

**Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation  
June 3, 2020  
Meeting Minutes**

Video conferenced: (via Join.me) and Conference Calling

- 1. Call to order by Chairman Robert Ostrovsky, (*the Chair*) at 10:05 am.**
- 2. 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 Library and Literacy) **Present**  
Patricia Olmstead (At-Large, Governor's Appointee) **Present**  
Bill Marion (Nevada Humanities) **Present (joined later)**  
Gail Rappa (Nevada Arts Council) **Present**  
E'sha Hoferer (Native American Representative) **Present (joined later)**

***Chair determined a quorum was present.***

Staff Present:

Rebecca Palmer, Historic Preservation Office  
Craig Burkett, Senior Deputy, Attorney General's Office  
Kristen Brown, Historic Preservation Office  
Carla Hitchcock, Historic Preservation Office  
Shana Johnson, Historic Preservation Office

Public:

Jay Howard, NDSP, Mel Green, Craig M. Burkett, John Helmreich, Arika Perry, Ralston Pedersen (Robison Eng.), Candace Wheeler, Garney Damele, Eureka Restoration, Laurel Marshall, Stephen Tibbals, Tony Manfredi - Nevada Arts Council, Do Co Historical Society, Ann Carpenter, Kristy La Belle, Jeff Scott, H Russell McMullen - Western Folklife Center, Ella B. Trujillo, Brew-Nevada State Prison, Jennifer Kleven- Neon Museum, Dana Toth- North Central Nevada Historical Society, Linda Clements, Fallon Theatre, Ron Applegate, Do Co Historical Society - Dennis Little, John Crowley, Esha Hoferer, Jeff Scott, Heidi Swank (NPF), Mark Bassett, Brew-Nevada State Prison, Mayor Nathan Robertson, Western Folklife Center, Margo Memmott, Chris Mulkerns, Bill Marion, Tia Mittelstadt, Susan Wetmore, Mark Jensen, BAC Carson City, & 19 other participant(s)

(Information downloaded from Join.Me)

- 3. Public comment:**  
*The Chair* asked for any public comment.

*Rebecca Palmer* stated that we had a public comment come in prior to the meeting from Thunderbird Lodge Preservation Society.

*Carla Hitchcock* states this comment is from Bill Watson with the Thunderbird Lodge and reads:

Greeting Commissioners, staff, and fellow applicants. I am submitting this public comment today not as a representative of applicant Thunderbird Lake Tahoe, but in my capacity as Managing Director for Foundation36, a Nevada non-profit corporation dedicated to preserving and protecting Nevada's natural, cultural, and historic treasures. Each of you who receives a CCCHP grant today in the amount of \$5,000 or more may apply for a matching grant from Foundation 36. We have a limited number of \$5,000 grants available and two \$10,000 grants available. If you wish to be considered for one of these matching grants, please e-mail your inquiry to me at [Watson@NV36.com](mailto:Watson@NV36.com) on June 5, 2020 or thereafter. Provide a brief description of your project, biographies of key personnel, and explain how these incremental dollars will help you achieve your preservation goals. Foundation 36 will respond to qualifying applicants by mid-August and lump sum grants will be disbursed by check once your organization executes its funding agreement with the State of Nevada. Because of my affiliation with both organizations, Thunderbird is ineligible to receive these matching funds. Preference will be given to rural Nevada organizations who have little or no opportunity to build a donor network or raise matching gifts in their communities. These matching funds are underwritten by a Silicon Valley tech company C.E.O. who has fallen in love with Nevada history and wishes to remain anonymous. He realizes these are difficult times, especially for institutions committed to saving Nevada's cultural heritage. Our benefactor offers this small token of his gratitude in support of your efforts. Respectfully, Bill Watson, Managing Director

*Carla Hitchcock* proceeds with public comment per Chairs direction by Fallon Theatre, Mike Berney.

