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PALMER: Hello. Okay. I need the (inaudible) --

OSTROVSKY: Hello.

PALMER: Good morning, sir.

OSTROVSKY: Hello.

PALMER: Or good afternoon, I guess.

OSTROVSKY: Good afternoon.

PALMER: My apologies.

OSTROVSKY: That's all right.

PALMER: We'll figure out what time of day it is.

OSTROVSKY: Well, sometimes Carson city's on a
different time zone that the rest of the states so. A little
joke there.

PALMER: Oh, it -- it definitely feels like that,
believe me. Okay. So we are having technical issues. So
what I've got -- I've gotta turn this off. No, I have to do
it. I'm gonna turn my little thingy off and choose no
background 'cause I have a member of the public with me.

OSTROVSKY: All right.

PALMER: We're having technical issues with the --
the computer. (Inaudible), so I am going to have this member of the public here with me. If I can get this thing to work (inaudible). Sorry about that. Okay. Gonna do that way. There we go. So I'm in the screen and so is Janice Beerwinkle. I can't answer that phone. Okay. I'll mute myself.

BROWN: Rebecca, we have a question in the chat box.

PALMER: Thank you, Kristen, for -- I -- I didn't know what was happening. I didn't see my -- my picture and I didn't see anything. So thank you for helping me out.

BROWN: No problem.

PALMER: So -- so this is Rebecca Palmer. We sent individual links to the panelists and that's the link you have to use, otherwise you come in as an attendee and I have to promote you. So if I'm looking to see if there are any more commissioners in the attendee file and I do not see anymore. And this is Rebecca Palmer again, my -- sorry Chair, I have a member of the public in my office because we've had technical issues at our physical location.

OSTROVSKY: That's fine.

PALMER: So we -- we have notified the public with a sign on the door saying the mood -- mood -- meeting has been moved to my office and the member of public is sitting right behind me. You can see her in the screen here. So if any
more members of the public need to join, they'll have to join
in my office, and we have made provisions for the public to
notify us if they wish to be at the physical location.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Would you let me know when we --
when we have enough arrivals to constitute quorum?

PALMER: Sir, we -- I’m -- I’m counting six
commissioners.

OSTROVSKY: That are present?

PALMER: Yes.

OSTROVSKY: Good, good. Well then this is the
appointed hour for -- for the meeting of the Commission for
Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation. Therefore I'd
like to call a meeting to order. I -- it's appropriate now,
one, to verify that the meeting is improperly posted under
Nevada state law (inaudible).

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.

Yes, it has been.

MALE: And would you, please call the roll?

PALMER: Yes, sir. I will. Commissioner Hoferer?

Commissioner Rappa?

RAPPA: Commissioner Rappa’s here.

PALMER: Commissioner Olmstead?

OLMSTEAD: Present.

PALMER: Commissioner Otlet -- Ortlipp?

ORTLIPP: I’m here. Ortlipp.
PALMER: My -- my apologies, sir.

ORTLIPP: That's fine.

PALMER: Com -- Vice Chair Stoldal?

STOLDAL: Present.

PALMER: And Chairman Ostrovsky?

OSTROVSKY: Present. Oh, wait, we have one, two, three -- five members of the commission present, constitutes a -- a quorum. David it's just -- it's actually this your first official meeting? David?

ORTLIPP: Oh, sorry. No, I think this is my second one.

OSTROVSKY: It's actually your second, that's what I thought. Well --

PALMER: Oh. My -- sir, this Rebecca Palmer.

ORTLIPP: Yes.

PALMER: My sincerest apologies. I forgot Commissioner Cavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY: Oh, Commissioner Cavanaugh.

CAVANAUGH: Present.

OSTROVSKY: Okay, great. So we're just missing one commissioner. Thank you very much. With -- just as a housekeeping matter, we would hope that this meeting would not exceed one hour. A number of other people I know have commitments and, I think, the agenda could be clearly handled in that or less time. This is -- we go onto item number 3,
public comment. Public comment will be taken at the beginning and the end of the meeting. I will also take public comment before taking any action on an item. Public comments may limited to three minutes, at the discretion of the chair. Comment will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action will be taken on any matters raised during public comment period that are not already on the agenda. Is there anyone on the phone, on the internet or present in the hearing room that would like to make comment -- public comment at this time? I see none. Staff, do you identify anyone that's either raised their hand or --

PALMER: Sir, I see no raised hands in the attendee area.

OSTROVSKY: All right. Well, thank you very much. Seeing no public comment, we will take public comment clearly, later during the -- during the hearing. So we'll move on to agenda item number 4, which is a discussion and decision to request the sale of bonds in accordance with NRS 3603.530.1. In -- in both state fiscal years of 2022 and 2023, the combined request for general obligation bond sales in these two will not exceed 4 million. I know my phone is doing strange things. Hang -- hang just a minute. I’m sorry, having a little problem there. My watch is talking to me if you can believe it. The proceeds of the bond sale will be deposited with the state treasurer to be credited to the fund
for preservation and promotion of cultural resources and will both be -- and will both be granted to successful applicants and support the administration of the grant program for the period 2022, 2023 grant cycle. This is an action item.

