Job Act. They've represented clients under this program and has already been working with staff to perform the diligence I described to ensure that the District and the QALICB can participate and continue moving forward with seeking this funding.

Earlier today, the West Las Vegas QALICB also approved engaging Ballard Spahr. The firm will be representing not only the Library District but the West Las Vegas QALICB in pursuing this funding. That's all I had, Vice Chair.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Thank you.

Any questions?

TRUSTEE WHITE: Have we worked with Ballard before?

MR. CABIAS: No, we haven't. The -- we sought out local

firms that had expertise in the Nevada New Markets Jobs Act. The experts in the New Markets industry in general is very small; there's a small number of experts that have this kind of niche expertise and the number of those experts that have expertise under Nevada program is even smaller.

Ballard Spahr actually comes recommended by our peers and partners. We've worked in the past with the City of Las Vegas's Community Development Entity, the LVCIC who recommended Ballard Spahr, knowing that the firm has experience under the Nevada program.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And could you just restate how their fees will be covered?

MR. CABIAS: The engagement letter notes the fees that would be charged per hour. It's ranges from --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Well, not necessarily the rate, but how it will be paid.

MR. CABIAS: That would be paid out of pocket by the District; that's the traditional practice for local counsel. Our other partners of special counsel, our consultants are usually paid by proceeds generated from the transaction itself, but this is why staff is asking the Board to engage Ballard Spahr directly because they do serve as local counsel that is paid directly by the Library District,

And that amount is difficult to estimate because of the -- this is the first time the District's been involved with the Nevada program so Ballard Spahr couldn't give us a guaranteed number of

hours that that would be required to ensure the eligibility requirements that I described. But based on prior history with other transactions, we expect the fees for this service to amount to about 15 to \$20,000.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Question, Chair?

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Yes, go ahead.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: On those fees, can we put a -- like a cap of 20 and if we exceed that that you would have to come back and let us know that we have to approve the extra whatever it was? Do you understand like -- it -- can we do that? Can we write that, you know, once we hit the 20,000, you are to come back and let us know.

MR. CABIAS: We can go back and discuss that with the firm and with Counsel Welt. Again, that \$20,000 is a number that, you know, I determined based on prior history. It could be different. I don't expect it to be significantly different, but again we this is our first round with the New Markets Program under the Nevada legislation. So it --

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: I just want to be fiscally responsible, especially since this is, you know, school district -- I mean Library District money; it's not going to be taken out of the funding that they're seeking.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Trustee Benavidez, we could probably just maybe modify the motion to add that sort of up to

number.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: That's fine. I feel comfortable with that.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Just not to exceed. So I'll -- before we do that are there any other questions?

If you want to read the motion and incorporate that up to.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Well I don't want to say up to. Can we just put -- because up to means they -- like they would be done at 20. I don't want to put that. I just want to say that to be able to fund whatever else --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Well, let's take a stab at it -- at stating it.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Motion to authorize staff to execute an agreement with Ballard Spahr LLP to provide legal services in connection with financial transaction under the NMTC and NMJC program for the West Las Vegas Library Project, subject to final review of the engagement letter by Counsel not to exceed 20,000 --

TRUSTEE WHITE: Without.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: -- without additional approval. I like that. Thank you. Not to exceed --

COUNSEL WELT: My feeling --

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: -- 20,000

COUNSEL WELT: My -- I don't know that they will sign that because they're going to put in an awful lot of time and effort

into a process that is done by very few people in the country, frankly, much less the state. So I understand your concern but if Floresto's comfortable in his guess, which is really all it is at this point, maybe you could raise that limit to say 40,000, so at least you have some protection. I'm concerned that Ballard Spahr may not want to tie themselves like that.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: I'll leave it up for the Board. I just feel like, you know, we can't just leave it open-ended.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And perhaps we could structure to where maybe Floresto will just come back to the Board at the next meeting, just to let us know where we are in the estimates of the work and just keep us apprised that way.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: I don't even -- I don't -- not necessarily feel like we need a monthly report on it, it's just -- even if we say like at 20 -- once you hit that \$20,000 mark, you are to come and let us know, we've got -- you know we've gotten to the \$20,000 mark, so we can then re -- or look into okay, where are we at? How much more hours are we expecting? Are we halfway through the project? Are we 90 percent through the project?

