

Pahrump Community Library
Minutes of the October 13, 2025 Meeting

1. Call to Order

Meeting called to order at 10:04 a.m.

2. Members Roll Call

In Attendance: Secretary Kelly Green, Trustee Mathew Morris, Vice-Chair Michael Runion, Chair John Shewalter, Director Kimberly Thomas, Assistant Director Shanna Gibbons, and Michelle Nelson from the District Attorney's Office. Trustee Mounts was absent.

3. Pledge of Allegiance

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Trustee Green.

4. GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT: (*Action will NOT be taken on matters considered during this period until specifically included on an agenda as an action item.)

Chair Shewalter opens public comment.

There are no public comments.

Public comment is closed.

5. Trustee/Director/Liaison Comments – This item is limited to announcements, brief discussions of public comments, correction of factual inaccuracies, direction to staff, or topics proposed for future board meetings. (Lengthy deliberation of topics not on the agenda is prohibited by the Nevada Open Meeting Law.)

Michelle Nelson – No comment.

Director Thomas – No comment.

Trustee Green – She thanks Julie for the list of patrons' favorite adult and children's authors. She states she has been doing preliminary work on how to contact them for possible author visits and book signings. She also thanks Director Thomas for arranging a meeting with Great Basin College to discuss ways in which they can support their mission. She thanks the library staff for obtaining a book through interlibrary loan so her

mother could participate in an Ann Cleeves book club. She adds that last week at the Remote Area Medical (RAM) she attended a training on Narcan, and how to use it. She states that she learned there are many non-stereotypical situations that a person may need Narcan, not related to drug use, such as a person prescribed an opioid who accidentally takes too much, a parent with memory issues, or someone who accidentally grabs the wrong bottle out of the medicine cabinet. The training was quick, and at the end, she was given a free kit with doses to keep in her car, house, or place of work in case of an emergency. She also learned that Narcan does not interact with any other medication except opioids, so it will not harm if someone was given it accidentally. She adds that people are covered by the Good Samaritan Law if they choose to do this, and that the Nye Coalition may be contacted if there is any interest in participating. She also states that she keeps her kit in her car and was told to always call an ambulance first, even though it might be too late by the time they get there.

Trustee Morris – No comment.

Vice-Chair Runion – No comment.

Chair Shewalter – No comment.

6. Approval of October 13, 2025 Agenda (Non-action item)

Item 7 is struck as there are no emergency items.

Without objection, the October 13, 2025, agenda is approved.

7. For Possible Action: Emergency Items

There are no emergency items.

8. For Possible Action: Discussion and deliberation to approve or amend and approve the meeting minutes for September 8, 2025.

Vice-Chair Runion made a motion to approve the meeting minutes for September 8, 2025.

Trustee Green seconds.

Chair Shewalter opens public comment.

There are no public comments.

Public comment is closed.

Trustee Green – No comment.

Trustee Morris – No comment.

Vice-Chair Runion – No comment.

Chair Shewalter – No comment.

Chair Shewalter calls the question to approve the meeting minutes for September 8, 2025.

The measure passes 4-0 with one absent.

9. Presentation: Treasurer's Report by Kim Thomas for discussion of monthly expenditures and revenue for September 2025 through October 2025.

Director Thomas reviewed the monthly expenditures and revenue for September 2025, along with the General Fund Voucher, Capital Fund Voucher, Credit Card Breakdown, and Petty Cash Reimbursements.

Director Thomas – She states the Teen Zone sign was too heavy and that we will be sending the frame for the sign back.

Chair Shewalter – He asks if the Clover Flex is the old equipment.

Director Thomas – She states they are, and it is an old lease that we are still paying on.

Chair Shewalter – He asks how long it will go on.

Director Thomas – She states that she will need to check and that we are able to buy them out. She adds that she believes it is toward the end of the year, but we could buy them out now if we wanted to.

Chair Shewalter – He states that we bought the privacy screens, sent them back, and bought them again. He asks if we are using the privacy screens.

Director Thomas – She clarifies that we bought a different set to try out and that she was out of the library last week, so she is uncertain if they are working better.

