

VIDEOCONFERENCE

**SPECIAL MEETING  
BOARD OF REGENTS  
UNIVERSITY AND COMMUNITY COLLEGE SYSTEM OF NEVADA**  
Sites: System Administration-Las Vegas

5550 West Flamingo Road Suite C-1 Conference Room  
System Administration-Reno  
2601 Enterprise Road Conference Room

Monday, June 28, 2004

Members Present: Mr. Mark Alden

Ms. Marcia Bandera  
Dr. Jill Derby  
Mrs. Thalia Dondero  
Mr. Douglas Roman Hill  
Mrs. Linda Howard  
Dr. Tom Kirkpatrick  
Dr. Jack Lund Schofield  
Mr. Douglas Seastrand  
Mr. Steve Sisolak  
Mr. Bret Whipple

Members Absent: Dr. Stavros Anthony, Chair  
Mr. Howard Rosenberg

Others Present: Interim Chancellor Jim Rogers

Assistant Chancellor Trudy Larson  
Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration Buster Neel  
Vice Chancellor, Academic & Student Affairs Richard Curry  
General Counsel Tom Ray  
Vice President Theo Byrns, CCSN  
President Stephen Wells, DRI  
Interim President Pat Miltenberger, NSC  
President Philip Ringle, TMCC  
President Carol Harter, UNLV  
Provost John Frederick, UNR  
Assistant to the President, Mike Hardie, WNCC  
Chief Administrative Officer Suzanne Ernst

Also present were Vice President, Finance & Administration-CCSN, Ms. Patty Charlton; Vice President, Academic Affairs-NSC, Dr. Lois Becker; Vice President, Finance & Administration-TMCC, Dr. Delores Sanford; Vice President, Administration-UNLV, Dr. Juanita Fain; faculty senate chairs Ms. Bridgett Boulton, TMCC; Dr. Jane McCarthy, UNLV; and Dr. Leah Wilds, UNR. Student government leaders present included Mr. Erin Lankowsky, UNR, and Ms. Jessica Muehlberg, UNR-GSA. System Administration representatives included: Mr. John Amend, Mr. Larry Eardley, Mrs. Carla Henson, Mrs. Becky Seibert, and Mrs. Ginny Wiswell.

Dr. Derby called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. with all members present except Regents Anthony, Howard,

and Rosenberg.

Regent Sisolak noted a point of order.

Regent Howard entered the meeting.

Regent Sisolak asked whether the meeting was being conducted from Elko(*Nevada*), adding that it was not posted in Elko. Ms. Ernst replied it was not. General Counsel Ray said he did not know from where Regent Bandera was calling. Ms. Ernst clarified that Regent Bandera was in Denver, Colorado.

General Counsel Ray stated that the law only requires that the location (*where the public may attend*) be posted and published on the notice. He said the Open Meeting Law does not prohibit any Board member from calling in as long as the members of the public can hear the proceedings.

Regent Sisolak clarified that his question was whether or not the meeting had a location in Elko. He established there was not an Elko connection. Regent Derby clarified there was no Elko connection and that Regent Bandera was participating from Colorado.

General Counsel Ray clarified that, so long as the agenda provided notice of where the public may attend, a member of the body can phone in as long as the public can hear that member's vote.

1. Approved-Men's Head Basketball Coach Employment Contract, UNR – The Board approved President John M. Lilley's request to offer Mr. Mark Fox, Men's Head Basketball Coach, a new multi-year employment contract. Terms and conditions of the contract were presented at the meeting.

Regent Alden moved approval of the UNR men's head basketball coach employment contract. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked about the automobile insurance (*Section 5.04, line 3*). He recalled that this was the second time the Board would be doing this (*providing liability and comprehensive coverage*). He said the first time was when they hired UNR's athletic director. He said that President Lilley had claimed it was an unusual situation and would not be happening all of the time. He believed that none of the presidents get liability or comprehensive coverage on their automobile, nor do any of the other coaches. He said he objected if they were paying it to one new coach when all of the others did not receive the same. He thought that this was the first request for a coach, and that the previous request had been the first for an athletic director.

