

Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation
April 12, 2018 10:01 a.m.
Meeting Minutes

Laxalt Building, Second Floor Meeting Room
401 North Carson Street
Carson City NV

1. Call to order by Chairman Robert Ostrovsky, (*Chair Ostrovsky*) at 10:01 a.m.

3. Roll Call:

Commissioners:

Robert Ostrovsky, Chairman (Board of Museums and History, Governor’s Appointee) **Present**
Robert Stoldal, Vice Chair (Board of Museums and History) **Present**
Judy Michaels Simon (State Council on Libraries and Literacy) **Present**
Patricia Olmstead (At-Large, Governor’s Appointee) **Present**
Jane Tors (Nevada Humanities) **Present**
Gail Rappa (Nevada Arts Council) **Present**

Chair Ostrovsky determined a quorum was present.

Staff Present:

Rebecca Palmer, Historic Preservation Office
Joshua Woodbury, Deputy, Attorney General’s Office
Robin Reed, Historic Preservation Office
Kristen Brown, Historic Preservation Office
Carla Hitchcock, Historic Preservation Office
Shauna Tilley, Historic Preservation Office

Public: see attached sign-in sheet

Chair Ostrovsky called for the introduction of the Commissioners. The Commissioners described their affiliations and backgrounds.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that each applicant would have three minutes and that the Commissioners will not accept any additional materials during the hearing.

2. Public comment: *Chair Ostrovsky* asked for any public comment.

Gary Smith asked what the Commission wanted to hear about the project since he was first on the agenda.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that applicants can use their time to discuss the application, anything that has changed since the application was submitted, anything the Commission should pay attention to, budget updates, and the one question that everyone will get which is “is there any way you can phase these requests.” There is \$2 million in requests and only \$1 million on money available. Discussing any way to phase the project would be helpful.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that *Chair Ostrovsky* was very generous in that there were \$2.4 million in requests and \$950,000 in money available. It is a tight budget and the more the Commission learns about the projects the easier it will be to decide where projects can be phased.

Chair Ostrovsky asked that Agenda items #4 and 11 be combined.

4. Staff Announcements and summary of the status of Commission grants for the FY2016 cycle.

Palmer provided staff announcements concerning parking, restrooms, and timing for presentations, etc. *Palmer* stated that one application was withdrawn (#13, agenda item #8.m), so there are 15 applications to review. *Palmer* stated that the 2016 grants were up to date with all 5th quarter reports received from grantees, but a final report from the City of North Las Vegas is missing. That is important because staff won't release the final 10% of the award until the final report is received. *Palmer* updated the Commission on grants extended (Dayton Depot, Ely Yards, and McGill Depot).

11. Staff update to the Commission on the status of the Huntridge Theater.

Palmer stated that she had sent a certified letter to the property owner for a February 9, 2018 inspection, but no one opened the building. *Palmer* stated that staff was likely to carry out another inspection in the 4th quarter of the year although the settlement is clear; the property owner must have a certificate of compliance for both quarters in order to receive a reduction in the settlement. She can't issue a certificate of compliance for the first quarter since staff did not have access to the building nor did she receive the requested documents. *Palmer* stated that last week staff received a note from a private individual stating that there were workers at the property conducting some kind of building repair. *Palmer* noted that all of the covenants for CCA/CCCHP state that structural or visual modifications to the building require prior written permission from her office. She sent a note to the owner reminding him of the requirements of the covenants along with a copy of the permission request form and the covenants.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if Huntridge had passed any inspection since the settlement was signed?

Palmer: No.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if they had provided any documents?

Palmer: No, they have provided no documentation that they have ever opened the building to the public.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that there are three things of concern here. First, they need to open the building for inspection by the State. Second, they have to open the building to the public. Third, they might be conducting work on the building and staff has not received notice of any such alterations. Is that correct?

Palmer stated that that is correct, any structural or visual modifications require permission from her office.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked *Woodbury* what are the remedies available for the Commission. Does this make the Settlement null and void?

Woodbury stated that immediately there is a yearly judgment reduction for every year that the building passes its quarterly inspections. Obviously, we won't be applying the \$32,000 yearly reduction. Beyond that, if there were a concern that the property owner is not meeting their contractual obligations under the settlement, the Commission would need to go back to court in order to receive any potential remedy.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if this situation continues would the Commission be setting any precedent if they didn't do anything? The covenants are critical for the proper functioning of this grant program. If they are disregarded, then the Commission could be losing the foundation, literally, of these buildings. He is concerned that not following up with a stronger action sends a message that the Commission isn't that concerned about the covenants. He is looking for a recommendation of a strong next step to send a clear message to the property owner. The *Vice Chair* asked *Chair Ostrovsky* for a special meeting to determine a strong next step to remind the property owner that he isn't following the rules.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if the property owner has a good faith obligation or if the only penalty is a financial one.

Woodbury stated that there is a good faith obligation in that they have arrived at that settlement as most contracts have that. It would require going back to court.

Commissioner Simon stated that she visited the building in October and the owner was present. It looked to her from the photos that staff was able to take that the building has actually deteriorated. Evidence of homeless had been cleaned out when she was there, but it appears to be back again.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that the consensus of the Commission was that they wanted to ask the AG's office to look into some options for further legal action. *Woodbury* can work through staff to help the Commission to hear what the options are in this case, perhaps through a telephonic meeting. The desire of the Commission is to save this building, have it open for public use; this has been the goal even before the Commission put any money into the building, before he joined the Commission. However, that doesn't look like that is happening. *Chair Ostrovsky* asked *Woodbury* to do a little research and get back to the Commissioners appropriately under the Open Meeting Law.

Commissioner Rappa asked if the Commission had ever had to take legal action against the owner?

Chair Ostrovsky stated that the Commission had taken legal action against the owner for failure to comply with the Covenants. The settlement was approved by the court; this is what the issue is. *Chair Ostrovsky* asked *Palmer* to remind the Commission of the dollar amount available for the distribution and the schedule for the awarding.

7. Discussion of Commission scoring method, grant review process, and review of statutory responsibilities of the Commission.

Palmer stated that the last legislative session gave the Commission \$1 million dollars for the biennium. There is \$950,000 available for funding once the Treasurer sells the bonds.