Kraven Betancourt – He states that they were bought prior to Director Thomas leaving, and they were delivered while she was away. He adds that we tried them out and they are alright, but we wanted her to be able to check them out before we ordered more.

Chair Shewalter - He asks if that was the end of the report.

Director Thomas – She states, “Yes.”

10. Discussion and deliberation to approve or amend and approve payment vouchers for September 2025 through October 2025.

Chair Shewalter made a motion to approve the payment vouchers for September 2025 through October 2025.

Trustee Green seconds.

Chair Shewalter opens Public Comment.

There are no public comments.

There are no comments from the board.

Chair Shewalter calls the question.

The measure passes 4-0 with one absent.

11. Presentation: Librarian’s Report by Kimberly Thomas for discussion on library activity for September 2025 through October 2025. Report activities include staff activities and training, library project updates, patron traffic, books checked out, books returned, fees collected, online story time, STEAM, internet use, website usage and materials added.

Director Thomas states that she has additional backup.

Chair Shewalter confirms that Director Thomas has a report that is not in the backup.

Chair Shewalter makes a motion to approve adding additional backup.

Vice-Chair Runion seconds.

Chair Shewalter opens public comment.

There are no public comments.

There are no comments from the board.

The measure passes 4-0 with one absent.

Chair Shewalter asks for copies.

Director Thomas states she has copies.

Michelle Nelson – She asks Director Thomas if she has copies for the public.

Director Thomas states she has 14 copies of one page.

Michelle Nelson – She requests that there should be a short break so that the public has time to look over the additional backup.

Chair Shewalter closes the meeting for a break.

Chair Shewalter reopens the meeting at 10:35 a.m.

Chair Shewalter reminds the public that they are on agenda item 11, and thanks Director Thomas for the backup.

Director Thomas read from her Librarian's Report as follows:

Staff:

I wrote a grant, procuring \$5,000 in funds for expanding our digital nonfiction collection. These ebooks will be available through Libby. Topics will include exam and study guides for young adults, resume and career guides, legal books, and general nonfiction to include health and wellness topics (self-help, diet, and exercise books). This is federal LSTA funding distributed by the Nevada State Library, Archives, and Public Records. Shanna sent the grant specifications over to our representative at Overdrive to curate a selection of books for us, which we can then select from. These books should be available by December, as our grant spending period ends on November 30.

Julie has been continuing to work on professional development and has viewed webinars from WebJunction on grant seeking, fundraising, outreach, teen programming and services, and leadership.

Shanna and Julie worked on creating an ad and choosing a coloring page to be run in the Pahrump Valley Times for Halloween. They will run a coloring contest on October 22 via a special insert in the paper. Participants bring their entries to the library where we vote on the top 3 from each age group, and a 1st, 2nd, and 3rd place winner will receive a prize to be announced in the paper on November 7.

Barbara hired 2 additional volunteers and called all of the applicants, of which 9 were still interested. She will be scheduling interviews with them. She worked on the catalog to remove some books from being listed as "new books" that were no longer new.

Director Thomas presented the Librarian's Report Statistics for September 2025.

Chair Shewalter asks if the Tales with Pebbles is still doing well.

Director Thomas states, "Yes."

12. Discussion and deliberation to approve, amend and approve or reject Professional Services Contract with Monument Cleaning Services, LLC to provide janitorial services at the Pahrump Community Library; or direct staff how to proceed.

Chair Shewalter makes a motion to approve Professional Services Contract with Monument Cleaning Services, LLC to provide janitorial services at the Pahrump Community Library.

Vice Chair Runion seconds.

Chair Shewalter opens public comment.

Dave Ochenreider – He states in reference to this agenda item, it has no dollar amount for services added, like it does in items 14 and 17. He states that a dollar figure should be a part of the agenda.

Public comment is closed.

Chair Shewalter – He states that we need to have new cleaning services at the library, and Director Thomas was pleased with their services when she used them previously. Director Thomas approached them, and they worked up a contract. He adds that there is a dollar amount on the contract of \$308.00 per week for the term of the contract as full compensation, to be paid monthly. He states that there is a binder with the backup and that they have their own liability insurance (CIO), and it is under Exhibit A. He thinks it's a great idea and he's going to vote for it.