Athletic Director-UNR, Ms. Cary Groth, replied that former Athletic Director Chris Ault had automobile insurance and all UNR coaches with a car in their contract also have the same type of coverage. Regent Sisolak said that was not what President Lilley had claimed. He asked whether she recalled the Board's discussion of her contract. Ms. Groth said she did not recall President Lilley saying that. She said that it was common

1. Approved-Men's Head Basketball Coach Employment Contract, UNR –(*Cont'd.*)

practice in their department. She said that it was typical when providing courtesy cars to also provide the appropriate insurance.

President Harter reported that in UNLV's case the car dealer provides the insurance because the entire group of cars provided to the athletics staff is provided through a car dealership.

Regent Sisolak said he was O.K. if every other coach had it, but he recalled specifically discussing this item with President Lilley with the UNR athletic director's contract. Regent Sisolak asked what happened if someone had a terrible driving record or added their children to the policy. Provost Frederick observed that Coach Fox's children were approximately twelve years too young to drive. Ms. Groth clarified that it would only cover the employee. She said the policy was provided through one of their donors. UNR pays a premium that covers all coaches with courtesy cars who are not covered by the dealership. She related that UNR had a few cars that were covered by the dealership. The majority of the staff that are provided cars are covered by this insurance policy.

Regent Sisolak asked Ms. Ernst to review the minutes to see what President Lilley said and report back to him.

Regent Sisolak then discussed the reporting line between the coach and Ms. Groth's assistant in her absence. He said that Coach Fox's wife is Ms. Groth's assistant. Ms. Groth replied that Mrs. Cindy Fox and Mr. John Nunn are UNR's Associate Athletic Directors. Mr. Nunn will supervise men's basketball in her absence. Regent Sisolak asked about when Mr. Nunn might be absent. Ms. Groth replied she had not explored the chain of command that far. Regent Sisolak said that he had a problem with the (*reporting*) line. Ms. Groth said that UNR had been very clear with Mrs. Fox and had provided a copy of the Regents' policy. In no instance can Mrs. Fox supervise or have a reporting line to basketball.

General Counsel Ray clarified that Board policies allow for exceptions under these circumstances. It requires presidential approval and written documentation for exactly how the reporting lines will exist to avoid any potential conflict. Regent Sisolak asked whether that information was included in the backup material. Ms. Groth said they had not done that, adding that she would work with Human Resources to prepare that documentation.

Chancellor Rogers said that he had a great fear of any sort of nepotism. He asked to review the final product. Ms. Groth agreed to do so.

Regent Derby clarified that a document was required that would spell out what the reporting lines would be in the case of the absence of the athletic director and the associate athletic director.

Regent Alden said he would accept an amendment to his motion.

1. Approved-Men's Head Basketball Coach Employment Contract, UNR –(*Cont'd.*)

Regent Alden moved approval of the UNR men's head basketball coach employment contract consistent with the Chancellor's statement on oversight that a modification to the reporting line would be in writing and that there would be no nepotism of any sort.

Regent Hill noted a point of order, observing that the Board has an existing policy. His understanding was that the policy was not being violated. There is no nepotism. He noted that the wife was not involved in the hiring process, the athletic director was. The athletic director has provided that Mr. Nunn will supervise men's basketball in her absence. He did not object to providing further clarification of the reporting lines if both the athletic director and Mr. Nunn were gone. He did not feel there was a need to modify the motion. He also did not object to providing the reporting lines to the chancellor and Board members.

Regent Alden said he would do whatever was necessary to expedite the meeting and the Board's business. He asked whether the motion needed to be modified.

Regent Derby noted that counsel had reminded the Board about their policy, which provides that some written document layout the reporting lines in the absence of the athletic director and the associate athletic director. She said that would be forthcoming from UNR.

Regent Sisolak offered a friendly amendment that when the document is prepared it be given to the chancellor before the Board signs off. He said if they could hold off and give the chancellor the authority to sign off on the contract once that document reporting line is provided to the chancellor's satisfaction in written form. He suggested that approval of the contract be contingent upon UNR complying with Board policy and providing a written document stating what the reporting lines would be in all instances, whether some individual is out or not, and the chancellor be given the authority to sign off on the contract if that is in compliance and he is in agreement.