I just -- I don't feel comfortable leaving it open-ended like that without some sort of a price tag on this.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And then Floresto, what do you estimate the time frame would be for this engagement?

MR. CABIAS: This engagement could continue through January. There's two layers of transaction.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: So a little over maybe two months or longer.

MR. CABIAS: Yes, approximately two months. We expect to be complete by the end of January. And again, there are two separate transactions at play here, so there will be a couple rounds of work that will be performed by this law firm. I think Counsel Welt's Recommendation is a good one. I'm sure Ballard Spahr having a conservative amount assuming they would agree to a cap, not really knowing themselves exactly how much time this may require.

But I can tell you that the fees for the other experts involved, not just for the Library District, but for all of our partners, the community development entities that are also participating in the program are also unknown. They have estimates but as Trustee Benavidez has pointed out those experts and consultants and attorneys are all going to be paid from proceeds from the New Markets transaction.

But again, like none of the parties can really exactly estimate what those fees are going to be and that's exactly why the net benefit, the amount that would be -- yield a return on this investment is unknown. We expect it to be 15 percent, but it could be up to 20 percent depending on costs. It's the cost of all these experts that determines how much of a return that the District and our partners receive.

And I can tell you that all of our other partners have



charged reasonable, you know, fees, you know, compared to the industry. I would expect based on the reputation of Ballard Spahr and how they come highly recommended from our peers that, you know, we could rely on a reasonable fee there based on the work that's performed and that the return on this work is going to be a total of \$7.5 million.

And that's where, you know, we feel -- or the entire -- all of the entities involved has been comfortable with the amount of fees that all of our service providers have been working and providing to all the different entities.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And the agreement with this firm, there is no dollar amount in that agreement, right?

MR. CABIAS: I'm sorry. Can you repeat that?

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: There is no up to dollar amount like we're talking about; it's just more so just whatever the billable hours would be for their time.

MR. CABIAS: Yes. It will be a matter of the number of hours that the firm puts in, in completing this work.

TRUSTEE FOYT: I'd like to see us follow Attorney Welts's recommendation. I think he was accurate in his estimation and capping, but we don't want to lose this company.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Well, yeah, I think we're locked in, so we have to use them given the limited pool of experts.

TRUSTEE FOYT: Right.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: So I think the cost is going to be

the cost. So -- it appears to me. So I'm not -- I'm at a loss in terms of how do we sort of tweak the motion to put a number there. So I'm certainly receptive to some suggestions from the Board or Counselman Welt.

MR. VINO: As a clarification that may help under purchasing agreements, it's capped at 50 for professional fees, so there is a cap. Anything over 50 would have to come back to the Board.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Okay.

MR. VINO: So there is automatically a cap under purchasing for professional fees. So if it approaches it, you'd be automatically required to bring it back.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Thank you for that reminder. I actually do remember that we did have a cap on it. That's why that's why I was -- because it's not noted on here. I would be okay with that as long as it's noted on the motion then. So cap it at 50 to follow our criteria.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Maybe it's not a cap, but it just will require them to come back --

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Back, right.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: I mean, because I think naturally within the current procurement guidelines, it has to come back to the Board anyway to be approved, to be an allocation greater than 50.

TRUSTEE FOYT: That's correct.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Right.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: So they would have to --

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So it would have been --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: -- return.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: -- capped at 50 anyway.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Right. So we don't have to state it  
in the motion.

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: That's fine.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay. All right. Well, let's start  
over. You want to read the motion?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: Again? Can I just --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: I'll read it. Let me --

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: I move to --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: -- just to make sure we're okay. Do  
we have a motion to authorize staff to execute an agreement with  
Ballard Spahr LLP to provide legal services in connection with  
financing transactions under the NMTC and NMJA programs for the  
West Las Vegas Library Project subject to final review of  
engagement letter by General Counsel.

COUNSEL WELT: And we'll put that in the engagement  
letter.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Thank you, Counselman Welt.