Vice-Chair Runion – No comment.

Trustee Morris – He asks if they are a local company.

Director Thomas – She states that they are a local company.

Trustee Green – No comment.

Michelle Nelson – She addresses Dave Ochenreider's comment that the agenda items are written to be clear and complete so that the public has an idea of what the matters are. She adds that even though there is no dollar figure, it still lets the public know what the board is going to be entertaining. She states that she will take Dave Ochenreider's comments into consideration and can include them on future agendas, but it is not required.

Chair Shewalter calls the question.

The measure passes 4-0 with one absent.

13. Discussion and deliberation to determine whether service and therapy animals will be permitted exclusively in the Pahrump Community Library.

Chair Shewalter makes a motion to permit service and therapy animals exclusively in the Pahrump Community Library.

Vice-Chair Runion seconds.

Chair Shewalter opens public comment.

There are no public comments.

Chair Shewalter – He states that there could be an issue with what kind of animals we permit in the library, and by law, we have to allow therapy and service animals. He states he has a well-behaved dog and would love to bring her in, but there is no purpose for it. If we allow it, we are opening the door to pets being brought in that could be disruptive or destructive to the library. He adds he is in favor of restricting access to therapy and service dogs exclusively, and library staff will determine what those categories are. The backup has guidelines and access to support on how to determine the situation, depending on how the board approves.

Vice-Chair Runion – He states that he is a “dog guy” and has a certified service animal and a therapy dog. He agrees, and we should not run the liability of having non-service type animals in the library.

Trustee Morris – He states he has a new big puppy and he is a handful. He has trained many dogs for various reasons, and his new puppy has made him realize how crazy an animal can act. He adds that dogs will sometimes get the “zoomies” and run around, and have the potential to soil the new carpet. He believes that it should also be restricted to trained animals.

Trustee Green – She states that she is also a “dog person” and supports this.

Chair Shewalter calls the question.

The measure passes 4-0 with one absent.

14. Discussion and deliberation to approve, amend and approve or reject Contract for Fixed Fee Services with the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno to update the Pahrump Community Library Policy Handbook and Personnel Policy Handbook at a cost of \$9,000.00 and 2) fund from the General Fund.

Chair Shewalter made a motion to approve the Contract for Fixed Fee Services with the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education on behalf of the University of Nevada, Reno to update the Pahrump Community Library Policy Manual and Personnel Policy Handbook at a cost of \$9,000.00 and to fund from the General Fund.

Trustee Green seconds.

Chair Shewalter opens public comment.

Ann Underdahl – She states she has done research on the cost of creating an employee handbook, and the agenda item has two items to be updated. Most of her research is from 2022-2023 and goes up to 2024. She states that in 2022-2023, the inflation rate was 4.1 percent, 8.0 percent, and she has taken that into account. She states that most organizations will want to use a template to do your own, and they charge \$1,000 to \$5,000. Consultants can customize the handbook to fit the culture, incorporating industry-specific requirements and legal compliance risks. They are templates and you get to fill in what the variables are. She adds that revising a handbook is more cost-effective, but it is essential to address specific needs if it is outdated or if extensive changes are required. She states that there is a big discount for \$9,000, but some employees' handbooks are from \$5,000 to \$10,000 for updates if they have legal services involved. She states you get what you pay for, and these figures are for just doing one, and the \$9,000 is not out of line. She suggests that an "up to" figure might need to be added. She states there might be complaints, but the decision has to be made on what is best for the library and the board.

Public comment is closed.

Chair Shewalter – He thanks Ann Underdahl for her research. He states that the \$9,000 fee is a set fee, and it is for both books. He agrees there may be a significant number of legal things that might need to be revised, and the director is not a lawyer. He states that if the board approves, we will have it done by someone who will write the manuals, and then they will review them. He adds that once they have reviewed them, the manuals will be given to legal for legal review. The books are significantly out of date, and he commends the director for doing something about it. He states that staff have said that they are not using them because they are so out of date, and it is ridiculous. The policy manual is still in effect, no matter how old it is. He states that the manuals will be brought up to date, including dress codes and other things. He states this is the same organization that has been working on the Five-Year Plan, and the conference with them was enlightening, and he was impressed with the guy who did it. He states he is in favor of this, it will be money well spent, it would cover a lot of issues, and that he is pleased with the directors' work.