Chair Ostrovsky asked *Vice Chair Stoldal* to give a summary of the CCCHP program as is customary.

Vice Chair Stoldal reviewed the statutes that govern the grant award process (NRS 383.520) and the priorities given to emergency projects.

Chair Ostrovsky described the awarding process, the scoring of applications, and concluded the announcement section of the agenda.

5. Approval of the minutes from previous meetings.

5a) July 25, 2017

Motion to approve minutes as submitted: *Vice Chair Stoldal*; second by *Commissioner Olmstead*.

***Commissioners Olmstead and Tors* Abstain, they were not present.**

No Commissioner comments.

Motion passed 4 Yea, 0 Nay with *Commissioners Olmstead and Tors* Abstaining.

5b) December 21, 2017

Motion to approve minutes as submitted: *Vice Chair Stoldal*; second by *Commissioner Simon*.

***Commissioners Olmstead and Tors* Abstain, they were not present.**

No Commissioner comments.

Motion passed 4 Yea, 0 Nay with *Commissioners Olmstead and Tors* Abstaining.

6. Review of the City of Ely's request to modify their 2016 Commission grant (CCCHP-16-08) to redirect the remaining \$2,317.83 of unspent grant funds to replace the flashing on the roof of the City Hall as identified in the Commission-funded Historic Structure Report.

Palmer stated that the request changed the original grant from a report to a development project. A modification of the grant that necessitated a review by the Commission.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if the Commissioners had any questions. No questions were heard. *Chair Ostrovsky* asked if *Palmer* had a recommendation.

Palmer asked *Reed* for her review of the proposed request.

Reed stated that she spoke with the City of Ely and they clarified the scope of work. *Reed* described the repair/replacement of the flashing on the roof and parapet. She stated that the proposal met the Standards.

Chair Ostrovsky asked for a motion to approve the request to modify CCCHP-16-08 as described.

Motion to approve the modification of CCCHP-16-08 as submitted: *Vice Chair Stoldal*; second by *Commissioner Olmstead*. No Commissioner comments.

Motion passed unanimously.

8. Review and testimony regarding the FY2017 applications:

8a) 1. Fallon Theatres, Fallon Community Theatre, Inc.

Mike Berney, Fallon Community Theatre presented the application.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked what was the extent of the roof damage?

April 12, 2018

Grant Hear Meeting Minutes

Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation

Berney most of the problems are the roof drains that were installed incorrectly when they were done. One section on the main roof where everything drains to and those drains leak.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the status of the 1920's stage.

Berney stated that they have done some work on the stage. They have had bands play on the stage, they have curtains, lighting, and they have started a sound booth.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the Marquee. The application shows that there are some possibilities to improve the Marquee as well.

Berney stated that a number of volunteers have cleaned out the Marquee. A local roofer has helped to repair the water damage to the Marquee.

Commissioner Tors asked about the various lifecycles that this Theater has had during its long history. What period does the organization want to return the building to?

Berney described the history of the Theater from the Vaudeville era of 1,100-seat theater to the current 120-seat box theater and the movie theater that they are now concentrating on. They want the stage to be used more.

Chair Ostrovsky asked about the flooring budget and *Berney's* statement that they could get by if they didn't get that funded. What is the condition of the currently flooring?

Berney stated that they have now is carpeting that is circa 1970's now. It is functional and there is hard wood flooring.

Chair Ostrovsky also stated that while there isn't in kind money for this application, there is in kind money for the building as a whole.

Berney stated that Enel, a geothermal plant has donated money to the lobby. There have been Eagle Scout projects, removed burlap, had donated electrical work.

Commissioner Simon stated that they needed to determine to what period they want to return the building. There is a mixture of more recent 70's materials and earlier periods together.

8b) 2. El Rancho Hotel, City of Wells

Jolene Sup, City Manager, City of Wells presented the application.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked that after the CDBG has been awarded, what specifically is left to complete?

Sup stated that the roofing will be incomplete after the CDBG portion has been completed and the brick repointing. The community has fund-raised extensively and will be there to fill in any gaps in funding.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the portico. Does it have to come off and is that in the grant application?

Sup stated that yes, the portico has to come off and that there is an I-beam extension going up through the center of the building providing structural strength. Mr. Palmer has calculated the

occupancy levels and structural strength for the second floors and the building is safe for high occupancy levels.

- 8c) 3. Fourth Ward School Historic Fourth Ward School Foundation
Margo Memmott, volunteer and Vice President of the Fourth Ward School Board of Directors, presented the application.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that he saw four basic activities in the application: Repair of the sloped roof, exterior painting, selective demolition of architectural elements or at least removing and either repairing or replacing elements of the building, interior repair of the third floor. Since there isn't enough money to complete the entire project, can she come up with a cost for just the roof and dormer repair?

Memmott stated that it would be somewhere around \$100,000. This would reduce the water penetration from the top but the water would still be coming in through the siding where a bondo material has pulled at the siding.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the repair of the siding could be separated from the painting?

Memmott replied that the two activities need to go together since the repaired siding would need to be painted.

Speaker (?) asked what kind of bonding material was used on the building?

Memmott stated that she didn't know. It was applied in the late 1990's in order to hold the wood together, but it is actually coming off and pushing elements away from the building.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked how many pieces of siding are damaged?

Memmott stated that most of the damage was on the third floor outside wall.

Simon asked about the seasonal precipitation and the building.

Memmott stated that the rainstorms have caused some damage on the front side of the building.

- 8d) 4. First United Methodist Church

John Helmreich presented the application. He has some updated information on the necessary work that will reduce the overall costs of the project.

Ron Applegate, former Chair of the trustees of First United Methodist Church. *Applegate* stated that they approached by a contractor who had been working on the Episcopal Church across the Truckee River. The cost estimate provided by these consultants was quite large so he tried to get other estimates. No one else provided one so he went back to a retired expert, Kathleen Gilmore (sp?) for help. Her evaluation was that the windows were not in very bad shape and that volunteers could do the work for about \$25,000.00. The putty is coming out and the soldering wasn't completed originally.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that this is the first application from a church since the National Park Service and the Commission changed its rules about funding properties owned by religious organizations. The National Register listed property is one of 14 churches or church structures

listed in the National Register in Nevada. *Vice Chair Stoldal* asked, why these windows? Are they most at risk?