First off we would like to thank the Commission for funds granted to us thru the 2017 grant process and we would like to especially thank the State Historic Preservation Office staff for their tremendous help with the process after receiving the grant. We have had a structural inspection performed by Mel Green and he felt that the work needed on our historic Fallon Theatre would be around \$110,000 and with that a new roofing structure + roofing (roofing bid was \$61,750) would be needed so that is our major need this grant cycle. We have had on going problems with the main roof on the theater, even after extensive repairs and it definitely needs to be replaced. We have also asked for grant money to replace our existing heating/cooling systems (bid was \$268,000). We are really excited at continuing to renovate & protect our 'century old' building.

*The Chair* asks if there is any other public comment

*Carla Hitchcock* states not at this time.

**4. Staff Announcements and summary of the status of Commission grants for the FY17-18 cycle.**

*The Chair* states he would like to start with his own personal comments.

We got twenty-five grant requests, nine new facilities, \$5,862,000 in requests and \$2,850,000 of Legislative Authority so we have a shortfall of about \$3 million dollars. I think everyone who has participated in this grant cycle in the past knows this is not a new problem. We will be making some difficult decisions today. Some will be fully funded, and some will definitely be partially funded. The funding question I have waiting and we made inquiry to the state, as of our last inquiry, bond sales were still anticipated, but I would like to make sure that everyone understands that (inaudible) We will be writing a letter to the State Treasurer. The sale of those bonds, the availability to folks that meet these grant commitments which we will make today, are all subject to the states bonding compacity. I have no information other than the treasures office has indicated that its ok for us to go ahead have these meetings and review these grants. Remember when your funded, whatever level you are, there is no money to spend until the state actually sells those bonds and make those funds available to the division to fund these grants. I also want to remind everyone that this is a technical milestone. I don't know of any other meeting of the state that we had so many participants that are not just observers, but participants includes every member or grant organization. We will have technical issues today I'm sure. If technical issues arise, which affect commission members, I will pause and tell those commission members (inaudible, phone ringing) If one of the grant applicants has a technical issue and is unable to answer questions, for example, for technical reasons, we may pass on you but we will come back to you. I will pause for commissioners, for other folks I will have to come back later to get your answer to questions, for example. Hopefully it will be limited, and everyone will get their opportunity to make their response. If people drop off, we will wait to get them back. Please remember to mute if you are not speaking. With as many people as we have on this, we need to be very careful about background sound. Also, to remind you if you are using a computer or a phone, plug it into a power source. This will not be a short meeting. It's very possible that if you are using a device that is running on batteries, they may exhaust during the hearing. The plan is after all the opening remarks, when we get to the issue of the grants, we will be asking questions of the applicants. We have eliminated the presentations to save on time and our ability to really manage this function. I assure you that every applicant will be asked at least one question which will allow them to come forward and make statements. Please keep your answers on point. Don't use this as an opportunity to make a presentation. We have literally thousands of pages of documents we have received. All of the commissioners have taken (inaudible) review all of those items. We will be doing that and then taking a break, then questions and do the scoring and the discussion afterwards. I ask everyone to be flexible. Its new to me as it is to you and hopefully we can get thru this in a timely fashion. I will let staff take over comments at this point.

*Rebecca Palmer* I am presenting what is left in our awards. All of the 2017-2018 CCCHP grant have been completed all with the exception of three grants that were extended with permission from the Chair. These extensions were based on requirements for obtaining contractors for materials that had been delayed due to COVID-19 responses. The first one is Goldfield Historical Society. The contractor was not able to visit the property and work on the project. They have a remaining balance of \$85,000. The second grant that was extended was for the Ward 5 Chamber of Commerce, Harrison House. That grant has been extended to the 1<sup>st</sup> of July. They have a remaining dollar amount of \$5,282 and the final grant that was extended was the Nevada Northern Railway Foundation, machine shop, it has been extended to July 31<sup>st</sup>, 2020. With a remaining funds to be reimbursed of \$77,121. Their concern is due to COVID-19 Issues the materials have not yet arrived. In total we have a remaining funds to be expended of \$199,356 for all of the proceeds that we have. The Commission awarded \$5000 to the Fourth Ward school in their September meeting. We have not awarded that yet and working with the grantee have chosen to roll that over into this next grant award assuming they receive one. If they do not receive an award in this grant cycle we will prepare a funding agreement for the \$5000 and any remaining proceeds, per the commissions requirements of the September meeting. I would be happy to answer questions on the remaining balance remaining for the FY17-18 grant.