Regent Hill noted a point of order, stating he did not recall that this was part of Board policy. He asked legal counsel whether the requirement for passing a contract included provision of the reporting line. General Counsel Ray replied that the policy was adopted in January 2004. Regent Hill asked whether it required the reporting

lines. General Counsel Ray explained that exceptions to the policy must have the prior, written approval of the employing authority along with a written agreement detailing the manner in which conflicts of interest will be ameliorated.

1. Approved-Men's Head Basketball Coach Employment Contract, UNR –(Cont'd.)

Regents Alden and Kirkpatrick agreed to the friendly amendment.

Regent Howard asked who was considered the appointing authority. General Counsel Ray replied that, in this case, it would be the president. Regent Howard asked whether the president would make the recommendation through the chancellor. General Counsel Ray replied they would not. The president is the appointing authority. Due to the length of the contract, Board ratification is required. Regent Howard asked whether it should be passed through the recommendation of the chancellor. General Counsel Ray replied it should not.

Regent Kirkpatrick said that the Board was requiring that with this motion.

Regent Derby clarified that the motion entailed UNR putting forward the written document laying out how the chain of authority would be handled in the absence of the athletic director and the associate athletic director. When that document is prepared it would come forward for approval by the chancellor. The Board would waive its authority to approve and assign that to the chancellor. She clarified that the motion was that the Board would approve the request subject to that coming forward to the chancellor. Regent Sisolak agreed, adding that he would need that to accept it.

Regent Howard asked if that was the normal process or the process used in only this instance. Regent Derby replied that it was in this particular instance. She said the document should have been provided in the materials. Regent Howard asked whether the normal process was for the contract/document to be given to the chancellor to be recommended for passage by the Board or whether it would go directly to the Board without the chancellor's involvement. Counsel Ray replied that the normal course would be for the president to do it as appointing authority of the coaches. Due to the length of the contract and it being a new hire, the Board must ratify the contract. That would not go through the chancellor. However, the chancellor could certainly offer an opinion. It would go from the president to the Board of Regents for approval. Because the written document showing the chain of command and supervision was not included, the motion entails the Board approving it subject to the chancellor's acceptance of that document. Ordinarily that would have been part of the package that went to the Board.

Regent Howard said she was clear, but did not understand why the Board did not have the same rules that they follow. She asked why they kept changing the rules every time there was a different type of contract.

Regent Sisolak said they could table the matter.

Regent Derby said that this part of the Code was just approved in January. She said it was the first time that this had come forward. Regent Howard felt that things should go through the chancellor. Chancellor Rogers said that the problem was that the document was not available and they wanted to pass the item. Regent Howard said that the document should have come to the chancellor prior to it coming before the Board.

1. Approved-Men's Head Basketball Coach Employment Contract, UNR –(Cont'd.)

Regent Kirkpatrick clarified that all other hires will be in accordance with the policy that the general counsel read regardless of for whom they work.

Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Rosenberg were absent.

2. Approved-Appointment, Interim President, NSC – The Board approved Interim Chancellor Jim Rogers' recommendation for the appointment of Dr. Pat Miltenberger as Interim President for Nevada State College, including salary and other contract conditions (Ref. A on file in the Board office).

Regent Kirkpatrick moved approval of the appointment of Dr. Pat Miltenberger as Interim President for Nevada State College with the salary and contract conditions as presented. Regent Sisolak seconded.

Regent Alden said that he had known Dr. Miltenberger and her family for approximately 40 years. He was honored that she stepped forward to take the interim position. He understood that she was not interested in the permanent position. If approved by the Board, he thanked her for stepping forward.

Regent Bandera echoed Regent Alden's comments. She has known Dr. Miltenberger since 1969. She felt that Dr. Miltenberger is extremely well qualified for this position. She appreciated her stepping forward on an interim basis.

Chancellor Rogers stated that he had 4-5 very lengthy conversations with Dr. Miltenberger. He said he had several conversations with people who support her. Based upon the System's needs in the immediate future, he felt there was no one else close to her qualifications. He said the chancellor's office supported the recommendation. He explained that the recommendation was for 90% of the normal presidential salary, plus 100% of hosting, automobile, and housing. That will be prorated based upon her stay.

Regent Sisolak asked whether she would receive car insurance. Chancellor Rogers replied she would not. The \$8,000 car allowance includes car insurance.

