Greetings and a call to order by President Larson, of the GNRHS Board of Directors at 7:30 AM. Directors present were: Chinquist, Gjeware, Larson, Sherry, Tanner, and Wosniak. Black was unable to attend.


The President declared a quorum present, and the meeting open to transact business.

The president noted that Operating Officers and visitors were encouraged to participate in the discussion, even though not entitled to vote. The president also commented that under the “Not-For-Profit” Laws of the State of Illinois, Proxy votes are not permitted.

**Item 01: Acceptance of the Great Falls, Montana Minutes.**

Motion by Sherry  
2nd. by Tanner  
Unanimous

**Item 02: Re-election of all Operating officers**

Operating Officers were requested to send the Secretary a letter if they were NOT willing to be considered for re-election. The Secretary noted that no letters were received.

Motion by Gjeware to re-elect all Officers.  
2nd. by Sherry  
Unanimous

**“Officers Reports”**

**Items 03: thru 06:**

All operating Officers gave brief written and oral reports on their respective positions.

Holmquist requested that his office be corrected to AFE Curator.

**Item 07: Convention Chairman Jim Chinquist along with Mike Lunak and the Local arrangements committee reported on the Convention events.**

**Item 08: Future Convention Sites:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis, Minnesota</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Dates to be set</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion by Sherry to accept  
2nd. by Salmon  
Unanimous

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minot, North Dakota</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havre, Montana</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 09: Status of Bruck Acquisition.
Myron Chase reported that the Bruck was purchased by an anonymous buyer and that it will be going to the Stumptown Historical Society for restoration. Details will come later as to whom purchased it.

Item 10: AFE Files and Future Location
(see Board Proposals presented by Archives and Research Officer Stuart Holmquist attached to Agenda 1999)
The Dakota County Fair Grounds has requested that the box cars containing the AFE and Related Files be removed from the premises due to an Era change wanted by the Fair Grounds.
John and Cathy Robinson representing the Minnesota Transportation Museum presented a proposal to the GNRHS to store the AFE Files in a secure area at the Museum.

Motion by Gjevre to accept the MTM proposal
2nd. by Chinquist
all in favor
Against Tanner

Motion by Gjevre that the Board allocate $2000 to Stuart Holmquist to move the AFE files to the MTM
2nd by Sherry
Unanimous

Item 11: Heritage Fund Disbursement for 1999: All recipients are 501 (c) (3)
Minnesota Transportation Museum 2,500.00
Lake Superior Museum of Transportation 2,500.00
Iron Goat Trail 1,000.00

Motion by Gjevre to accept
2nd. by Tanner

Amendment to the Motion (Sherry)
Minnesota Transportation Museum 2,000.00
Lake Superior Museum of Transportation 2,000.00
Iron Goat Trail 500.00
All in favor
Wozniak abstained

Item 12: Membership list.
Motion by Larson that the membership list be published once a year for all members and be included with the June GOAT.
2nd. by Sherry
Unanimous
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Editorial Concerns (see attached proposal's sponsored by Larson)

Items 13, 14, 15
Durfee: The Editorial staff will no longer advertise book reviews in the GOAT.
Klouda: Facts need to be double checked before publication
Peter: Need individuals to do Technical review.

Item 17: New Business
Ulver: We need to know who is holding GNRHS property. Larson will start a
listing of people holding such items.
Sherry: Reported on the Amtrak rates for those wishing to go to Convention by train.
Larson: reported on Stuart Aldcroft's condition and will write Stuart a letter of recognition for his years of service to the GNRHS.
Larson: Considering holding a meeting of the Board mid year.
Chinquist: Needs to receive feedback to his E-mails sent to directors and officers.

Item 18: For the good of the order

Adjournment 1:10 P.M.

Distribution to all Directors and Masthead Officers

Connie L. Hoffman, Secretary
May 28th, 2000
July 2, 1999

Board of Directors
Officers
GNRHS

Dear Sirs and Madam:

Another year has transpired and another board meeting is soon upon us. As we make our plans for the future of the organization, I hope that some time will be spent to consider the current situation with the AFE’s and that the board will see fit to look favorably on the attached document.