Applegate stated that given the weather patterns in Reno, these windows are the most open to wind and weathering.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about what would in place temporarily when they take the windows out? There is a plywood option and a glass option.

Applegate described the process of removing and repairing the windows while putting in place a temporary Lexan panel.

Commissioner Rappa asked about the Lexan plexiglass. Is that a storm window type of insulation?

Applegate stated that the new product would stay clear like glass for about 40-50 years. It won't fade. He asked to go through the costs since they didn't want to ask for too much or come back too many times requesting funds.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked for a copy of the revised budget if possible.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that he would accept the budget but not the revised scope or description. Staff can get this information for review later.

Applegate stated that the total request was not \$20,000.00 and was at the bottom of the page he handed the Commission.

8e) 5. Douglas County High School, Douglas County Historical Society

Cindy Rogers, Director of Museums for the Douglas County Historical Society presented the application.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if *Rogers* had said that the flagpole project could be separated from the stairs project. If so, what would the cost for the stairs be?

Rogers stated the steps are a priority and that she didn't have a separate bid for the stairs, but the flag surround was about \$5,000-8,000.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked *Palmer* if the flagpole was connected to the building by the stairs or is it separate and therefore outside of the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Palmer stated that according to her review, it is possible that the flagpole was separate from the building and therefore should be viewed as landscaping feature and not part of the building.

Commissioner Rappa asked *Palmer* asked if historic standards need to be upheld for the repair of the flagpole since it is not part of the building?

Palmer stated that if the Commission decided to fund the flagpole, then SHPO would have to adhere to the Secretary of Interior's Standards for it rehabilitation.

Commissioner Rappa asked what if they get outside funding?

Palmer stated that since there are covenants on the building, staff would need to adhere to the Secretary of Interior's Standards regardless of the funding received.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the third rail proposal, were there three rails historically?

Rogers stated that they want to add a third rail.

Commissioner Tors asked *Palmer* if there was anything else about the application that was not consistent with the Standards.

Palmer stated that staff looked at the use of Tufflex as a coating material. Staff recommends repairing the concrete or replacing the stairs would be more consistent with the Standards.

Chair Ostrovsky asked the *Rogers* if she felt the flag surround was an important element of the building.

Rogers stated the originally the flag was on the roof of the building but was moved to in front and replaced with an aluminum flagpole and the surround was a later addition after the Historical Society received the building (between 1980-1999). When they first started to deal with the stairs, the proposal was to wrap the stairs in rebar and repour the steps. This would have extended the steps out to the flagpole surround.

8f) 6. George Whittell Jr. Estate, Thunderbird Lodge Preservation Society
Bill Watson, Chief Executive, and Curator Thunderbird Lodge

Chair Ostrovsky asked what contractual services were eliminated to reduce the ask by \$30,000.

Watson replied that it was mainly the security services that were eliminated.

Chair Ostrovsky asked what the status of the fire protection system today since that is being retained.

Watson stated that they were able find a method to delay the requirement to provide site-wide fire suppression that would have been required by the terms of their business license by 2011. They have made progress in working on the fire suppression but to date there is still no site-wide fire suppression. This grant will provide the foundation for that system. There are gas-powered pumps that are placed in the lake.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the seven items in the application are ranked by priority? For example, the windows seem like a priority.

Watson stated that the windows are a priority since their damage creates a hole in the security system. The wind can blow them into the boathouse and then they break. Replacing the expensive glass is a priority since protecting the building envelop includes the windows.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the water system.

Watson stated that from a cost and level of effort standpoint, the water system was the meat of the application. It is also the single largest line item in the budget.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the other items in the budget and what was critical beyond the windows. What isn't a priority?

Watson stated that the stairwell bulkhead removal might not be very high on the priority list. It is work that needs to be done to return the building to its historic appearance that was envisioned by Whittell and Delongchamps when the boathouse was designed and built. Heating and ventilation are there to protect the artifacts.

Simon asked about the financial statement of December 31, 2015. Are there more recent documents?

Watson stated that he could forward the 2016 financial statement.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that the Commission and *Watson's* calculations didn't match.

Commissioner Tors asked about the role of this resources as a community center beyond visitorship.

Watson gave a summary of the resource as the only remaining cultural attractions on the Nevada side of Lake Tahoe that is open to the public.

Simon asked how the cultural events and school trips are funded.

Watson stated that the general public access is paid for by a fee, school groups are subsidized by the Foundation and by contributions from the members at \$5.00 per students. During the recession, the Foundation also paid for transportation to the site as well.

8g) 7. Stewart Indian School Nevada Indian Commission Building #90.
Sherry Rupert, Executive Director, Nevada Indian Commission gave the presentation.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked when the State of Nevada replaced the roof.

Rupert stated that she believed it was about six years ago.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if they did a structural analysis of the building when they replaced the roof?

Rupert stated that they did structural analysis from the roof plate up. This was one of 11 buildings that had their roof replaced to prevent further deterioration.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked where the estimates for the schematic design come from.

Rupert stated that the estimates came from H&K Architects.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the \$13 million that the Stewart facility had received.

Rupert stated that it was \$4.5 million.

Palmer stated that the remainder comes from sewer, water, and other infrastructure at Stewart.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if this is a critical building, why isn't the building in the \$4.4 million dollar CIP award?

Rupert stated that initially the \$4.5 million dollar came from consultation with the NIC and the Stewart Advisory Commission. The first effort was to tell the story of the Stewart Indian School in the Cultural Center and Welcome Center buildings. This was a big ask and thanked the Commission for the letter of support from Chair Ostrovsky to the Governor. \$1.2 million dollars was also awarded was to replace the roof in the Old Gym. The next building is the Auditorium in the Master Plan. Carson City is interested.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked how the project could be phased.

Rupert stated that any funding they can get would be appreciated and will use the funding as best as possible.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that this grant was not for construction; does she know the magnitude of the construction costs?

Rupert stated that it was at least over \$200,000 but she didn't have the exact number. She could call her office.

Commissioner Olmstead asked about the timeline for the \$4.5 million dollar project.

Rupert stated that construction would proceed by July 23 and an April 2019 completion date.

Commissioner Rapa asked about the building envelope. It is secure. Is there damage?