*Commissioner Rappa* I am getting so much feedback. Everybody please mute your microphones, or this will not work all day. We are getting a lot of feedback and phones going off. That is all thank you.

*The Chair* Yes, that is an improvement, thank you. Are there any other commissioners that have any announcements? Mr. Stoldal you give background comments usually. Do you have any for today's meeting?

*Vice Chair Stoldal* Mr. Chairman, the comments that I had were prepared, I subsequently moved them, but the point that I feel is critical, and I am sure that everybody at this meeting has read the statutes that governing this Commission under NRS 383.510 and under the law as well as the policies and procedures that have been set up with this Commission for more than a decade. The law specifically says that financial assistance may only be awarded for the actual expenses of preserving or protecting historical buildings, that will be used to develop a network of cultural centers and activities. Now the criteria for granting full or partial assistance must include and is not limited to the following. The key here is, and it is said throughout the law, the statutes, that projects coming before us must show they have the ability to move forward without the necessity of future state financial support. Other keys are that the projects will be accessible to the full community, promote tourism, and can be used in multiple ways for the different cultural organizations; the Arts Humanities. The Commission also will give priority to projects of statewide historical, prehistorical, cultural significance and projects that demonstrate the ability to raise and sustain the required amounts of financial support from other sources other than the state of Nevada. Again, there's a key

in the key there is the ability of a project to raise and sustain support was also be weighed against the relative means and abilities of the applicants and the communities around the state. The record of this Commission clearly reflects full funding for some of the smaller projects that can be completed within the grant cycle and partial financial assistance for the larger projects that can also be, as the law mentions, can sustain financial support from other sources, other than the State of Nevada. (Inaudible)

*Rebecca Palmer* asks audience to mute themselves as there is a lot of background noise and feedback.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* continues, Finally, the Commission will also give consideration of projects that are emergencies, roofs and maybe foundations. And those projects that will the assist the Commission as it addresses the needs of geographic and demographic balance. Mr. chairman, I appreciate your indulgence for going over those key things as we look over these important projects.

*The Chair* Thank you Mr. Stoldal. I notice it really falls under item 7 which we will get too but we always get that little review and I appreciate it. My understanding and I want to make it clear Rebecca, the \$199,000 yet to be expended, that that's not available money, that's money that's committed but not yet expended right?

*Rebecca Palmer* that is money that has been committed but not expended.

*The Chair* Thank you. On occasion we've had money that rolled over from another grant cycle, and that is not what we are talking about here. So, I appreciate that. Would you like to give us an update on item #5, Washoe County Library System?

**5. Review of request by Washoe County Library System (CCCHP -17-08) to reimburse expenditure made prior to funding agreement reimbursement period (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION).**

*Rebecca Palmer* state that in the FY 17 cycle the Commission awarded \$10,632 to the Washoe County Library system. A funding agreement was prepared with the commencement date of July 1st of 2019, and the completion date of May the 1st 2020. Unbeknown to us the grantee completed the project April 29th of 2019, prior to the commencement date established in the funding agreement. The funding agreement was sent to the grantee on May 14th, 2019 and received back signed in August 2019. Th expenditure that the grantee is seeking reimbursement for of \$10,632, occurred prior to the commence date of the funding agreement. At this point, as the part of the guidance staff received from the Commission, the reimbursement request received July 12th, we would not be able to reimburse because it occurred prior to the July 1, 2019 commencement date. The grantee has requested that we bring this issue forward to the Commission to request a potential waiver of that requirement so that staff can reimburse the request received on the 12th of July 2019. That concludes my summary.

*The Chair* asked if any commissioners have questions for Rebecca on this issue or other comments.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* asks to speak and is granted by the Chair.