Regent Dondero asked when Dr. Miltenberger would be present on campus. Dr. Miltenberger replied that she would be available July 1<sup>st</sup>. Regent Dondero asked whether Dr. Miltenberger would move to Las Vegas full time. Dr. Miltenberger replied that she would.

Regent Seastrand asked whether UNR would fill the position that Dr. Miltenberger would be vacating and whether it would be available upon her return. Dr. Miltenberger replied that she was retired and had been teaching graduate classes on a Letter of Appointment. She will continue to teach one graduate class on the weekend. The other classes have been covered. She will contact her advisees via e-mail.

## 2. Approved-Appointment, Interim President, NSC – (Cont'd.)

Regent Sisolak requested clarification, asking whether a problem was created with Dr. Miltenberger being paid by two different institutions. Chancellor Rogers replied that it had been worked out.

Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Rosenberg were absent.

3. Approved-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – The Board finalized and approved a prioritized list of 2005-07 capital improvement projects requested by the UCCSN institutions to be forwarded to the State Public Works Board for its review and recommendation to the governor. Discussion included proposals for seeking alternate funding sources for UCCSN capital projects, including but not limited to an increased property tax and a public bonding initiative. Interim Chancellor Rogers brought additional recommendations to the meeting (Ref. B on file in the Board office).

Regent Sisolak moved approval of the prioritized 2005-2007 capital project requests. Regent Seastrand seconded.

Chancellor Rogers said that, following Regent Kirkpatrick's request to review the list, he reviewed the projects with everyone, prepared his own list which he shared with the presidents. The basic problem is that there is not enough money. As the list has been prioritized, they have assumed that they might receive approximately \$122-125 million or as low as \$100 million. In his memo he explained that he wanted to get the DRI CAVE facility in the first \$100 million. A supplemental memo informed Board members that the \$7-9 million extra that they expected from the federal government would come through. The memo also discussed the problem with projects beyond #10 (*Pahrump Education Complex*). He has discussed item #11 (*\$30 million for CCSN*) with the president to explore dividing it into two \$15 million phases. Other funding sources will be considered. He said that he felt comfortable with the list and thought that the presidents did as well. He said he had tried to consider everyone's

needs, adding that it was very difficult to be fair when there is not enough money. He said that a lot of time had been spent on it.

Regent Alden commended the chancellor, the presidents, and Vice Chancellor, Finance & Administration-UCCSN, Mr. Buster Neel. He said this was the first time that capital priorities had been broken out in sections with delineated reasons. He highly recommended that the same thing be done with the enhancements in August. He thanked staff for the work in preparing the document.

Regent Kirkpatrick said that he wanted to support the motion but could not. He commended the chancellor for his efforts under these circumstances. He said the budget demonstrated to the Board that they must begin to look at other ways to fund capital improvement projects. He felt they should start looking at that now for the next biennium. He was concerned and surprised that one-third of the budget was devoted to FF&E. He said he recognized the importance of item #5 (*NSC Liberal Arts Building*), but

### 3. Approved-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

could not support it because when the Board approved NSC it did so under the condition that \$10 million would be raised for the building. The money has not been raised. He hoped the Board would recognize that taking \$10 million for that building was taking \$10 million from another institution. He said that Henderson individuals promised the money which never materialized. He said the Board would never have built a college in that location if the promise for the building had not been made. It would have been located instead in an area more convenient to the majority of the citizens.

Regent Kirkpatrick recalled several past projects (*Fire Science Academy, Redfield Campus, Dental School*) where the Board had been asked to approve something only later to find out that information provided at the time of approval was not correct. He discussed item #7 (*CCSN Automotive Tech*). He said he first heard about this program at the last meeting, which surprised him because the Board normally hears about these things before then. He said that the real need at the community college was not an automotive tech building, but rather, another classroom. He said he could not support this building at such a high priority level.

Regent Kirkpatrick then discussed item #9 (*\$1.5 million Academic Medical Center planning*). He was concerned that there was no other construction planning money requested in the budget. He felt that some funds should be provided to review future needs. He felt that the Academic Medical Center was an area that was least important overall to the delivery of academic programs.

Regarding item #10 (*Pahrump Facility*), Regent Kirkpatrick said that he loved the project, but questioned whether it should be that high of a priority given all of the other needs.