Rebecca, could you give us a brief summary of what the treasurer's office has indicated to you regarding the bond sales?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. The treasurer's office has indicated that they are going to hold a very unusual spring bond sale. Usually their bond sales are in November, but this year because of other, like the state infrastructure bank needing bond proceeds, they are going to conduct a spring bond sale. This is fortuitous for the commission because in any one calendar or any one calendar year, the commission decides how much they want to award, and then in either one of the fiscal years, they can sell up to $3 million in I -- any one fiscal year. So the 4 million that you will find in one of the agenda supplement items in the executive budget, 4 million for CCCHP pro -- projects in the biennium is still available for bond sales. The treasure has indicated that they can sell it in two increments, one in the spring bond sale in fiscal year that we're currently in '22, and one in November, which would be fiscal year '23. And they can either be equally split amongst the fiscal years, '22 and '23, which is what I put in the draft letter to the state
board of finance. Alternatively, they could be split either with 1 million in the first fiscal year and 3 million in the next fiscal year. The commission should be aware that by placing these in two separate fiscal years, there will be two separate requirements to expand the proceeds of the bonds, and so to ensure that they're appropriately expanded, staff would recommend a sale of 1 million in state fiscal year '22 -- 2023 and 3 million, which is the maximum allowed per fiscal year in state fiscal year 2023. However, the commission can decide in any other increments that it wishes, as long as the total request of -- in any fiscal year is no more than the 3 million allowed by statute.

OSTROVSKY: And -- and I believe, you will find that in appendix nine, you'll see listed bonds for conservation and natural resources, historic preservation at 4 million. The -- the challenge, of course, for staff is getting the money out appropriately to the -- to the successful grant applicants. Timing wise, it -- it's a lot of work to get a million dollars out, and usually, as it turns out for when -- when we award in a grant, there's a time lag between the award and the actual ability of the -- of the applicant to start to expend those funds for various reasons, going back, getting final bids, whether they have to get building permits. The staff still needs to -- to get the appropriate documents, contracts signed, covenants filed and so on. It's -- correct me if I'm
wrong, but I think, staggering it a bit makes it easier for staff, for example, if we start with a million dollars, which would have to be -- would be available in a couple of months and followed by the other 3 million might be a better for staff. I don't think it'll make any difference to the grantees. Would -- would you agree with that, Rebecca?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
Yes, I would agree with that. In fact, most applicants have lag time of several months, and if -- if the precedent holds that will occur here as well. So the -- the less we can put in the first or request in the first bond sale, the -- the less we have to expand earlier. There are, however, grantees who are ready to hit the ground running.

OSTROVSKY: Right.

PALMER: And so -- and I would -- staff would recommend that it would -- it could possibly be the entire 1 million going out the door quickly.

OSTROVSKY: Sir. Yeah, go ahead. Mr. Stoldal, do you have a question?

STOLDAL: Well, I -- I'd like to respectfully disagree on -- on -- on a couple of points. I -- I -- I would prefer front loading rather than back loading for a couple of reasons. One, as we got later in the agenda, we have the opportunity to extend for what -- for -- for whatever reason. So if we need to extend either because of staff or -- or -- or
whatever the reason, we have the authority to extend.

Secondly, there are projects that are ready to roll, ready to take care of that are -- these buildings are -- start with are old and the quicker we could get, a, either funding planning, construction plans and or b, actually start the restoration and -- and preservation of -- of these buildings, the better off we are. And -- and thirdly, I think there's still gonna be a line of trying to get contractors in -- in -- personnel to work in some of these places, whether it's (inaudible) Austin or -- or -- or wherever. So the quicker we can get money to these grantees, the quicker they can get in line. So I think that there is some urgency that I would suggest from the structures themselves to the -- to -- to being able to get work started. If they know they have got -- they've been granted funding and the -- and the contractors know they have been granting funding, it's not a, well, we put a grant in and maybe next year we're gonna get that funding, they're gonna go to the back of the line. So I -- I'd like to have a little more discussion on maybe either two and two, or three and one, and I put the staffs working hard at the very bottom of the list. I say that semi consciously. They're already working hard and -- and have a great reputation around the state of -- of helping every grantee through the challenges with restoring these old buildings. So that's my thought, Bob Chair.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Let me just respond. I -- my -- my
view of how the grant process is gonna work is we -- we're
gonna hold grant hearings and we're going to award the entire
$4 million in one grant sitting. We would not come back for a
second round of grants, so they -- they would know that
they're entitled to these funds, and when they would receive
'em. There's -- I think -- staff tell me how many months are
there between the -- the window of between a million and 3
million or 2 million and 2 million.