Do we have a motion?

TRUSTEE BENAVIDEZ: So moved.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do I have a second?

TRUSTEE FOYT: Second.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All right. Any further questions or.

[No heard response.]

All right. All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Any opposed?

[No heard response.]

All right. Motion carries.

MR. CABIAS: All right. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay. Now we go to announcements. We have our December Board meeting will be held on Thursday, December 12, 2024, at 5:00 p.m. at the West Las Vegas Library.

We have our January Board meeting scheduled for Thursday, January 16th.

We have our February Board meeting scheduled for Thursday, February 13th.

So those are the Chair announcements. Do we have any other announcements from the Board?

[No heard response.]

All right. We'll transition to Agenda Item No. XI. Eboni, do we have anyone signed up for public comment?

MS. NANCE: Daniel B. Please remember to state your full name and address for the record.

MR. BRAISTED: Mr. Director, Mr. Vice Chairman and the

Board, my name is Daniel Braisted, B-R-A-I-S-T-E-D. I'm a resident of Las Vegas since 1982. I just got back from a high-end business meeting in Scottsdale and a number of the businesses, they were paying fees to learn what to do and many of the steps that they were learning are in popular books. One of the best business books out there if you've ever checked it is called E-Myth and I can give you a recap of it, but I only have three minutes.

So I think there's a void in the community to help small businesses. Yes, you have the Chamber that has 700 members and yet you have 50,000 businesses. And yes, we have about 22 different chambers, but they all come in -- their meal fees are 40, 50, 60, 80 bucks. And I think what we need is a basic library that has a small room -- I was glad I came tonight to learn the new fees and understand them.

But we have all sorts of programs for children and art, and I don't -- am not aware of seeing anything in libraries talking about the four quadrants; E-Myth. The Seven Habits of Highly Effective -- these are books that are already out there. They have videos on the Internet and I'm going to try to explore some way that the libraries could pick it up.

What I really would like is if a library would become a Chamber of Commerce for your District; that it would set up a way to contact those individuals who are members of your -- of the Library in your District and say how many of you want emails about business or self development? Because when I signed up for a

library card, all it was, was, what's your name, rank and where do you live? There wasn't any what are you interested in?

And I think that I don't quite know how to go forward with it because I need to deal with bureaucracies. But even a small meeting on some of these books to explain it. E-Myth is -- I'm looking for my time. Okay.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: You're at about two minutes and 30 seconds.

MR. BRAISTED: Okay. Well, let me go over quickly the reason for the book E-Myth. What happens is the people they're working for their best friend or somebody as a car mechanic, and they're making a good living but then they see the invoice that the boss puts out for doing their work, and it's five times what they're getting paid and they go, Gee, I'm going to go set up my own business.

Well, here you have a practitioner setting up a business, and he or she doesn't understand pricing, doesn't understand all of that stuff. And one of the --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Time.

MR. BRAISTED: What's that?

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: It's time.

MR. BRAISTED: Okay.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Eboni, any other sign up for public comment?

MS. NANCE: Brenda Talley. Please state your name and

address for the record.

MS. TALLEY: Brenda Talley, 326 Echo Road, Mount Charleston.

After seeing that report that indicated that Lundy was severely damaged, I just had to get up again and I would like to ask has CCSD provided you with any official report from a structural engineer other than Wright Engineers that they hired and have indicated the school is safe to occupy? It is not your responsibility to provide a school, but two classrooms isn't even a school.

As a former Nevada State PTA President and National PTA Board member, I have been advocating for over 40 years for the safety, health and welfare, the equitable and equal education for all children. By not denying this proposal, you in essence are promoting the educational inequity of our students. What the District is proposing isn't just irresponsible, it's just not fair. By postponing your decision, it only further delays getting our kids back to school on the mountain.

The CCSD Minutes from the meeting where the motion to not repair in that presentation and all other meetings regarding Lundy, they never ever stated it was beyond repair. It was only the storage room foundation on the south -- or the northeast corner that was undercut the foundation by the flood and that has been repaired. The septic system, relocating the propane, and replacing an HVAC unit that washed away are the main items needing repair.