I would like to spend the few minutes I have at the board meeting discussing the plans for the future and what preparations are necessary to make the move to another storage location. I thought that I would never have to move the files again, but obviously that was a little too optimistic. To make any plans for the future, it will be necessary to be able to perform certain negotiations with the organization (MTM at this time). As will be explained, there will be substantial costs involved with this affiliation. I do not want to proceed with any assumption on my part that will commit for funds of the GNRHS; but yet there needs to be some ability to negotiate and produce a document to present to the board. The fact that the board only meets once per year and there are many issues needing to be discussed presents a problem for getting this matter resolved in the next year.

At the board meeting, I will open the meeting to review my proposals. After that I would like to spend our time discussing the type of arrangement being desired by GNRHS toward building a lasting relationship with MTM.

Sincerely,

Stu Holmquist
EVENTS SINCE LAST YEAR

After approval (at the last board meeting) for certain projects effecting the AFE’s and their storage in the box cars at Farmington, contact was made with the Dakota County Fair Board to request installation of inset doors, electricity, and steps. This contact opened a series of events which ultimately lead to the situation reported on today. Without going into great detail, I will try make a statement as to our current situation.

FARMINGTON FAIR BOARD

Immediately after I called discussing our plans on the storage arrangement with the box cars, the fair board was formulating its own “long term plans” for the “Dakota City” where the box cars are housed. The position statement they desired was to develop the project as though it were + or - 15 years of 1920. They talked to me about doing away with the 1944 caboose, which we donated them at the outset of the “AFE” project. While winter set in no further conversation on any subject occurred until spring of 1999, and then the situation turned in a direction I certainly did not expect.

Because of liability situations, the Fair Board and the “Dakota City” committee decided that the caboose and the box cars had to go. Letters were exchanged and the fair board ultimately decided that the Dakota City Committee would work with us to move off the property. Two things have to be understood at this point in time:

1). The committee thought that our moving off the property would take approximately a year to accomplish!
2). Our moving off the property, we would take the box cars with us!

Without being directly told of the conversation being discussed by the committee, I waited for a letter outlining their intentions during this “transition” period. They had a meeting on the subject, but never have created the letter that I was promised. Some weeks later, I called the committee secretary asking what they intended. She stated that they intended to work with us to resolve this issue, but that we had to vacate the Fair Grounds and they expected this to be done within a year. During that conversation I made a statement about our position on the entire matter.

I told her that one year was not enough, as it really constituted only six months; as the grounds was inaccessible for winter months. And secondly, when we leave, the box cars stay. The box cars were legally transferred to the fair’s ownership, they are no longer are road worthy (on the railroad), and cost of moving them would be prohibitive. When I made these statements, the secretary was amazed at my comments. I can only conclude that this was not what anyone, on their part, expected. To this date, some three months later, no further contact has been made with the committee. But they have covered the ladders on the box cars with boards to prevent anyone
climbing on the cars, which really is the liability issue. It is my position, that once the board of GNRHS approves procedures for the upcoming disposition of the files, I write the Fair board outlining our expected plans for disposition.

**CONTACT WITH BNSF**

When it became apparent that our long term relationship with the Dakota County Fair was in jeopardy, I wrote BNSF explaining the situation. As part of this letter, I asked BNSF to further consider their position in regards to the files and their control over their future. Within this letter, I asked them to consider one of the following issues and asked BNSF for a position statement telling us their long term desire for the AFE files. Three options were presented:

1). Maintain the current restricted use and storage of the files for an indefinite time. With this I requested BNSF support for the file storage. This support would be either financial in nature or to assist in alternate storage facilities (other box cars or perhaps in a BNSF building).

2). Unrestricted donation of files to GNRHS, with permission to determine the ultimate final disposition of the collection, as well as individual files. The intent here is to condense the files into a more manageable quantity. BNSF would no longer have the current access to the files.