Vice-Chair Runion – He states that, having worked on project management, this represents an excellent use of risk transference. If we were doing this in-house, we would

be accepting the risk if we mess up doing something against labor laws or other laws. He states these people seem to be experts, and we are transferring the risk of \$9,000 in comparison to how much we could spend in lawsuits. He adds that he is in favor.

Chair Shewalter – He states that brings up an interesting point about last month, and the nullifying of the practice of allowing banking of hours. He asks Director Thomas if that was in the handbook.

Director Thomas – She confirms that it was in the handbook.

Chair Shewalter – He states there was a policy that was in conflict with a federal law, and it was put into practice. He adds it was really a bad thing.

Trustee Morris – He states it is a good idea to go forward, and the handbooks have needed to be updated for some time. He adds Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education is in the ballpark for \$9,000.

Chair Shewalter – He adds that they understand the NRSs.

Trustee Green – She states she agrees with the other trustees that the manuals are out of date, and that she found them interesting, and that interesting can be dangerous. She adds that she supports this.

Director Thomas – She states she could go through the policies one by one and submit them for legal review, but this is a way to get them done at the same time. After speaking with several organizations and most of them didn't want to touch the personnel manual because we are a public sector. She spoke to a company out of Tennessee that only works on library policies, and other quotes only wanted to help with job descriptions for \$5,000. This company is \$9,000 for both manuals. She adds that if the board thinks that this is a good expenditure of money that she is happy with it, or if the board would like her to review them over a long period of time, she can do that as well.

Chair Shewalter – He states Vice-Chair Runion made a valid point about the liability transference, and that Director Thomas is not a lawyer and does not expect her to perform those duties because it is outside the scope of her education. He states that Director Thomas was hired to run the library and enforce policies, not to create them.

Michelle Nelson – She states she has a question that she has spoken to Director Thomas about. This facility is not qualified, and specifically excludes any legal advice or the capability of providing legal information. All the background that she was given on this contract is that they throw in whatever revised statute they want to throw in without a guarantee if it applies to the library, which means it will come to the District Attorney's office to do a 100% thorough review of the policy, which is using double efforts. She

adds she requested the Governing Law Jurisdiction be changed to the 5th Judicial District of Nevada in Pahrump. She states it is the District Attorney's policy to see that all contracts have jurisdiction in the 5th Judicial District, except for certain grants or estate contracts. She adds that this facility refused to accommodate that request. She confirms with Director Thomas that they refused.

Director Thomas – She confirms that it is correct.

Michelle Nelson – She states that although the contract is sufficient, she has expressed her concern to Director Thomas and has now brought it to the board's attention. She adds that much of the discussion has been regarding the legal aspects and providing the correct NRSs, and that is not true. She states she wants to bring that to the board's attention for consideration when thinking about the cost, as well as the jurisdictional requirements.

Chair Shewalter – He asks if there are problems, would they would have to go to Reno.

Michelle Nelson – She confirms that they may.

Chair Shewalter – He asks what issues does that create for the District Attorney's office.

Michelle Nelson – She states she is not familiar with how Reno runs their court system. It could be a phone in procedure, a Zoom in procedure, depending on how they are set up, or someone from the District Attorney's office would have to go up there. With the limited number of staff, it might create a substantial hardship, especially for the Chief Civil Deputy to the District Attorney's office. There are only two deputies who are part of the Litigation Division, and they are overwhelmed. She adds that she is not familiar with their filing system, or if they have an E-filing system, and that it could potentially be a huge burden on the District Attorney's office.

Chair Shewalter – He asks what the probability of that happening is.

Michelle Nelson – She states it could be the same as any contract. There may be disputes or discrepancies; she is unfamiliar with the organization and does not know what the work product is going to be.

Chair Shewalter – He states that the books need to be done badly. It has been over a decade, and he believes the last revision was done in 2015. He states that knowing about the banked hours being a violation of federal law statute, and it puts us in an awkward position. He asks Michelle Nelson if her office is willing to revise and generate new employee and policy manuals for the library. He states he understands her concerns, but it needs to be done, and he doesn't want to put it on Director Thomas.