Regent Kirkpatrick said that he was most concerned about item #13 (*Health, Safety and Code Violations*), asking how the Board could continue to not fund those items and possibly endanger students' lives. He felt the priority had been repeatedly postponed and should be moved into the top ten. He said that he was all for the capital budget, but based upon those things, his obligation to the entire System, and his knowledge that CCSN needs a classroom building he could not support it. He apologized to the chancellor.

Chancellor Rogers stated that the \$1.5 million for the Academic Medical Center would only be put up at such time as the mayor has raised \$50 million (*not promised, but raised*). He did not know about the likelihood. It seemed to him that if the mayor could raise \$50 million that they ought to be able to put up \$1.5 million in a partial match.

Chancellor Rogers related that they had discussed whether there would be a problem with CCSN's automotive tech program with the System putting up its part and others not coming through with their portion. He said that they would include the project at this level for the \$5 million, but would not begin to make plans or put any money into architects or construction until they have a binding agreement from the automobile and diesel truck owners. The agreement would stipulate the amount of money to be put up under certain conditions. He felt that a similar agreement should have been created for Nevada State College. He recalled that the original program was for \$18 million. He

### 3. Approved-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (Cont'd.)

asked CCSN whether the program could be developed in stages. UCCSN will provide \$5 million if the car dealers will provide \$2.5 million. The second \$5 million will only be provided if an additional \$2.5 million is provided. A third \$5 million will be provided if an additional \$2.5 million is provided. He said they would all be binding contracts and that the Board would be protected.

Chancellor Rogers said that he knew how Board members felt about NSC, adding that they were either duped or that hope had exceeded realism. He did not agree that providing the \$10 million was taking money away from another institution. He said they had to develop both UNR and UNLV as first class universities. The only way they can accomplish this is to cap enrollments by continuing to raise the entrance requirements at those institutions. In order to continue to raise those entrance requirements they will need NSC to supplement the universities' efforts. He said it was more economical to run a state college than it is to run a research university. He felt the \$10 million would be better spent in support of NSC than at either of the two universities. He felt that they needed to conclude that they were done in, but they should not punish the students because someone else misled the Board. He said the chancellor's office really supports NSC because they feel that to do otherwise would not be supportive of UNR or UNLV.

Regent Kirkpatrick said that he had discussed this matter with the chancellor. He felt that a state college is essential throughout the state, not just at Railroad Pass. He said he wanted one in Centennial Hills so individuals in this valley will have the opportunity to go to a state college if they so desire. He questioned how students would access NSC without providing their own transportation. Chancellor Rogers observed that in a recently received report it was suggested that five additional state colleges be developed over the coming years. He said it could be argued that the first state college had not been appropriately located, but had instead been located there based on the persuasion of money being available. He felt that in the future they needed to ensure they have the money in the bank before proceeding. He said that the future welfare of both universities was dependent upon a state college system. One of the things that he has looked at is that there are many who have a substantial financial investment in the System. He said that his family was obligated to \$29 million and was considering raising it to \$54 million. He wanted to ensure that his money goes into something that is very efficient and has a great future. He believed that it would be much more difficult to sell the private/public partnerships without NSC. He felt it would be more difficult to convince people to invest in the future without the ability to restrict admissions to some extent to both universities. For someone willing to put up a lot of money to see the System continue to grow, he felt it was essential to ensure that something like NSC supports the universities. Regent Kirkpatrick observed that the RAND study indicated the need to develop state colleges.

Regent Sisolak discussed item #11 (*Learning Center/Classroom Building*). It was his understanding that an arrangement had been made with Thomas & Mack Company for a lease/buy-back on the building. Vice Chancellor Neel explained that there had been meetings with this group and that the possibility had been considered. He said that, conceptually, it was something for the System to consider. In this particular instance there was not a revenue stream that would allow it to happen. He said that it might occur

### 3. Approved-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (Cont'd.)

at some point once other options have been reviewed. Regent Sisolak thought that the revenue stream would be provided by the increased enrollments. Vice Chancellor Neel replied that it was not sufficient. Chancellor Rogers said that the chancellor's office was well aware of that income stream and how lacking it is. They have discussed trying to develop an income stream that would amortize the building construction cost. He said that it would be easier to do at \$15 million to start than at \$30 million. Regent Sisolak agreed, adding that they need to be more creative in looking at ways to finance some of the building and capital improvements.