3). Restricted donation of the files, with BNSF determining the guidelines of the file disposition. I would expect that BNSF would still contact us for information, but certain mutually agreed upon criteria, many files would be eliminated or condensed.

There was no immediate response from BNSF, so telephone contact was made with Topeka to determine that the letter was received and what the property accounting department was considering at the time. I was told that the property accounting department saw value in preserving the files, but had no say in their disposition. That decision had been turned over to the legal department (in Fort Worth) and contact would be made from them shortly.

Within a couple of weeks, a lawyer from Chicago called and stated he had been hired by BNSF to review the files and write BNSF an opinion as to the legal position of the company. This individual spent two days with us (one with Larry Schrenk of NP and one with myself). He dug through files, took notes, listed potential for the legal benefit of the files. Verbally he told both Larry and myself, that the files could provide "historical" benefit for potential legal use of the files. Direct benefit such as insurance policies, deeds, and legal documents (building permits, contracts, etc.) were generally not present.

The conclusion of the person doing this work was BNSF would be better off without the files than with them either in their present state or condensed. Larry Schrenk commented that he hopes that does not mean that BNSF would ever desire to destroy the files, which would make
them unusable for either side of a court case. I like to remain optimistic, thinking it would be
BNSF’s desire to preserve this valuable historical set of documents, than to destroy them.

Since this contact was made, I have heard nothing from BNSF. Finally I called (again Topeka)
and asked what was going to happen and had they heard anything. The answer was no, nothing
had been decided; but he promised to follow up and get back with me. Since then all has been
quite from both fronts (Topeka and Fort Worth). Part of this silence is understandable, the
property accounting depart was being relocated from Topeka to Fort Worth; and everything was
in a flux. Just like when the department left St Paul to Topeka, it was expected that the move to
Fort Worth would implement a lot of staffing changes. These changes make my contact list less
and less, I will have not direct contact with anyone at BNSF once this move occurs; unless, of
course, new contacts are made.

POSSIBLE STORAGE ALTERNATIVES

One of the key positions I have taken during this period, is that now is the time to establish a
“permanent” home for the files. A home that will remain viable in the future to assure indefinite
preservation of the documents. The value of the AFE’s and other GN Property Accounting
Records should stand on their own. I believe, what ever happens to the files, the arrangement we
enter into should be considered a “mutual” benefit to any organization. With that, they should
offer us as much as we offer them; they should benefit us, as much as we benefit them. This
should not be a begging situation, nor should we compromise our desire to retain control over the
files (particular considering that BNSF has not released them as of this date).

Dakota County Fair - assuming that I am correct, that the fair felt the files being removed would
get the box cars off the property, might change their position about how welcome we are to keep
the files there. I feel this is only a temporary arrangement an that we should decide where they
are to go and inform the fair board what we plan to do - now and in the future. As will be
explained below, we will need time, perhaps as many as two years to accomplish our ultimate
goal.

Lake Superior Transportation Museum - I visited with Tom and Tim from the museum and
explained what was happening and what our need would be to relocate the files. Although I got
mixed feelings of the conversation, both of them expressed interest to see the files preserved.
They unfortunately, have limited resources and could do nothing financially to support our
efforts.

They would be willing to facilitate storage of the records in box cars on their property; but we
would have to supply the cars, pay for the move, and monitor the control of the files. Plans now
and in the future seem to be strongly in question. I was obvious that L.S.T.M. has not got the
financial support nor the wear-with-all to get it. I currently believe this would be our last
alternative.

Minnesota Transportation Museum - Our discussion with the MTM opened through contact with
Jim Larson contacting them to discuss this and other issues. From that informal meeting, Larry
Schrenk (NPRHA), Jim Larson and myself met with John Robinson of MTM to discuss the possibility of the AFE Files being stored under a joint custody and joint use arrangement. During this meeting, it was clearly demonstrated that MTM could assist in our endeavor to find suitable storage facilities. These facilities have potential to be a long term arrangement and could be expanded to contain other documents, records, books, and even photo collections.