Michelle Nelson – She states she has been working with Director Thomas on some of the policies piecemeal that have come to their attention because she is so overwhelmed. She adds that whether or not the District Attorney's office could undertake this kind of endeavor would be decided by District Attorney Kunzi.

Chair Shewalter – He asks if he would do it for \$9,000, and would that be persuasive enough.

Michelle Nelson – She states that District Attorney Kunzi would have to make the call if this would be a type of project they would be able to undertake, due to workloads and staff levels.

Chair Shewalter – He states, given that and the need, what would her comment be if he said let's withdraw the motion and the second, and the motion dies, allowing her to have the conversation with District Attorney Kunzi, and then bring it back next month. He states it would be done by her office, avoiding the possible issues that she has outlined.

Michelle Nelson – She states that it would be acceptable, and she can run it by District Attorney Kunzi to see if he believes they have the ability and staff to undertake the project. She adds if that is what the board wants to do, then she is willing to discuss it.

Chair Shewalter – He asks if that would be an acceptable alternative to engaging in a contract that she has concerns with.

Michelle Nelson – She states, "Sure," as long as there is no imminent need to sign this today, and she doesn't see that there is unless Director Thomas had a different opinion. She adds that there is no reason that it could not be postponed for another month.

Chair Shewalter – He asks Director Thomas if there is an issue postponing until next month.

Director Thomas – She states she has no issue.

Trustee Green – She asks if we can check what the other judicial procedures are, and if we are able to Zoom in if we accept this contract the way it is presented. If we have to deal with another jurisdiction, then find out what their procedures are as well, so we can compare.

Michelle Nelson – She states that she can look into that.

Trustee Green – She states that it might be perfectly fine if Zoom is available, and no travel time will be required.

Chair Shewalter – He states that it is a good point; if District Attorney Kunzi says no, they can't do it.

Trustee Green – She states that in this day and age, there is so much business being done.

Chair Shewalter withdraws his motion.

Trustee Green withdraws her second.

The item dies for lack of motion.

15. Discussion and deliberation on whether to authorize the Library Director to sign grant agreements.

Chair Shewalter makes a motion to authorize the Library Director to sign grant agreements.

Trustee Green seconds.

Chair Shewalter opens public comment.

There are no public comments.

Chair Shewalter – He states we have access and opportunity to submit for many grants, and to simplify the issue, he wrote the item after speaking with Director Thomas. He doesn't see why she shouldn't be able to sign grant agreements. They are clear and do not have a lot of negotiations in them, and are specific on what the money can be used for. He doesn't see an issue with it, and there are a lot of grants that can be applied for. He states that getting funding into the library is part of the day-to-day operations, and she shouldn't have to bring it to the board.

Vice-Chair Runion – He agrees with Chair Shewalter.

Trustee Morris – He agrees.

Trustee Green – She states that other library directors sign grants, and ours should too.

Chair Shewalter calls the question.

The measure passes 4-0 with one absent.

16. Discussion and deliberation to approve, amend and approve or reject a social media policy for the Pahrump Community Library.

Chair Shewalter makes a motion to approve a social media policy for the Pahrump Community Library.

Trustee Green seconds.

Chair Shewalter – He states the backup is on pages 46-48. He states that he hasn't had a chance to read it yet, and there will be a recess.

Chair Shewalter closes the meeting.

The meeting re-opens at 11:30a.m.

Chair Shewalter opens public comment.

Helen Schneider – She states that she has a problem with number 4, on page 47. It says “identifies themselves as employees”, and then on page 48 it says “employees choose to identify.” She states here you must, but here you must not.

Trustee Green – She states the first one pertains to library social media, and the one on page 48 pertains to someone's personal social media.

Chair Shewalter – He clarifies with Michelle Nelson that she has reviewed the item.

Michelle Nelson – She confirms she has reviewed it, and states this is a social media policy for the employees of the library, and not for the public in general.

Chair Shewalter – He states he wanted to make it clear that anything being looked at has been reviewed by legal.