I guess what we're doing here would be potentially setting a precedent and the question that comes to mind is how far back a project could be completed, that could come forward and ask for reimbursement? Was it finished before they came to us and got approval, or was it finished after they asked? I'm trying to get a sense, as I wasn't clear on the time frame. They came before us, asked for the money, we granted it. Had the project already been finished at that point?

*Rebecca Palmer* states the answer to the question is no. When they requested the grant and received the grant, they had not initiated the project. However, the funding agreement wasn't in place and didn't start until the 1st of July. The project was initiated and possibly completed in May of that year.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* If I understand correctly, the question would be can we set the precedence that once a project comes before the Commission, and is approved, in essence the applicant can then move forward before the deal is signed. I think the chairman made it clear off the top that these projects should not count on funding until the bonds are sold, so I'm concerned about setting the precedent.

*The Chair* ask if any of the other commissioners have any comment.

*Commissioner Simon* states that Jeff Scott is somewhere on the chat line and maybe we could ask him, why did he do this?

*Jeff Scott* comments, If I may, we used the funding already to pay for the project and that was done early and there were some technical issues with the contractor to get it done ahead of the, when the fund cycle was activated. So, all we are asking for, if the funding was activated to get reimbursement. So, we (inaudible) the grant, we received the grant, we moved ahead on the project, and go the project completed. We wouldn't expect funding until the funding was actually available so we're not asking for outside the cycle we just got it done about two weeks early. Before the funding was available so we're not asking for anything that's outside the funding cycle it was completed prior to so we were able to pay for that we just want to seek reimbursement as part of the grant.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* asks, the other issue here is, are we saying though that an applicant can start spending before an agreement is signed? That is a challenging (inaudible – too much background noise) that the applicants can just start spending money without an agreement finalized. It's a contract. Even though this Commission may approve a certain amount the contract has to be signed with the SHPO.

*The Chair* comments that people need to mute.



*Rebecca Palmer* comments, whoever is talking right now, you need to mute yourselves.

*The Chair* comments, Rebecca, we cannot continue if this keeps up.

*Rebecca Palmer* states, we are going to have to cancel this hearing if people cannot mute themselves.

*Craig Burkett* comments who you can see is unmuted.

*The Chair* asks Mr. Stoldal to continue.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* asks if he can be heard. This system is slow and does not respond well to mute and unmute. The question is whether we're setting an important precedence here by allowing the applicants from now on to the minute that this Commission grants a certain amount of money for a project that they can start immediately. Where right now they have to wait for a contract to be signed with SHPO. I would suggest that that's not a precedent we want to have. We want to be able to go through the process of hearing the applicant, determining the amount of money, and then an agreement, a contract, is signed with the State of Nevada. To start expending money before that contract is signed, I don't think, unless I'm reading too much into this, then I would ask the attorney general for an opinion. Thank you.

*Craig Burkett* I don't know that it's that clear from the statute, looking at it right now, that I can give you a definitive opinion on that. I'm going to say it is discretionary with the board, you can do as you please. If Mr. Stoldal is concerned with that and you all have that same concern, then I would say you can use that as your guiding principal. I don't know that the statutes that clear. I am looking at the statute right now and I can't see that its clearly telling me, giving direction to this board one way or another. I'm sorry, that is as clear as I can be.

*The Chair* asks if staff has a recommendation

*Rebecca Palmer* states, the covenants were not received until the 1st of November, they were not recorded until the 11<sup>th</sup> of September. The work occurred prior to the covenants both being recorded and received by our office, if that helps.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* getting back to what you announced at the beginning, this money is not guaranteed until the bonds are sold, and I think that the applicants are rolling the dice to start spending money. And if we approve the process that, well, its ok, you can go ahead and spend the money, is actually what we are saying, before the bonds are sold, don't worry about it. I think it sets up an unnecessary legal challenge later down the line. I think we need to clear that up right now. You get a grant and the way you move to the next step is signing an agreement with the State of Nevada. Do not spend any of that money until you have an agreement. There are certain elements in that contract

with the State of Nevada that have to be adhered to. I'm still worried about setting a precedence.