Regent Sisolak stated that item #9 (*Academic Medical Center*) was likely the most important to the citizens in Clark County and the state. He said it might not provide classroom space or automotive tech facilities, but would provide medical research that could save lives in the long term. He felt that if UCCSN was going to have a first class medical school, the Academic Medical Center was necessary for the state of Nevada. His concern was that he requires a commitment from UNR to be involved and assist in the fundraising. He said that he needed a commitment from UNR that they would cooperate and assist in the effort as opposed to being an impediment.

He felt that it was important that they get a great deal of cooperation from UNR on this project because it was extremely important to all the citizens of Nevada. He said he knew how committed the City was to this project.

Regent Sisolak then discussed item #7 (*Automotive Tech*), stating that this was an example of what a community college does best. He said he knew they had made a commitment to this. He agreed with the chancellor that the commitment needed to be a bit more binding and that the dollars needed to be delineated. He said they had reduced it and were building in phases. He felt it was clearly needed for workforce development.

Regent Sisolak then discussed item #5 (*Nevada State College*). He recalled sitting at a meeting when an elected official promised \$50 million. He said that was why the project had been approved. He said it was a case of promises made and promises broken. He said that elected officials had promised to bring the money from Henderson and UCCSN did not receive any of it. He said it reflected poorly on the Board as well as on the college and students. He recalled that the promise had been made at a Board of Regents meeting and not at a cocktail party. He said he was really disappointed. By doing this, he did not want to let those individuals off the hook. He said he wanted them to still try to raise that money. He was concerned that they did not try. He was unsure if there was a means for getting some answers. He said that the promises were clearly broken. He was unsure whether there would be legislative support for that item. He said that he hoped UCCSN would do something for those students. He said the site was selected because of the commitments and promises that were made. He said the Board had taken the promises at face value. He said he appreciated the work that had been put into the list, as well as the flexibility, cooperation, and compromise necessary to develop the list. He said he could support it as it stands. He felt the Board should do more in terms of looking at their options to finance the buildings.

### 3. Approved-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

Chancellor Rogers said that raising money for colleges and universities appeared to be a simple thing. However, if there is no long term plan regarding for which projects money is being raised and how the naming opportunities are handled, etc., it can create a problem. Seven-eight months ago, before he considered being chancellor, he went to breakfast with President Romesburg and Mr. Bill Martin. He explained that he had stopped his participation with NSC's Foundation because he felt that they could not raise seed money for a college or university. They asked the chancellor whether he had a plan that could help them. They had an individual who had offered to provide \$2-3 million for a building under the condition that the building be named for them. Chancellor Rogers said that he told them not to do it because accepting \$3 million on a \$23 million project would limit the contribution for future naming opportunities. He felt they need to take a long-range perspective. He felt that accepting a smaller figure for a naming opportunity would limit their ability to receive more in the future. He believed that the problem at UNLV had been repaired. He said it was not that they didn't try, but that the entire picture needed to be considered. He thought that once the NSC building was built that the people who made the promises should have a lot of heat put on them. The Board should tell them that they picked up their load and that they should be raising the funds for the next building. He said they would not do anything for the next building until a written agreement was received with the required funding. He said they were all learning. He did not believe this would have occurred if they had used a professional fundraiser.

Regent Schofield discussed the CCSN Automotive Tech program. He related that the automobile dealers had passionately pleaded that they need this program desperately because they are sending their employees out of town for training. They all agreed that they would support it, some financially to the degree that they could. Only one automotive dealer would not commit. He felt they had enough commitments from the automotive dealers and that it would be a good move because it was needed in the community.

Regent Schofield then discussed NSC. He recalled that when he approached the Henderson Chamber of Commerce while campaigning that they had passionately told him that they had the money. He said that now appeared that everyone was waffling. He believed that UCCSN has leverage and should pursue it. He felt the Board should remind the Henderson Chamber of Commerce of their prior pleas for NSC. He said the Board should go after the people who made the commitments and hold their feet to the fire.

Regent Howard felt that the Board had been duped by the Fire Science Academy and other projects. She felt that



the proposed UNLV project (*Bureau of Land Management land*) would be good for North Las Vegas. She felt that North Las Vegas required more than just CCSN's Cheyenne campus.