Rupert stated that yes, there is damage in the building, but the repair of the roof has stopped the progress of the damage and sealed the building envelope.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that the state of Stewart is significantly improved from seven years ago.

8h) 8. Downtown Reno Library Washoe County Library System
Jeff Scott, Director of the Washoe County Library System, presented the application.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked *Scott* which of the seven items in the application would meet the requirements of the CCCHP program as outlined in statute.

Scott stated that the book railing would help restore the wall. Right now, water goes inside the wall. The bollard lighting helps to protect the building (from vehicle crashes) and provide lighting. The candy cane lighting helps to enhance the building at night.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the flagpole and that it didn't really fit into the Commission's mission and about the public art piece in the front of the building. While not a comment on the art itself, it might not fit into the jurisdiction of the Commission.

Commissioner Simon asked about the source of funding for the entire project. She also stated that she understood the need to make the building look more accessible, but she was concerned about the historic significance of the building.

Scott stated that he had received comments from SHPO staff about some of the proposed exterior elements (such as the banners) that might not be consistent with the historic integrity of the

building. The south side of the building needs to have some indication that it is a Library. SHPO staff has asked that the banners be freestanding or very carefully attached to the roof. *Scott* stated that they would likely eliminate the entryway sculptures in the proposal, which doesn't fit with the minimalist style.

Commissioner Simon asked if the City of Reno was paying for the “Monument of Legacy” sculpture?

Scott stated that yes the City had paid for the sculpture.

Chair Ostrovsky asked about the book railing. Is it an original element of the building?

Scott stated that the cap on the wall was removed and the book railing would protect the wall as the new cap.

Palmer stated that in prior years, the Commission has determined that in prior years the addition of railings could be consistent with the statutory requirements of this program because they would improve access to the existing building. In prior years, access issues have been funded such as at St. Augustine's in Austin. Public art would not be eligible.

- 8i) 9. Goldfield High School, Goldfield Historical Society.
John Ekman, President, Goldfield Historical Society, presented the application.

Chair Ostrovsky asked about the entire south wall.

Ekman stated that the west portion is in good shape with some additional steel columns, it should be sound. The south side wall red brick has mortar that is starting to fail. This is the last phase needed to stabilize the building.

The Vice Chair asked when the roof would be repaired.

Ekman stated that he has made some temporary repairs to the roof while attached to a harness. The repairs are made with corrugated metal from abandoned trailers.

The Vice Chair asked about the requirements for funding and structural issues for the roof.

Ekman stated that only through observations does he know about the roof. There isn't a report yet.

Commissioner Tors asked about the insurance. Is there any update on that?

Ekman stated that there wasn't.

Commissioner Tors asked *Palmer* what issue this presents for the process?

Palmer stated that in her search of the prior grantees, she found that most had insurance. However, she can understand why a building such as this might not yet have insurance. In the last two grant round the Commission has asked that the search continue. However, given the condition of the building, she can understand why the coverage is prohibitively expensive or not available.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that he believed that there have been other structures that didn't have insurance as well.

8j) 10. La Concha Lobby, Neon Museum

Tracey Sprague, collections manager for the Neon Museum, presented the application.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if the museum charges a fee to visit and if the number of visitors was above 100,000 per year.

Sprague stated that the visitorship was over 120,000 every year and that yes they charged a fee to visit. The fees support operations and educational activities at the museum.

Vice Chair Stoldal said that the report of the condition of the La Concha Lobby stated that that the condition could be addressed now and then it would need additional work in the near future or the rehabilitation could wait for a number of years, be more extensive, but only need to be completed in one phase at once. *Vice Chair Stoldal* wondered if this project could be phased? The plan for maintenance costs less, but not be completely deal with the issue.

Sprague stated that yes, on page 7 of the report, the proposal for maintenance was only \$14,000, but that wouldn't be the whole project. They would be able to phase the work.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that this museum has been wildly successful and he asked about the signs on Fremont Street.

Sprague stated that the signs on Fremont Street were taken down when they building “slotzilla”, but that the signs on Las Vegas Boulevard are on loan to the City of Las Vegas with a condition that they maintain them but they are owned by the museum.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that the museum was responsible for the saving of the La Concha and they should be proud of their efforts to maintain it.

Sprague stated that they were.

Chair Ostrovsky told the audience that the Commission was going to break for lunch and that the doors were going to close and the public would need to find lunch. ***Chair Ostrovsky recessed the public meeting for lunch at 12:30 pm.***

Chair Ostrovsky reopened the public meeting at 1:03 pm.

8k) 11. Mesquite High School Gymnasium, City of Mesquite, NV

Richard Secrist, City of Mesquite, Director, Development Services Dept presented the application

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the City planned to replace all of the historic windows with new glass?

Secrist stated that yes.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked that they wanted to use bronze glass, is the existing glass was tinted or colored?

Secrist said no.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that it would change the look of the building.

Secrist said slightly, yes.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked how much would it cost to rehab the window frames?

Secrist stated that to take out the frames, fabricate new if needed, and paint they are estimating it to be \$25,000.

Commissioner Rappa asked why the bronze glass?

Secrist stated that it was climate control and energy conservation.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if there were an alternative, what would it be?

Secrist stated that he didn't know but could explore other options.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that the question really was for staff.

Palmer stated that *Reed* might be able to help answer the question.

Reed stated that usually replacing clear glass with tinted isn't advisable. If the glass wasn't tinted historically, it should be used now. Perhaps blinds on the interior would be preferable to keep the same color of glass.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if the applicant was willing to work with staff to explore other options to retain the integrity of the building?

Secrist stated that certainly he would.

Commissioner Rappa asked if all of the glass needs to be replaced?

Secrist stated that possibly some of the glass could be reused.

Palmer stated that in other buildings in Southern Nevada, such as in Boulder City, they have used interior storm windows to keep the heat load down might be another option.

Vice Chair Stoldal said that the City has received quite a bit of grant money from the Commission so protecting the character-defining features is important.

Secrist stated that when they started the project, they wanted to do it right and make sure that the contractors are following the Standards for Rehabilitation.

- 81) 12. Harrison House, Harrison House, Inc.
Stanton Wilkerson, President of Harrison House, Inc. presented the application.