*The Chair* asks if there are any other Commissioners

*Commissioner Simon* asks if we can check with our attorney general again if this would be precedent setting or if there is a way to do this without it being precedent setting.

*(inaudible – background noise)*

*The Chair* states, just a comment from the Chair, they can come in for another grant request and go thru another cycle, (inaudible). Mr. Stoldal would you like to make a motion?

***Vice Chair Stoldal* I would like to make a motion that we not approve the request**

***Commissioner Rappa* seconds the motion**

*The Chair* asks if any other commission has comment. All those in favor of Mr. Stoldals motion, say Aye. **Commissioners Rappa and Stoldal respond Aye.**

*The Chair* asks, if any oppose.

***Commissioner Simon* states, she would like to abstain**

*The Chair* In those circumstances the motion does not carry. I might ask the attorney general (inaudible, background noise/talking)

*Carla Hitchcock* asks for whoever is speaking to please mute their phones if they are not speaking to the commission.

*The Chair* states he has a question for the Attorney General's office. I only have four commissioners present. Does it take a majority of those present to defeat a motion? Or do we need a quorum?

*Craig Burkett* I see Commissioner Olmstead's microphone is permanently on, did she participate in that vote?

*The Chair* asks if Patricia Olmstead is on. (no response)

*The Chair* asks if we have 4 of the 7 commissioners here and 3 vote, is that satisfactory?

*Craig Burkett* Yes it is. Three out of the four of you required pass a motion.

***The Chair* states then the motion passes.**



**6. Approval of minutes from previous meeting (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION).**

**6a) September 9, 2019**

Motion to approve minutes as submitted: *Vice Chair Stoldal*; second by *Commissioner Judith Simon*  
No Commissioner comments.

**Motion passed 2 Aye, 0 Nay**

*The Chair* comments that he notices Commissioner Bill Marion joining the video chat and welcomes him to the meeting.

*\*Continued background noise/unmuted microphone interruption*

*Commissioner Rappa* asks Rebecca if there is any way for the host to mute those who are not speaking.

*Rebecca* replies, unfortunately we can't, we can just remind people need to mute themselves. If you are an applicant and you have your phone or microphone unmuted, mute it now please.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* it seemed to me that the Attorney General's office was able to visually see whose microphone is on and off. Can someone pull that screen up and have that responsibility otherwise we are going to be here for the next 3-4 days trying to communicate.

*Gail Rappa* calls out those who still has their microphones on and asks them to mute.

**7. Discussion of Commission scoring method, grant review process, and review of statutory responsibilities of the Commission (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION).**

*The Chair* states the scoring method that we are going to use, ones we have used in the past, each commissioner has (inaudible) which includes a review of historic preservation issues, community impact, and accountability. Those are three standards we'll be using. Each Commissioner at the conclusion of the question and answer period will prepare a budget that will submitted to staff. They will combine those budgets into a single worksheet identified by each commissioner, and we will discuss those as necessary.

*\*Continued background noise/unmuted microphone interruption*

*The Chair* states that if this doesn't work, we will suspend this meeting and find another method to get this done.

*Commissioner Judith Simon* agrees and states we should do that because this is miserable, and it is not fair for the applicants.

*Rebecca Palmer* states she is not sure how we would accomplish a meeting under the existing extension of executive orders. We have to get a list of awards to get on a Board of Finance, Board of

Examiners meeting. If everyone can take five seconds to see if they are muted, we may be able to continue.

*The Chair* states that we need to make an effort and we will, but the patience of the Commissioners will only last so long.

*Commissioner Gail Rappa* I think that every time we lose audio for the whole meeting, it re-sets and unmutes everyone.

*Carla Hitchcock* states she thinks she has figured out how to mute everyone individually. I am going to mute everyone, but if you are calling in by phone you need to mute yourself as we cannot do this on our end. Hopefully that will help.

*The Chair* I would like to move onto the applicants. We are going to take them in the order they were received in the office.