I implore this Board to reconsider to delay your decision.

The District already committed -- if the CCSD Trustees chose the school -- if they had chose to repair the school at that August meeting, they showed they had the funding and where it would come from. They never said it was beyond repair; they said how they could repair it. By not accepting the proposal, the school District has indicated it would have to reconsider their original motion to repair and open the school. CCSD has already delayed a year.

We need our school and our community center. It's the heart of our community. We need it repaired. We need our kids back on the mountain and in their own classrooms where their backpacks, their water bottles are still on their desk, their jackets are still hung on the coat closet, and they haven't even been permitted to go back in, in a building that has been deemed safe to occupy, to get their own items.

Please reconsider. The longer you delay making a decision, it's just longer that we get our chance to have it reconsidered and those kids back in school. And one other thing, in that meeting they indicated it will be cheaper to repair the school, and the kids will get back to class sooner -- a year sooner than if they do the Library proposal. It will be a further delay. Thank you.

MS. NANCE: Chris G. And please state your full name and address for the record.

MS. GIUNCHIGLIANI: Hello again. Chris Giunchigliani, 1717 S 15th Street, Las Vegas, Nevada 89104.



I neglected to ask that Brenda's and my comments and Joy's be added into your record. That's unusual as a public -- it's automatically -- all public comment is included in the Minutes for public record, but for some reason you guys have that as a policy, so I'm asking to make sure that our comments are entered. In addition to that, it would be good to have the backup materials, especially the -- that were provided to here to be at the table to -- available to the public.

CCSD has not agendaized this discussion that you had tonight on their agenda. They're meeting as we speak. Our new Trustee just texted me when I said, did you know about this, she said no and it's not on the agenda. So they have not even had a conversation, let alone you all be asked to have a conversation.

There's no need for a partnership. Thank you very much again. But we don't want our school added to a library. We want our school opened. Our new Trustee, and -- that's just been appointed, as well as a new one that will go online in January are going to be asking for motions to reconsider. So the school has never been closed, they just won't open it. So we don't want you to give a mixed message to the District. It's very clear, we don't want a school, with no disrespect added on to a library because it's not a real school.

Our school is available, and we need to focus on -- as community people on that. In fact, do not spend any more staff time and meetings should -- any meeting should include Nakia

Jackson-Hale, who's our current Trustee or Lydia Dominguez, who will become the new Trustee. So if anybody has a conversation, they need to be the ones because they're the -- it's their Districts, not staff pulling the strings on that part of it. CCSD has two to three -- 2.3 acres that they could build something else on if they decided that they don't want to open their school. They don't need to add it onto your library property.

I guess you've all read the press receipts and everything else that's gone on. The frustration we have is it sends mixed messages which makes it harder for us to go back and have to argue with them about why the facility should be reopened. They got the insurance money; they took it and they have not spent it to repair and so that's going to be part of our argument with the new Trustees that are coming in is you got the money. And their own insurance company told them if you found more information that was needed, come back to us and reapply. They have not done that.

We had firefighters and Metro and First Responders using that facility for eight months until they evicted them in May. That school was being used, again, by Metro, by Fire Service, by Nevada Highway Patrol for their training on the upstairs floor for eight months after the flooding, yet they would not open it, and they said this building isn't safe. If it was unsafe, then why were our First Responders in it?

So we're still having our argument. Thank you for your

comments tonight. Thank you, Ms. Benavidez, for understanding. We just don't want you to be pitted against us as we're fighting as the community to make sure that our schools reopen. And so that's part of why we're here tonight.

And then thank you on the venues. Having been in politics for almost 30 years, I always appreciate staff, but the community and the stakeholders --

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: We're at time.

MS. TALLEY: -- and the stakeholders should be involved. So thank you for doing that as well. Thank you.

MS. NANCE: Lance Earl.

MR. EARL: Hi. Lance Earl, 8333 Granite Mountain Lane, Las Vegas, Nevada 89129.

I just want to thank the Board for the consideration in allowing the community involvement. I look forward to working with Mr. McNally and trying to identify and how we can collaborate on the venue use fees, but I appreciate your consideration and acknowledgement of some of the concerns. I know these are difficult decisions to make.