Chair Ostrovsky asked about the amount quoted for HVAC was it \$117,000.

Wilkerson stated that no, that wasn't just for the HVAC for a considerable number of rehabilitation activities that he named from the list (i.e. fixtures, permits, painting, HVAC, kitchen bathroom).

Chair Ostrovsky asked about the roof, what is the cost of that?

Wilkerson stated that that \$4,436.00. This number is different that the application because they had asked another contractor to sharpen the numbers.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that he appreciated that effort and that they had found other funding for work on the building.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that it was a matter of public record that there was a time when the liens were placed on the property due to failure to pay property taxes. This has since been resolved. Who now owns the building and is there a mortgage on the property or has that been paid off?

Wilkerson called on Katie Duncan to answer the question.

Duncan stated that the Ward 5 Chamber of Commerce is the property owner. They have paid off the property taxes, it is fully insured (after they did some work to make it habitable), and there is a mortgage on the property.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that the images provided by Commission staff highlight the condition of the building. He also stated that they appear to show a trailer on the property with water and power leading to it. Is someone living on the property?

Duncan stated that yes, due to the condition of the neighborhood; they needed 24-hour security at the property. In addition, two artists-in-residence provide maintenance, janitorial, and facilities staff as well. She also lives in the Pearl Bailey cottage in the back as part of the security team. They had two choices with the budget, either remove the items that they had already paid for from the \$180,000 total or start with a new budget from another contactor. They went with a new budget, but unfortunately, it didn't cover the commercial kitchen or the solar panels on the roof.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the commercial kitchen and the laundry. Can the Commission fund these items?

Palmer stated that in previous grant rounds, if the items are installed into the building, and therefore are not portable, they could be funded. The commercial kitchen does need to be installed and therefore would qualify.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the laundry facilities, are those eligible?

Palmer stated that staff was uncertain about this item. Staff could not determine if the equipment was permanently installed in the building or whether it was temporary or removable. We would need more information.

Duncan stated that for the kitchen, they planned to put a fire suppression system, a hood/fan, a stove, and a refrigerator.

Vice Chair Stoldal said that is where the numbers are a little uncertain.

Duncan said that the \$30,000 was in the \$180,000 budget. However, they didn't break down the individual line items; they just provided a single number. They have gone back and received firmer estimates for kitchen equipment. They might not have put those in the application, but they do have them.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked *Palmer* if they would check each item to make certain that it met the Standards and if it was portable.

Palmer stated that yes, before any funding agreement was created, they would examine each item from the revised scope of work and budget. If it were temporary and removable, it would not be allowable.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the roof and that it currently wouldn't support solar.

Duncan said that they approached this project as if they wouldn't be funded. Instead of repairing the roof, they have been patching the roof. If the Commission funded the project, they could put on a new roof and they wouldn't have to consistently patch the old roof. Part of the challenge with making this center available to the public, is keeping the power bill paid. The power consumption is large and if there was solar on the roof, they could keep the consumption down and she wouldn't have to write checks every month to keep the non-profit functioning.

Vice Chair Stoldal if the \$17,000 included preparing the roof for solar?

Duncan yes, it would. But, not the solar itself.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked staff about whether solar panels would be consistent with the Standards and is the Commission able to fund?

Palmer stated that the Standards do address sustainable building practices, but asked *Reed* to explain further.

Reed stated that indeed sustainable building practices can be compatible with the Standards, the office has reviewed the installation of solar panels on historic buildings in the Review and Compliance, Section 106, program. It would probably be an allowable work item, but staff would be concerned about where they might be placed, whether they would be visible from the public right-of-way, would they affect the integrity of the property? All of those items would be evaluated by staff.

Duncan stated that she was unaware of any historic house museum that was LEED certified in the country or world. Once they complete the project and are LEED green certified, they will be a first and then they can come back and teach everyone how to do it.

Wilkerson stated that they are prepared to comply with the requirements of the Commission.

Reed stated that she believed that there were many museums that were LEED certified.

Duncan stated that not private house museums.

Reed stated that she would need to do a little research.

Commissioner Simon asked if the solar panels were included in the application.

Duncan stated that no, those would come later.

Commissioner Simon stated that they couldn't install the solar panels until the roof was replaced.

Duncan stated that if they got the right roofing contractor, some would install the solar panels at the same time as the roof, which is negotiable.

Commissioner Simon stated that if approved and funded, staff would need to work closely with the project to ensure that the panels were installed in the right location.

Duncan stated that they have been working closely with the City of Las Vegas' historic preservation officer, Courtney Mooney, before she left and with the LEED people to ensure that the right location and materials were selected. There is really only one location that wouldn't work and that a lot of work could be done with affecting the National Register listing. Mooney was encouraging her to move forward.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that he didn't know that the Old Mormon Fort was in West Las Vegas.

Duncan stated that for them it is on the west side so they consider it in west Las Vegas. They are looking at the entire Pioneer Trail as a revitalization initiative with all parties working together.

8m) 13. Pioneer Hotel, The Western Folklife Center, Inc.

Chair Ostrovsky announced that this application has been withdrawn by the applicant.

8n) 14. Tonopah Historic Mining Park Silver Top Head Frame Rehabilitation, Tonopah Historic Mining Park Foundation.

Don Southwick, Trustee & Secretary, Tonopah Historic Mining Park Foundation, presented the application.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if the Foundation had ever done any work on this head frame? Had they previously stabilized it and it failed or has it been stable and is now failing?

Southwick stated that they haven't done any work on it. It has been standing for 110 years, but a wet winter and a strong wind could blow it down. The timbers are large and the foundation is crumbling underneath.

Chair Ostrovsky asked when was the Park opened.

Bill Wahl stated 1999.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that he was there on opening day and the walking tour doesn't go near the Silver Top because of its state. He is trying to determine the risks of losing the head frame. They don't want to lose it, but what is the risk? How close are we to losing it?