Regent Howard observed that the UNLV dental school was a project that had been forced upon the Board. She said that it had happened at every institution.

Regent Bandera said she understood passionate commitments, but noted there are projects with money in the bank. She wished the Board would consider those projects.

3. Approved-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

She did not agree with Regent Kirkpatrick's comment regarding Pahrump. Chancellor Rogers said that Pahrump was included.

Regent Howard said that while driving on Lucey Road in North Las Vegas, she noticed a Volvo plant advertising the need for auto mechanics. She felt that demonstrated there is a high need for the automotive technology program and that the workforce is in dire need of that training.

Regent Alden complimented Regent Schofield's comments about NSC.

Regent Sisolak asked about the money for DRI's CAVE project. He noted that \$14.4 million would be provided by the state and that \$3.4 million would come from outside. He asked where the \$10 million they were discussing would go to. President Wells replied there was \$3 million from one federal appropriation that is in the bank. There is another one that just came out in defense language for the infrastructure. He said that most of the money would be used for the infrastructure. Regent Sisolak said he did not understand. Regent Seastrand explained that the money here was to build the building. The \$10 million was to put the equipment inside the building. Regent Sisolak observed there would be no FF&E for that project in the following year. President Wells agreed.

Regent Hill said that he agreed with many of Regent Kirkpatrick's comments. He was concerned about the Math and Science building, noting that it started out at priority #5 and had since been moved to priority #12. He felt it would not be built based upon the low priority. He observed that they had committed to coming up with \$18 million, which was much more than many of the other projects combined, except for the Greenspun building. He said that UNR could not hire another professor because they do not have the lab space.

Regent Hill said he had some problem with the Automotive Tech program because he felt it should be below classrooms. He said that they had a building for which they received planning funds in the previous session that would not be built. He said the planning funds would be a waste by the time they approached another session. He said there were also health and safety concerns, adding there was no simple solution. He said he appreciated the difficulty of the job.

Regent Dondero said that she appreciated the work that had gone into classifying these projects. She noted that the property that has been gained for the buildings at NSC and Pahrump had been donated by the federal government. She said that she considered the growth in those areas. She approved the proposed list, adding that she felt they were headed in the right direction.

Regent Kirkpatrick said he appreciated the chancellor's efforts in prioritizing the list.

Regent Sisolak asked whether there was a deed restriction on the BLM land preventing a future sale of the property. Chancellor Rogers replied that they would check on that.

3. Approved-2005-2007 Capital Project Requests – (*Cont'd.*)

Regent Schofield thanked Regent Dondero for her efforts in getting the BLM property.

Motion carried. Regent Kirkpatrick voted no. Regents Anthony and Rosenberg were absent.

4. Approved-Resolution #04-17, Reynolds Foundation Grant, UNR – The Board approved Dr. Frederick request for the following resolution in support of a capital grant application to the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation for a new School of Arts Building (*Ref. C on file in the Board office*) .

“The Board of Regents of the University and Community College System of Nevada do hereby resolve that the University of Nevada, Reno Foundation’s request for the benefit of the School of Arts for a capital grant application to the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation conforms to the University’s strategic plan and facilities master plan. Be it further resolved that the governing board supports this capital grant application as prepared by the University of Nevada, Reno Foundation.”

Regent Alden moved approval of Resolution 04-17 in support of a capital grant application to the Donald W. Reynolds Foundation for a new School of Arts Building at UNR. Regent Kirkpatrick seconded.

Regent Sisolak asked whether this had been done previously and what the Board was approving. Dr. John Frederick, Executive Vice President and Provost-UNR, replied that the Board approved a similar resolution at the Elko meeting for TMCC. UNR is applying for money from the Reynolds Foundation. They have been assured that the two proposals would not compete with one another. If they are both found to be meritorious they will both be funded. This is a formality. President Wells explained that the Reynolds Foundation requires that the governing body approve a resolution when making such a request.

Motion carried. Regents Anthony and Rosenberg were absent.

5. Public Comment – None.

6. New Business – None.

The meeting adjourned at 5:11 p.m.

Suzanne Ernst  
Chief Administrative Officer to the Board