Ms. Benavidez, I'm glad you're still there on a legacy. Apparently legacy, reminding -- remembering some of the things that were done years ago. I didn't realize it was that long. But I thank you for your time and how long you've been here. I know you -- it's a long night but I appreciate it.

MS. NANCE: Caitlin Shea.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: And before you start, Eboni, how many more do we have signed up?

MS. NANCE: She's the last one.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Okay. I was saying we sort of exceeded our 45-minute allotment from -- for public comment. So I just wanted to see if we needed to make an adjustment there,

MS. SHEA: Okay.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Thank you.

MS. SHEA: I'll keep it brief then. Caitlin Shea, 7524 Enchanted Hills Court in Las Vegas, Nevada.

I just wanted to echo Lance's thanks. You know, we are super open to being a collaborative and great partner and continuing to work with Matt, Sherry and Ryan. I think it's just really all about the sitting down and getting some clarity and not having these things be surprises and we look forward to the round table, we look forward to continued partnership with the Summerlin Library and thank you all so much for your time.

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: That concludes with our last Agenda Item XII, which is adjournment. Do we have a motion?

[No heard response.]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: Do we have a second?

[No heard response.]

VICE CHAIR ROGERS: All those in favor say aye.

[ALL BOARD MEMBERS WERE IN AGREEMENT]

TRUSTEE ROGERS: All right, we are officially adjourned.

Thank you, everyone.

[Meeting concluded at 8:11 p.m.]

\* \* \* Total Meeting Run Time – 3 hours and 23 minutes\* \* \*

ATTEST: I do hereby certify that I have truly and correctly transcribed the audio/video proceedings in the above-entitled meeting to the best of my ability.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Britt Mangelson". The signature is written in a cursive style with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Brittany Mangelson  
Mangelson Transcribing

# 2024 ATTENDANCE

2024		January 11 Regular Board Mtg	February 12 Finance and Audit Comm. Mtg	February 15 Regular Board Mtg	February 28 Special Board Mtg	March 11 Naming Committee Mtg.	March 14 Regular Board Mtg	April Finance and Audit Comm. Mtg	April 11 Regular Board Mtg	May 6 Special Board Mtg	May 23 Regular Board Mtg	June 13 Nominations Comm. Mtg	June 13 Risk Management Comm. Mtg	June 13 Regular Board Mtg	July 11 Regular Board Mtg	AUGUST	September Finance and Audit Comm Mtg	September 12 Regular Board Mtg	September 24 Special Board Mtg	October 10 Regular Board Mtg	November 13 Finance and Audit Comm. Mtg	November 14 Regular Board Mtg	December 12 Regular Board Mtg
Waugh	Nathaniel	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	A-E
Rogers	Keith	A	P	A-E	A-E	P	P	P	P	P	A-E	P		P	P		A	P	A-E	A-E	P	P	
Jiron	Jennifer	P	P	P	P		A-E		P	P	P	P	P	P	P		A	A-E	P	P			P
Turner Whiteley	Kate	P	P	P	P		A-E	P	P	P	P	P		P	A-E		A	P	P	P	P		A-E
Foyt	Elizabeth	A-E		P	P		P	A	P	P	P	P	P	P	P		A	P	P	P	P		P
Ortiz (Term Ended 7/11/24)	Felipe	P		P	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P								
Benavidez	Kelly	A-E	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P			A-E	A-E		P	P	A-E	P	P	P	P
Sanchez	Elaine	P		P	P		P		P	A-E	P	P	P	P	A		P	P	P	P	P		A-E
Dutkowski	Karen	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	P		P	P	P	P			P
White (Term Began 7/16/24)	Claytee																	P	P	A	P		P
Jimenez (Term Began 8/7/24)	Aranzazu																	P	P	A			A-E
Shelton (Term Ended 4/9/24)	Chris	P		P	A-E	P	P		P														

P	Present
A-E	Excused Absence
A-U	Unexcused Absence
	Attended Committee meeting but not a member
X	Term Ended/ New