Southwick stated that since the application was submitted, new estimates have shown that the area right around the shaft where the head frame is needs stabilization. They need to get heavy equipment up there and the area cannot support it. They would like to break the rehabilitation into two parts: Stabilize the ground so that they can get heavy equipment safely up there that is what they would like the first grant to do. Once that is complete, they can get the heavy equipment up and support the head frame while they repair the foundation. The budget, which was originally \$336,000, will now be in the \$300,000 range just to support the area. They need to support the collar of the mine and the area around that so that big heavy equipment can get up there.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that he needed a little clarification. It sounds like there are two phases, one to stabilize the area so that they can do the work, the second would be to work on the Silver Top Head frame. Will this be \$125,000?

Southwick stated that it is more in the range of \$300,000.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated just to get the equipment up there.

Southwick stated that is correct.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that if they don't get the full \$300,000 but instead get only \$115,000 that isn't going to be sufficient.

Southwick stated that they have a head frame stabilization fund that they have fund-raisers and donors contributing to that is growing. Anything that the Commission can grant would be used to stabilize the area around the head frame as part of phase 1.

Commissioner Rappa asked why the stabilization was needed. Are there underground tunnels from the mining?

Southwick stated that the head frame is on a little hill, the shaft is 1500' deep in the middle of the hill. The collar, where the shaft meets the surface, is wood. When they rehabilitated the collar of the Mizpah, the wood was all full of dry rot and they spent \$105,000 on that project which replaced the collar with a concrete collar going down about 15'. Atkinson construction was believed to have spent about \$250,000 in construction costs and they ate that cost. They needed a crane for that work. With the Mizpah, the area was flat and they could get the crane in easily. The Silver Top has different problems and they have to take it in stages.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if any consideration has been given for temporary stabilization? He would hate to see the head frame collapse. Could there be a steel reinforcement installed around it without cranes? If they do get some money and it only goes into a growing fund that is waiting until there are sufficient funds, he is concerned about the legal time frames built into the sale of bonds and whether the project could meet those time frames. He understands that it is an iconic resource and anyone who stops in Tonopah wants to see it.

Southwick stated that he understands that the Commission doesn't want to put the money in a hole

Commissioner Simon asked if there has been any thought about dismantling it and storing it or would that do more damage?

Southwick stated that the money would be used to put a foam plug down the shaft down to a depth of about 50'. This foam is what the Division of Minerals uses to seal up open shafts. However, if there will be a piece of heavy equipment next to the shaft, the plug has to be deeper than what a truck driving over it would require. If there is a crane picking up the head frame, spreading out the weight, the shaft has to be stabilized to a deeper depth to hold the weight. At the same time, they will need to create a pad where the crane can lift the back part and release the pressure on the front feet.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked how deep was the plug?

Southwick stated that it was about 50’.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the expenses, is the biggest expense the plug?

Southwick stated that there are three different expenses: the foam is expensive, leveling off and securing the pad for the equipment, and finally attaching some support cables to further stabilize the head frame. That is what the Commission’s money would be used for. In addition, the Foundation will need to raise about \$100,000 and they think that is doable.

Chair Ostrovsky asked over what period of time?

Wahl, member of Foundation since 2000. They were able to raise about \$100,000 quickly. Last week he made eight phone calls and he was able to get \$30,000.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if this was in the next 100 days?

Wahl stated that yes it was.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked roughly how much the plug costs?

Wahl stated that the Division of Minerals plugged another shaft about 1/6 the size for about \$25,000. *Wahl* meet with Rich Perry of the Division last Monday night and he thought that the State might include that in its hazardous mines program.

Commissioner Rappa stated that living in Tuscarora, she is familiar with plugging sinkholes and other mining features around town. Are there any tunnels in or near the facility?

Wahl stated that they are all over the facility.

Commissioner Rappa stated that it is her concern with when one area is stabilized another area will collapse. A plug being put in and then a crane on top scare her. Has there been any thought about relocating the head frame?

Wahl stated that the timbers are so dry and brittle that if you tweak them they might not be able to go together again. The design of the head frame truss is to have all of the timbers in compression. As the timbers have shrunk, they are now in tension rather than compression. There are cross members at least 1-2 feet away from where they are supposed to be seating.

Southwick stated that one of the first engineering firms who looked at the head frame said why don’t you take the head frame apart, label the pieces, fix the foundation, and put the entire thing back together. On the surface that sounds fine, but their biggest fear is that if they take it apart, they might not be able to put it back together again.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated and then what if it collapses.

Southwick said the next idea was to tie the feature together with netting and then get a big crane to lift it, move it aside, and then fix shaft, and then put it back together. That still leaves a place to put the crane. The area around the shaft needs to be stabilized no matter what.

- 8o) 15. Nevada Northern Railway Machine Shop, Nevada Northern Railway Foundation, Inc. Mark Bassett, Executive Director, Nevada Northern Railway Foundation presented the application.

Chair Ostrovsky asked about the engineering and construction parts of the budget. How firm are the numbers since the engineering isn't done yet?

Bassett stated that the section of ground they are going to be using hasn't been disturbed since 1941. He is concerned that there may be additional subsurface issues that they will find once they tear the track out. He based the estimate on another previous project where they had a bridge fail and after the engineering was done, it came to approximately \$100,000. While can likely twist the arm of the engineer and the contractor, at a minimum they are still looking at \$120,000 or so.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if they needed to take up the entire track near the Machine Shop?

Bassett stated that yes; they needed to take up the entire track in the area where they will likely come across contaminated soils that will also need to be dealt with.

Commissioner Rappa asked what plans are in place to ensure that it doesn't happen again?

Bassett stated that they were planning to place heaters in the flange ways next to the rails to help with the freezing and they also keep the snow out as much as possible since it is in the shade. The combination of better drainage and heating system will take care of the problem.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked why they couldn't wash the boilers in another area?

Bassett stated that most of their washes occur in the summer but that all of the tooling they need to work on the washes is in the Machine Shop. These washes are conducted with a fire hose and take thousands of gallons of water.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the cost of this might be better spent on moving the washing elsewhere?

Bassett stated that they have drainage in the Machine Shop and most of it does go down the drains, but just when they spray the boilers, they get water all over the place. The project would allow them to put in valley gutters to capture most of the water so that it goes into the drainage and not into the ground.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that there wasn't a detailed budget in the application, but that there was a \$15,000 for an architect and an additional \$50,000 for Engineering.

Bassett stated that it should be \$50,000 for the Engineering and \$100,000 for the construction but no architect.

Chair Ostrovsky asked how many acres was the facility.