**8. Review and testimony regarding the FY19-20 applications (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION).**

**Note: The Commission plans to take applicants in order of receipt (as represented below). The Commission reserves the right, however, to take applicants out of order. Applicant testimony, if needed, will be limited to answering Commissioner questions on the application as necessary.**

**CCCHP Application # Building Name Organization**

8a)	1 Ely Latter Day Saints Stake Tabernacle	White Pine Community Choir Association
8b)	2 Fourth Ward School Historic	Fourth Ward School Foundation
8c)	3 Miner’s Cabin, Virginia City Cemetery	Comstock Cemetery Foundation
8d)	4 Lani and Repetto Saloon and Eureka Brewery	Eureka Restoration Enterprise
8e)	5 Nevada State Prison	Nevada State Prison Preservation Society
8f)	6 Red House Historic Site	Nevada Division of State Parks
8g)	7 Carson Brewing Company	Brewery Arts Center
8h)	8 St. Teresa of Avila Catholic Church	Brewery Arts Center
8i)	9 Fallon Theatres	Fallon Community Theatre, Inc
8j)	10 Dangberg Home Ranch	Friends of Dangberg Home Ranch
8k)	11 Reno First United Methodist	Reno First United Methodist
8l)	12 St. Marie Louise Hospital	St. Mary's Art Center
8m)	13 Cumley-Richardson House, Greinstein Building, and St. Mary's Episcopal Church	North Central Nevada Historical Society
8n)	14 Douglas County Courthouse Genoa	Douglas County Historical Society
8o)	15 Carson & Colorado Railroad Depot	Lyon County
8p)	16 Tonopah Historic Mining Park	Tonopah Historic Mining Park Foundation
8q)	17 Transportation Building	Nevada Northern Railway Foundation, Inc
8r)	18 McGill Depot	Nevada Northern Railway Foundation, Inc
8s)	19 Ely City Hall	City of Ely
8t)	20 Goldfield High School	Goldfield Historical Society
8u)	21 The Pioneer Hotel Building	Western Folklife Center, Inc.
8v)	22 Carlin School House	Carlin Historical Society
8w)	23 La Concha Motel Lobby	Neon Museum
8x)	24 George Whittell Jr. Estate Thunderbird Lodge	Thunderbird Lodge Preservation Society
8y)	25 St. Paul's Episcopal Church	Western Missionary Museum Corporation

*The Chair* states the first applicant was the White Pine Community Choir Association. This is a new project. Because we are not going to give presentations, I am going to open it up to the commissioners. First of all, who is on to represent the association? Is there someone available?

*Carol Mackenzie* introduces herself as the president of the board.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* states according to the grant request, the White Pine Community Choir Association, after submitting the grant request for \$824,000, alerted the State of Nevada it had been awarded federal funds for “abatement, roof removal and the installation of a new roof.” So, sections A&B are no longer to be considered by this commission. My question is, how much is the White Pine Choir Association asking for and for what?

*The Chair* comments that if Carol is still on, to reply directly to the commissioner.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* suggests if she is not on right away, maybe we could move onto the next one.

*The Chair* I agree, that’s the plan. I will give her another minute.

*Margo Memmott* comments that Susan Whitmore with White Pine is trying answer the question and to communicate thru the chat.

*The Chair* states that he will pass on White Pine and we will come back to them as he is not sure how this is going to work. We will move forward on the Fourth Ward School Foundation. Who is on the line for Fourth Ward?

*Rebecca Palmer* states that this is not working. Join me is not working. Either we can’t control the mute or unmute, etc. Asks Craig Burkett if it would be possible to recess the meeting for 15-20 minutes so we can try our standard conference line? It would only be a conference call but at least it would not have the technical problems.

*Craig Burkett* replies that certainly if we want to take a break and do that in the interest of communications here, yes we can do that. The chair has the right and ability to take a break to address technical issues.

*The Chair* we will take a 15-minute break, I will talk to staff during that time and we will come back with a decision on how to move forward. Actually, lets make it 10 minutes and we will get back on about 11:15.