Ann Underdahl – She states in reference to page 47, personal social networking, the library respects the right of the employees to use social networking sites, and does not want to discourage employees from self-publishing and self-expression. She adds number two on page 48 states employees are prohibited from using library equipment, including computers, licensed software, or other electronic equipment, the internet, or facilities on work time to conduct personal social network activities. She states that the two conflict with each other.

Michelle Nelson – She clarifies page 48, paragraph two, that is during their worktime. If they are working, they are not to use library equipment for their own personal social networking while on the clock and are supposed to be performing their job functions.

Ann Underdahl – She asks if they have access to the network when they are not working.

Michelle Nelson – She clarifies that employees would have access just like any other person when they are not working, and this is just for while being paid at work.

Chair Shewalter – He asks Director Thomas about number two on page 48, and how it works regarding employees having access when they are off work, and can they post after hours.

Director Thomas – She states that if an employee came in on their day off, they could still use our public computers or Wi-Fi, while they are off the clock.

Chair Shewalter – He states that it is not library equipment, correct.

Director Thomas – She states library-owned equipment.

Chair Shewalter – He states this item came up after he got a complaint from a member of the public who was upset regarding a post that a library employee made after the Charlie Kirk assassination. He asks Director Thomas how the library handles these things. There is no policy, and he tries to address as many complaints from the community as he thinks are appropriate. His concern is about things that are sensitive to the public that employees might post on a social network where they identify themselves as an employee of the Pahrump Community Library, and that posting could be taken as a position of the library, and that bothers him. He states he is not concerned with what somebody posts and supports the First Amendment. Things offend people, and that's the point, and it's easy to digest stuff that he likes, and not the stuff he doesn't like. He states posts are permitted, but it is how they are connected to the library on a personal level. If you say you work at the Pahrump Community Library and the post is not well-received, that post gets connected to the library, and it concerns him. He is hoping that the policy they implement may help cover that to make sure there is a definite division between a personal position and it's not the library's position. He states he knows Michelle Nelson has reviewed the item, and is there anything that they are able to do to cover that, and it's a touchy issue.

Michelle Nelson – She states she believes it is addressed in the policy that what any person puts on their social media, whether they are employed at the library or not, is up to them. She is not familiar with all forms of social media, but is familiar with Facebook, and you can put your job, job title, history, and your address, if you want to for the public to view. As long as an employee under this policy doesn't express their opinions as being those of the library on their own personal page, they can express any opinion, and the fact that it simply has their job as Pahrump Community Library District does not in itself tie them to that opinion on any matter. She adds that just because they work for the library, it does not change their First Amendment right as private citizens to post whatever opinions they have about any issue. She asks Director Thomas if it is addressed in the policy.

Chair Shewalter – He states where is says on the disclaimer that any views or opinions presented are solely by the author and do not necessarily represent those of the library, and where does that get posted. He asks if we are asking them to post that on their social media as well.

Michelle Nelson – She clarifies they do not have to, and are not required to.

Director Thomas – She states that we need to modify number four on page 48, “If employee chooses to identify oneself as an employee of the library, note that some readers may view the employee as a spokesperson for the library. Because of this possibility, employees are required to comply with the Social Media Post Disclaimer policy as set forth on the first page of this policy”. The way that it is worded pertains to anything that is connected to their library email address, but she can see where being posted in another forum on a personal social network would be confusing, and it would seem like they are required to post this on their personal social media.

Michelle Nelson – She states that the social media disclaimer post on page 46, that is from library email address, and not from their personnel sites.

Director Thomas – She states she is concerned that it will confuse employees when it is listed again under their personal social networking section. She adds this is the Pool Pact policy.

Michelle Nelson – She asks if this was from Pool Pact.

Director Thomas – She confirms that it was and is a sample policy from Pool Pact with some modifications, such as adding listservs and email discussion groups where it talks about posting the disclaimer, changing public information to library information, and changing everything to library instead of organization.

Trustee Green – She asks if employees could say something like “I’m posting this as a private individual, and my thoughts and views expressed do not reflect on any organization, or group other than my own”.

Chair Shewalter – He states he doesn’t think we can require any disclaimer on personal.