Bassett said that it was 56 acres with over 76 buildings and structures.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if in the facility there was only one track?

Bassett stated that in the main yard there are eight tracks.

Chair Ostrovsky stated but only one was going to be worked on?

Bassett stated yes.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the ability of trains to run the entire length of the track. How close are they to being able to run the entire length?

Bassett stated that a section of the line is involved in a lawsuit that he hopes will be settled this year. It is not the historic line, which has 36 miles of track, but the commercial line, which has 128 miles of track on the north end.

8p) 16. McGill Depot, Nevada Northern Railway Foundation, Inc.
Mark Bassett, President, Nevada Northern Railway Foundation presented the application.

Chair Ostrovsky asked Bassett to walk him through the budget. What does the \$95,000 buy?

Bassett flooring has areas that rather thin (\$20,000) interior rough work has been done and they want to get the finish carpentry done (doors), \$45,000 for water and sewer since the building has bathrooms. They are currently down to their studs and it doesn't make sense to finish them if there isn't any water and sewer.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if this would connect to the water and sewer in McGill or would it be a septic tank?

Bassett stated that it would connect the building to the existing water and sewer in McGill. Unfortunately, the existing water and sewer pipe has to be replaced. Toilets are important for the building because there aren't facilities in the vicinity.

Commissioner Tors asked about the ongoing operations at the building. It is sporadically used, are volunteers checking on the building regularly?

Bassett stated that an employee lives near the building and checks on the building every day. There is power to the building and it is very well lit at night.

Chair Ostrovsky closed the public hearing on items 8a-8p minus 8m, which was withdrawn. *Chair Ostrovsky* asked what budget sheets they were to use to create the budget.

Palmer stated that it was the sheet with their names across the top.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that each Commissioner was to figure out an award for the applicants and a budget that totaled \$950,000.

Palmer stated that in prior years, the Commissioners have attempted to come back with a balanced budget totaling the award amount available. Staff will turn off the projector, input the numbers from each Commissioner that will produce an average award for the applicant, and then the spreadsheet will total the awards and when the public returns, the numbers will be projected on the screen.

Chair Ostrovsky stated then they go down the list, project by project, and discuss why each Commissioner awarded the amount they did if they differ to try to come to a consensus. The applicants are here to answer any questions if needed.

Chair Ostrovsky closed the meeting and asked the public to leave for about 30 minutes so that the Commissioners could work on their budgets and give the numbers to staff. **2:04pm**

9. Discussion and awarding of grants 2:15pm.

Chair Ostrovsky described the awarding process and the starting numbers that the Commission was going to have projected on the screen. The numbers are not final and they can change during the discussion process. *Chair Ostrovsky* asked the numbers to be posted.

The initial Commissioner award in a spreadsheet was presented on the screen for the public to review.

Chair Ostrovsky explained that each Commissioner has been allotted \$950,000 and has distributed the total as requested. *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that he will ask Commissioners with the lowest and the highest awards to discuss their decision and then he started with the first request.

- A. Fallon Theatres: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$46,828.00 but that the average was \$31,517 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners. After discussion, the consensus was \$37,000.
- B. El Rancho Hotel: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$150,000 but that the average was \$74,717 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners. After discussion, the consensus was \$75,000.
- C. Fourth Ward School: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$217,310 but that the average was \$107,500 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners. After discussion, the consensus was \$100,000.
- D. First United Methodist Church: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$51,000 but that the average was \$15,600 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if \$20,000 was mentioned in the presentation?

Helmreich stated that yes, that that total was \$25,600 but that they were requesting \$20,000.

After discussion, the consensus was \$20,000.

- E. Douglas County High School: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$38,978 but that the average was \$25,667 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

Chair Ostrovsky asked Rogers to come and discuss what would happen if they received \$25,000.

Rogers stated that they would have to raise the difference. They had bids from three contractors one was \$40,000 the next was \$50,000, and the third contractor said that he would remove the stairs and replace them but he didn't send in a bid.

Chair Ostrovsky asked what other resources they had to complete the project.

Rogers stated that according to *Palmer* they would have 24 months to complete the project so they would continue to fund raise or look for other grants.

Commissioner Olmstead asked about the other two tenants in the building. Would they be able to contribute?

Rogers stated that one was the Chamber of Commerce that is on a very tight budget and the other was the Visitors and Tourism Authority and they receive room tax revenue that is very competitive. She didn't see that as an option.

Rappa asked about mining companies in the area. They can often provide concrete.

Rogers stated that there weren't mining companies but there are larger contractors.

Simon stated that she felt that the flagpole needs to be addressed with staff since it isn't historic and may interfere with the stairs.

After discussion, the consensus was \$25,000.

F. Thunderbird Lodge: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$185,000 down from the original \$215,000 request but that the average was \$84,833 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners. After discussion, the consensus was \$95,000.

G. Stewart Indian School Auditorium: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$221,395 but that the average was \$113,000 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners. After discussion, the consensus was \$79,000.

H. Washoe County Library: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$75,000 but that the average was \$20,333 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

Chair Ostrovsky asked *Palmer* to discuss the items in the request.

Palmer stated that in accord with precedent set by the Commission, access is the way to look at the request. Anything that improves access and visibility probably would be consistent with the requirements of the Commission. However, this is a grey area with some items seen as landscape and not access. For example, the railings are integral to the building so one might think of those as access issues. It is up to the Commission how they want to interpret their statutes.

Commissioner Simon asked about the cost of the railings.

Scott stated that the railings were \$20,000.

Vice Chair Stoldal said that he was concerned that railings are considered access issues but that lighting wasn't.

Palmer stated that this was a grey area and the access could be improved by railings, but that a flagpole might be seen as landscaping.

Commissioner Simon stated that the library does need to be more inviting and that the railings would do that. She didn't know about the flagpole though.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that with the number of emergencies that they have to deal with, trying to force feed a good project through their requirements just didn't make him comfortable. The Washoe County Library is a good building, but the proposal just doesn't fit.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that they should table this request and move on.

Commissioner Olmstead stated that she could see a case for the railings as important to preserving the walls.

- I. Goldfield High School: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$85,000 but that the average was \$57,667 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners.

Chair Ostrovsky was the lowest award and he asked John to come up to discuss the project.