*Craig Burkett* I want to be sure everybody online, in the interest of open meeting issues, knows how and where to get information on how to dial in. Perhaps we can tell them that number now, or if the plan is to come back to this site so we can direct them elsewhere.

*The Chair* states his plan was to have everyone stay on this Join me site for about 10 minutes and will come back with an announcement for how will move forward.

***The Chair* recessed the meeting for a break at 11:05am**

*The Chair* returned at 11:15 and asked if Craig Burkett was on the line

*Craig Burkett* confirms he is.

*The Chair* states to Craig that we have been discussing so the public should be aware, that we might want to adjourn this meeting and ask the applicants to submit to the commission any changes that may have impacted their request as originally granted, for example, item #1 where the applicant received funding from another source or at least a portion of the request, or other items, we have had issues of fires and floods that affected the request, would submit those to the office by the end of the week by which time will be shared with the commissioners who would then would propose a new budget and we would call a second public meeting, properly posted, where we would take action on those budget requests. It would limit unfortunately public input but would give the opportunity of the grant applicants to at least in writing give us a brief synopsis of any changes. It's a vast change from the way this commission has operated in the past and prides itself on lots of public input but given these circumstances that are unforeseen and hopefully will never be seen again, we are just trying to find a solution. Is it adequate for us to ask them to do that and then post another public meeting in the near future? Which would be in the next ten days probably.

*Craig Burkett* confirms, yes. I have a lot of thoughts about that. I have other commissions and boards and those boards have found different ways to work around to get public participation. I know for example; Wildlife has had Zoom meetings where they allow the public to post comments during the course of the meeting that would allow that level of public participation to increase. Here where you have this technical problem with getting the amount of public participation as you would like. What you could do I think is take public participation at the start of the meeting and allow people to give you their voice, assuming what you're talking about is the case, you want to go ahead and allow people to update or provide any further public input about their grant applications between now and the next meeting. In addition to that, it would be great if you could allow public participation perhaps to start your meeting and then shut it all down and just let your commissioners talk to each other, discuss and deliberate on the applicants. Wildlife has done that and that seems to work fairly well. And then what Wildlife has done, is at the conclusion of the meeting, allow people to post on a Facebook site or on a public access site, they did it on YouTube, but they allowed people to comment at the conclusion of the meeting about the public process or about anything that they wanted to talk about that related to that meeting. That I think satisfies your open meeting law requirements. There has to be some sort of public participation during the course of the meeting.

*The Chair* states his goal is that he wants everyone to understand that we need to find a better way to do this. I would ask the other commissioners if they would agree to a process where folks could submit updates to their grants proposal as required, do it very quickly, so that can be shared with the commission and we will hold another public meeting at which time we will go over the funding. The commissioners would ask to submit a budget, those budgets would be prepared, shared and discussed at the next

public meeting based on their grant applicants and based on their updates. Do other commissioners have comment?

*Vice Chair Stoldal* comments that he would like to suggest a different process. One that is closer to our existing process. I suggest we recess this meeting until next Tuesday. Between now and then, SHPO staff sets up a Zoom meeting. The reason why we don't have a zoom meeting and I have attended as I believe many of us have, several zoom meetings with multiple participants successfully. The reason we don't have a zoom meeting is apparently the staff at State Lands and SHPO do not have computers that have either a microphone or a camera. I would suggest, A: we recess this meeting until Tuesday, potentially implement some of the ideas Craig talked about and you talked about by getting some more information, B: SHPO staff find another state building that has computers that they could use to use for a zoom meeting. I think Craig mentioned Wildlife. One of the important functions of SHPO staff is to calculate and gather all the information from the commissioners. But the most important part is the input from the applicants and to have some sort of jaded process where we don't have that real time, and based on the fact that SHPO staff does not have computers with microphones or cameras; I don't mean to be rude, but it would seem to be easy for the SHPO staff to find another location where those are available and then we could use Zoom. There may be some elements we need to flush out, but my recommendation is to move to a Zoom platform, and we recess the meeting. We don't have to reschedule but simply recess it until next Tuesday which is almost a full weeks' notice. Thank you Mr. Chairman

*Commissioner Marion* I would like to Echo Bob's suggestion. I put in the chat that I have used Zoom on many occasions with more than ninety participants. It is so user friendly and I think one of the things we could do is if our staff can find (inaudible) or even use a personal laptop. I can Zoom off my iPad. Then we can move forward with next Tuesday. I just think it's a good idea. The other thing is, I would be willing to participate in a test run with staff so they can work out any kinks they might have in terms of how to operate the system.