Michelle Nelson – She states the disclaimer would be fine if it’s from a library email address, and sending it as a library employee, but on their personal sites, we cannot require them to put any type of language or disclaimers. Employees are allowed to do whatever they want to do on their off time. She adds we cannot make any dictation, notes, requests, or requirements while employees are on their off time.

Trustee Green – She asks if it can't be a requirement, can it be a suggestion, or encouraged, if it would look bad on the library.

Michelle Nelson – She states, “No”.

Chair Shewalter – He states how the issue came to light, and the Kirk assassination comments, that during the time period employers were reprimanding up to, and including termination for personal social media posts that they felt reflected poorly on their organization because an employee identified themselves as an employee. He asks if that is a path the library could take.

Michelle Nelson – She states she thinks she knows what he is trying to say, but the difference is that a private employer can make whatever policies and procedures they want, but it is different when you are speaking about a governmental entity. The library is a governmental entity, and there are different rules, policies, and procedures, as opposed to private industry, and that is where the big difference comes in. She adds that this is a viewpoint from a governmental entity, not a private employer, who can make any rules and restrictions they want for their employees. The government cannot do that because they are government employees who cannot have their First Amendment rights abridged by the government.

Chair Shewalter – He states he understands now, and a private owner does not have restrictions regarding the First Amendment, and as a governmental entity, we do. He asks if that is clear.

Michelle Nelson – She confirms that it is clear.

Chair Shewalter – He states that the best we can do is pray that the employees of the library who post on social media where it reflects they work here, will have a little discretion and decency about issues.

Michelle Nelson – She states the only thing required of the employees is to follow the policies and procedures of the library, and to know that on their personal time, they are free to express their First Amendment right any way they choose, as long as it is not something the law already says is a violation. She adds, for example, inciting violence. They are 100% free to express their opinions regarding government policies, actions, or public figures in any way they choose, as long as it complies with the social media policy and does not say that it is the opinion of the library, or “as working for the library, I am expressing this opinion”.

Chair Shewalter – He asks if it is the same thing, if they say that this is the position of the library, or my position as an employee of the library, when they say that they are an employee of the library.

Michelle Nelson – She states no, for example, on Facebook it can say what your job title is, and that doesn't matter as long as it is not in the post itself saying as an employee of the library, this is my opinion. She adds it is not tied together by where you work, and the law promotes governmental entities the expression and opinions regarding public figures in the public sector that they work in, or any public figure not to infringe on the First Amendment right. There is greater protection for government employees on their off time, in their personal space, to express those views.

Trustee Morris - He states Facebook is not responsible for something someone posts using Facebook; they don't go back and blame Facebook for something someone says. He asks what is the language that Facebook uses when someone posts that says they are not liable for what anybody says on our social media.

Michelle Nelson – She states there may be, but she is not familiar with it. Facebook is a private company, so in perspective, it would be comparing apples and oranges, with private industry and government entities.

Chair Shewalter – He states the policy is clear, and only a limited number of people are permitted to post things on the library's social media accounts. He asks Director Thomas to confirm.

Director Thomas – She states, "Correct".

Chair Shewalter – She asks Director Thomas if she ultimately has approval of what gets posted.

Director Thomas – She states, "Yes, what gets posted on the library's account".

Chair Shewalter – He states that we don't need to worry about the library's accounts because those restrictions are already set in place with the policy that we are looking at here. He asks Michelle Nelson if that is correct and if those things have been covered.

Michelle Nelson – She states she believes they have.

Chair Shewalter – He states he just hopes and prays that people use discretion when posting. The language in the item has been approved by legal, so he is not questioning it.

Vice-Chair Runion – He states that if legal is good with it, then he is good with it.

Trustee Morris – He states his question is that a private company can have a policy, and as a government entity, you can't indemnify yourself.

Michelle Nelson – She states she does not understand the question.

Trustee Morris – He asks if the government has protection against a congressman saying that he is speaking for the government, and they say something salacious. He expresses his concern about people having a difference of opinion.

Chair Shewalter – He states that if someone did something illegal on their social media page, and it said they worked here, he doesn't think we would be held liable.

Michelle Nelson – She questions what he means by illegal.