Because MTM will make their own presentation at the Board meeting, I will not go into detail on any aspect of their potential. I will suggest to the board several resolutions, with will progress as pieces of the puzzle start coming together.

COORDINATION OF GNRHS ARCHIVES

With the current questions of AFE Archive disposition, some consideration should be given by the board to establishing an “Archive Committee”. This committee would continue to look into the suitable disposition of other type collections, which up to now are only temporary in nature. Several organizations like our have formed committee to deal with donations to their respective society’s. Immediately close to our organization is the NPHRA which successfully have found homes for material donated to them by individual members (Warren McGee Photo Collection).

We need to consider what collections are in our hands - Norm Keyes, and others which currently are housed in individual homes.

Public institutions are strapped for funds, many lack proper certification for historical archive preservation. Yet there is a loose knit effort out there for railroad preservation. We should make every effort that the GN is properly preserved. To affiliate ourselves with an organization like MTM is only going to muster a continuance of our desire to preserve the record of the GN. We need to develop those relationships, we need to assure that material collected today will have the potential of being preserved and not enter into the private “collectable realm” (even though everything I personally have collected has come through those means). Many have larger collections than I do, but I certainly would like to know that I have accumulated will stay together and not be split up and sold.

Recently Kalmbach Publishing announced a yearly grant for historical railroad preservation. I would think we would formulate a policy that we apply for funds every year. This could be for our projects or projects of matching funds with outside organizations.

Please consider these concepts for future discussion.
BOARD PROPOSALS

Considering the "limbo" situation with both BNSF and the Dakota County Fair, I need to board to authorized certain operating procedures, and/or understandings on how to proceed with the disposition of the files:

1). *Be it Proposed* that the GNRHS desires to move the AFE and Related Files out of the box cars located at Dakota County Fair Grounds, that the board empower the AFE Archive Office to proceed with the negotiations for possible storage at the Minnesota Transportation Museum. These negotiations will be monitored by one Board Representative to assure that the desires of the Board be followed. This Representative is suggested to be President James Larson.

2). *Be it Proposed* that the AFE Archives Officer will represent the GNRHS in negotiations with outside interests in regards to disposition of AFE records and the desires of BNSF.

3). *Be it Proposed* that the AFE Archives Officer be empowered to refile Series I AFE files into numerical sequence - rather than subject listing (refer to board meeting notes 1997, 1998). It is estimated that Series I AFE's can be condensed into one half their present state. File folders for this project will equal approximately 20,000 files or a cost of approximately $600.

4). *Be it Proposed* that the AFE Archives Officer will continue to coordinate and encourage common relationships with other BN predecessor organizations to encourage communications and development of common goals with their Property Accounting Records.
In reply to the Agenda Request letter.

12) Membership List:
   • determine frequency of publication timing/date of future publication
     (in particular not to be in the March Goat as non-renewing members
     have not been deleted by the preparation date of the March GOAT
   • should we increase font size—if we do, cost of production will increase

13) Should we build up a backlog of "ready to go" Reference Sheets?:
   • would reduce present unacceptable pressures on editorial staff
   • would provide a time window (presently not available) for review or
     revision of articles by others before submitting for publication

14) Deadlines for our printing company for GOAT material:
   • the present deadline is the first day of the month of the month prior
     to the issue month (i.e.: the deadline for the March issue of the GOAT
     was February 1). This is the date when all items have to be final and
     in the hands of our printing company. This timing must be changed to
     reduce time pressure on our editorial staff (not the printing company)
   • discuss substitution of two month timing or more for Reference
     Sheet activity, and 6 weeks or more for GOAT production
   • item 2 (above) impacts on this also

15) Discuss total number of pages of any one GOAT issue
   • presently we continue to provide from 56 to 76 pages. Most other
     similar publications provide 30 to 40 pages
   • consider modest reduction in our normal page output

PMT
April 1, 1999