*\*Inaudible - Continued background noise disruption*

*The Chair* asks Craig if he needs to take a recess until Tuesday or do I need to repost an agenda?

*Craig Burkett* Go ahead and repost a new agenda would be the right way to do it. Start fresh. Post a new agenda. I would also say if you can hear me, that Wildlife did their zoom and the nice thing is, you can get specific individuals online and mute everyone else.

*The Chair* asks for any other questions or comments from the Commissioners.

*Commissioner Rappa* Tony Manfredi from the Arts Council has offered the Art Councils Zoom account and is willing to help the staff facilitate the meeting. I just wanted to remind them of that.

*The Chair* comments, I will as Chair work it out with staff and we will repost a new meeting. The target will be Tuesday if we can move that fast. Before I close this meeting, is there any member of the public that would like to make comment at this time?

*Linda Clements* Can we call in with Zoom? We have a problem because we are not supposed to use Zoom. During our day jobs we are defense contractors and it not a secure platform. As long as we can call in.

*The Chair* comments, yes you can call in. I really have to apologize to everyone. We tried the best we could. This is just not capable of handling the level of discourse and exchange of information which needs to be done to make this done properly so that everyone has an opportunity to speak and the Commissioners have the best information possible when they make their budget decisions.

*Brew – Nevada State Prison* I noticed on the chat line and also my own comment, we would very much like to have your questions, so that we could answer them. We have nothing to add to what we submitted, but we would like to know your questions.

*The Chair* I don't know if we'll be able to respond to each of you individually. I can guarantee you the questions are purely based on the information that you gave us. Your applications are usually focused on cost or specific issues and prioritizing the items in your budget request because we have to cut budgets somewhere, but I will talk to Rebecca what we can do.

*Brew – Nevada State Prison* Thank you so much.

*Vice Chair Stoldal* We have all gone through four massive thick binders and on one hand, I think I could speak for the other Commissioners that we enjoy delving into the projects and the history of the State of Nevada. A lot of work goes into what each Commissioner does in reviewing those and so I think each Commissioner may have their own sort of separate line of questioning and I think it would be a challenge for Rebecca and staff to gather all of those questions and culminate them. I suggest we just go with a normal process as we can and that is, if we have a question, the applicants address us during the meeting. Thank you.

*The Chair* asks for any other comments

*Mark Bassett* comments, If the meeting is moved to Tuesday, unfortunately I have a prior commitment which will be impossible for me to get out of, and in the past grantees had to attend the meetings. Will that still be the rule on Tuesday?

*The Chair* asks, is there anyone that you would feel comfortable with representing the foundation other than yourself?

*Mark Bassett* replies, no not really. I am the grant writer. If necessary I would try to bring someone else up to speed and see if I can (inaudible)



*The Chair* asks, if it is possible for Mark if he was given a time certain on Tuesday, rather than spending the day he could take 30 minutes out.

*Mark Bassett* replies, yes that would work.

*The Chair* states, Ok, try to work with staff to accommodate you then. I would accommodate any other applicant in the same way if possible.

*Mark Bassett*, thanks the Chair.

*The Chair* comments, If applicants do have that concern with a short notice meeting, if you would let staff know what is a reasonable time for you, I will try to adjust the agenda so we can pick you up at a time certain.

*The Chair* asks if there is any further public comment. I really appreciate everyone working so hard trying to get this done. We will make another run at it on Tuesday and hopefully by close of business we will have this wrapped up.

## **9. Adjournment (11:35 am)**