Ekman described this as the last stage in the stabilization of the building. The building has an interior and exterior wall. The exterior, red brick wall, is failing and bricks are falling out. The walls need steel bracing and the reconstruction. At half of what they asked for they can do the reinforcement of the interior stone wall but not the red brick exterior. At \$60,000, they could do a little more. He described the process of seeking a contractor to do the work. He also described how they were able to get the stone lintels from a demolished building that had been sent to Miller's rest stop returned by NDOT and will be used for the reconstruction of the south wall.

After discussion, the consensus was \$60,000.

- J. Neon Museum: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$120,000 but that the average was \$48,000 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners. After discussion, the consensus was \$60,000.
- K. Mesquite High School: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$40,000 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners. After discussion, the consensus was \$30,000.
- L. Harrison House: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for originally for \$120,000 but they dropped it to \$156,000 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners. After discussion, the consensus was \$90,000.
- M. Tonopah Mining Park, Silver Top Head Frame: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$226,483 and asked for discussion from the Commissioners. After discussion, the consensus was \$100,000.
- N. Nevada Northern Railway, Machine Shop: *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that the request was for \$150,000 and that all Commissioners supported the proposal. At this time, he wanted to discuss this application and #16 for McGill.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that the two projects together are about \$229,000 combined. *Chair Ostrovsky* asked Bassett to return to discuss the two projects. He asked *Bassett* that if he had to choose which project would he fund or which portion of each project would he want to fund.

Bassett stated that the track in front of the machine shop is critical. It is reaching the point that it is becoming dangerous to move equipment in and out of the Machine Shop.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that however, \$50,000 would get the flooring and water/sewer in the McGill Depot.

Bassett stated that the averages now (#15 at \$81,667 and #16 at \$48,333) he could make work.

Chair Ostrovsky asked *Tilley* to put in \$81,000 for #15 and \$48,000 for #16.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that that leaves the Commission with \$50,000 remaining to distribute.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that of the projects, the City of Wells came in short and that is an emergency that requires stabilizing the building. The Goldfield High School is also stabilizing an historic building. He would like to look to those that are in the emergency category.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that they also no decided what to do with Washoe County Library either. *Chair Ostrovsky* asked to go back to #8 to discuss perhaps putting some money to the railings that were \$20,000 for example.

Commissioner Olmstead asked that they put \$20,000 to the railings that will secure the wall.

Commissioner Rappa asked if they put \$20,000 to the library that would leave \$30,000 for Wells?

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that if had to split the remaining he would give \$20,000 to Wells and \$30,000 to Goldfield.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if that would leave \$0 for Washoe County?

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that yes, it wasn't an emergency project.

Commissioner Tors stated that there could be a compromise here since she has watched the wonderful work they are doing at the Washoe County Library and giving something to the railings would be a nod to the project with the idea that they could come back next year with some interior work that is more consistent with the Commission's mandate.

Commissioner Simon asked *Scott* to return to the podium. *Commissioner Simon* asked what would \$10,000 or \$20,000 do for the railings?

Scott stated that they could see what they could do. They could simply cap the wall and have a partial additional piece with railings.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that he agreed with *Commissioner Tors* that there are probably quite of many items in the building that could be funded by the Commission and that another application with more construction activities would be received with open arms by the Commission.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if a partial award would work?

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that he would be fine with \$10,000 for the railings and \$30,000 for the other two projects.

Commissioner Rappa stated that she was thinking of a similar split.

Commissioner Simon stated that she could support this proposal.

Chair Ostrovsky asked how the remaining \$40,000 would be split.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that it should be equally split with \$20,000 each to Wells and Goldfield High School.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that the new totals for Wells would be \$95,000, Goldfield High School would be \$80,000, and Washoe County Library would be \$10,000.

The Vice Chair made a motion to approve the awards as depicted on the spreadsheet totaling \$950,000 with the direction that with the requirement that each grantee work with staff to ensure that their project is consistent with the Secretary of Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation.

Commissioner Rappa seconded the motion.

Chair Ostrovsky asked for comments. There were no comments.

Chair Ostrovsky called for a vote.

The motion passed unanimously.

9. Letter from the Commission to the Board of Finance requesting the sale of bonds in the amount of \$1,000,000.00.

Commissioner Simon made a motion to direct staff to prepare a letter from the Commission to the Board of Finance requesting the sale of bonds in the amount of \$1,000,000.00.

Commissioner Tors seconded the motion.

Chair Ostrovsky asked for any discussion. There were no comments.

Chair Ostrovsky called for a vote.

The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Ostrovsky thanked the Commissioners for all of their hard work today.

12. Public Comment

Bassett thanked the Commissioners for doing such a good job. *Bassett* stated that this is the second grant hearing in a row where the meeting has conflicted with Rural Roundup; perhaps the Commission could coordinate with TravelNevada to ensure that there isn’t a conflict in the future. *Bassett* noted that in NRS 383.500, the amount of bond that can be sold to support the Commission can reach a maximum of \$3 million a year and there is definitely a need. Although if you had \$2 million there would be \$4 million in requests, your job hasn’t gotten any easier. The economy has turned around but we are still at 2011 numbers.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that the conflict will be noted and that arrangement will avoid this conflict in the future. *Chair Ostrovsky* stated that Legislature reviews and decides the amount of bonds that will be sold and that grantees should make their concerns known to their legislator.

Bassett asked which Committee should he write to?

Chair Ostrovsky stated it would Chairman of Finance and Chairman of Ways and Means.

Commissioner Rappa stated that a postcard campaign is often effective and way to get a response from a Legislator.

Commissioner Olmstead stated that resolutions from non-profit organizations and charitable endowments supporting full funding the program might also be effective.

Chair Ostrovsky asked for other public comment.

Berney stated that he was very thankful to the Commission and how well they worked together.

Duncan thanked the Commission for the award and that as the only African American cultural center in Nevada this is very good step to help continue dialogue in the state.

Southwick thanked the Commission for the award and that with this they can get the shaft plugged, some dead men to support the head frame, and hopefully there will be funding to repair the foundation as well.

Chair Ostrovsky asked for any other public comments. There were no comments.

Chair Ostrovsky called for adjournment.

Adjournment at 4:04 pm