Chair Shewalter – He states there are certain restrictions on some of our civil rights, the First Amendment being one of them. You can't incite violence, and if someone were to do that, being an employee of the library, are we liable for any of that.

Michelle Nelson – She states that she doesn't think so, and we are talking on broad stroke hypotheticals without any additional facts. She adds with the broad stroke, if the person did not have the authority to post on behalf of the library, saying, "as a library employee, I think we should rally up and burn down the library," she states that she doesn't see where it incites violence, and it would not be permitted as a protected First Amendment right, and doesn't see how the library could be responsible for something like that unless it is tied to something the board said. She states that they are talking in such broad strokes that it is impossible to answer that kind of question in a box.

Chair Shewalter – He states she (Michelle Nelson) tells him all the time that people can file a lawsuit for anything.

Michelle Nelson – She states "sure," and that she didn't say they couldn't file a lawsuit, but could you be liable, and that is a different answer than could you file a lawsuit. Anybody could file a lawsuit, whether or not you would be liable in the end is a different question.

Trustee Morris – No comment.

Trustee Green – She states that if legal has approved it, and it protects the library, the library's social media accounts, as well as it protects employees' private social media First Amendment rights, she thinks it is a good policy.

Chair Shewalter – She states that the motion is to approve a social media policy for the Pahrump Community Library.

Chair Shewalter calls the question.

The measure passes 4-0 with one absent.

17. Discussion and deliberation to approve, amend and approve or reject 1) the installation of a desk station to monitor and control the back door access control system with a five-year contract at a cost of \$1,586.39 and 2) fund from the General fund.

Chair Shewalter makes a motion to approve 1.) the installation of a desk station to monitor and control the back door access control system with a five-year contract at a cost of \$1,586.39 2.) to fund from the General fund.

Trustee Green seconds.

Chair Shewalter opens public comment.

Chair Shewalter clarifies that this item is for a control mechanism for the back door, where the card readers and camera were installed.

There are no public comments.

Chair Shewalter – He states that it is controlled by two cell phones, and if they are not around, we do not know what is happening at the back door. He adds that we need to know what is happening at the back door.

Vice-Chair Runion – He states he has read through it and it looks to be in order, and he is in favor.

Trustee Morris – He asks if it will require additional personnel to monitor.

Director Thomas – She states it is an iPad on a stand that can be moved around, where a staff member or volunteer could monitor it.

Trustee Green – She states she is in support.

Chair Shewalter calls the question.

The measure passes 4-0 with one absent.

18. This item is limited to announcements, brief discussions of public comments, correction of factual inaccuracies, direction to staff, or topics proposed for future board meetings. (Lengthy deliberation of topics not on the agenda is prohibited by the Nevada Open Meeting Law).

Michelle Nelson – She states that she has said all of her comments.

Director Thomas – No comment.

Trustee Green – She thanks everyone for coming and being involved in the library. She also thanks the staff for a job well done in moving the library forward.

Trustee Morris – He states he concurs with Trustee Green and has no other comments.

Vice-Chair Runion – No comment.

Chair Shewalter – He states the youth area is looking good and inviting to the younger adults and kids. He commends Director Thomas for a job well done. He adds Barbara hired two volunteers, and called them all. He asks how many were there.

Director Thomas – She states she cannot remember off the top of her head but there were 40 or more.

Chair Shewalter – He states 40, and that maybe we will get another nine lined up to have a whole workforce of 11 volunteers. He states he has been talking about the vision Director Thomas has for the library, and that there are two self-checkout stations up at the Circulation Desk that are nearly functional. He invites everyone to check them out at the Circulation Desk, and they will be ready for automated checkout and returns for our patrons. He adds that it will remove the need for staff to check people in and out. They scan the barcode, scan the library card, scan the book, and check out. It gives a receipt that tells them at the bottom how much they saved by using the library instead of purchasing them. He adds that next month, we will be looking at the automation of library services, and it is currently being reviewed by legal for copies, scanning, faxing, and other things that consume much of the reference staff's time. He states well done on Director Thomas moving the library forward and implementing her vision.

19. Adjournment

The meeting is adjourned at 12:06 p.m.