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I
don't have exact dates at this point. The treasurer's office
has indicated that it will be a spring sale and the -- if we
make the request today or tomorrow, it will be on the board of
finance agenda for March, and so the sale could occur after
that point. So if it took a month to prepare the sale, then
you're looking at May, possibly. This is all hype -- you
know, this is all speculation at this point.

STOLDAL: Yeah.

PALMER: May, June, July, August, September,
October, November, it's six months difference between the
spring sale and the fall sale.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Commissioner Cavanaugh, question?

CAVANAUGH: I have two questions. The first question
is when let's say that we do the sale of bond, approve the
sale of bond, is there a penalty for us not to expend all $4
million of that funding for -- that's my first question. The
second question is, do we have to limit our grant making to one session or could we do two?

OSTROVSKY: Any response from staff? I -- I mean, I'm assuming we could do two, if we wanted two. We could actually break them. Is that right, Rebecca?

PALMER: For -- for the record, there is no prohibition in statute that would limit the commissions holding of grant hearings to one in an calendar year. There could certainly be two. The answer to the first question is that if the funds are not expended totally in three years, the state will pay arbitrage fees.

OSTROVSKY: Well, there's -- brilliant. From a legal point of view, there's only a three-year window we have to worry about. The rest of it is really --

PALMER: For the record --

OSTROVSKY: -- a policy decision.

PALMER: -- for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.

Yes. The final window closes at three years.

STOLDAL: Bob, did you indicate one of your thoughts was that we would -- for the -- the -- the first cycle -- well, the -- we would put out all 4 million, we'd take in all the applications and allocate the 4 million, but since some of that, half of that, we would tell the -- the grantees who got the money, they wouldn't get it until the following year?

OSTROVSKY: They'd be a six month lag, I think,
between the first and second grants. That some would be --
some would be -- the first million or 2 million, whatever that
number would be available for distribution in the first six
months, and then approximately, and I think Rebecca has
indicated, she's not quite sure what that is, but within a
six-month window, the remaining balance of the bond revenue
would be available to us for distribution.

STOLDAL: So that would be a new -- a new element of
our grant making process that we would say, you get it the
first six months and you get it in -- in the second six months
is one we're voting or allocating.

OSTROVSKY: We would have to do that. We would have
to voluntarily ask the -- the grant applicants who's shovel
ready, basically.

STOLDAL: Okay.

OSTROVSKY: We could put the money out the door right
away or who can wait. But I understand your concern, Bob.
You don't wanna -- you don't wanna run short of funds either.
But I also understanding -- isn't -- correct me if I'm wrong,
Rebecca, I think 2 million is about our limit. Isn't it in
the first year, as indicated by the treasurer's office? They
don't have a desire to go higher than that.

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
The only limit is what's in statute and that is 3 million per
fiscal year. So it could be 3 million in the first fiscal
year and 1 million in the second fiscal year. The difference
between the two sales is six months only. So the -- all the 4
million will be available by November of this year.

RAPPA: This is Commissioner Rappa. Rebecca, have
we spent anything in FY 22 so?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.

No.

RAPPA: Okay.

PALMER: There are no bond proceeds available right
now.

RAPPA: Okay. This is Commissioner Rappa again.
I'm gonna -- I'm gonna go with the original staff suggestion
of 1 million for the remainder of 20 -- FY 2022 only for
budget and bookkeeping purposes. It just seems like a very
tight turnaround for -- for accounting for that money for --
for these organizations, and then -- and then starting a new
fiscal year with another budget in -- on July 1st.

OSTROVSKY: I -- I appreciate your comments. I -- I --
Rebecca, one other piece of information would be helpful. I
think the Commissioners making that decision, is from your
past experience, from the time bond sales are initiated to the
time you can actually put money out the door that -- that
process we are already know takes a few months. Is that
right?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
The answer is yes, because first it has to go before the board of finance to make sure that there is sufficient debt capacity to sell bonds.

OSTROVSKY: Right.

PALMER: And then once that decision is made, it takes about a month for the treasurer's office to get the sale ready. Once the sale occurs, then the proceeds are deposited -- relatively quickly if the bonds offered for sale are purchased. So we are probably looking at -- the board of finance would -- would meet -- I would imagine they'd meet in September for the November sale. So they would meet in September, it would take a -- a month to prep. So we have received bond proceeds in the middle of November, traditionally. So those grantees who were awarded funds, who did not receive funds from the first bond sale, will be able to start their projects sometime after the middle of November because I can't authorize funding agreements if I can't don't have proceeds to support those funding agreements. So we -- those would have to wait in advance until the proceeds are deposited in the account. But the only thing that could wait in advance could be the covenants. Everything else could be prepped in -- in advance, but the state could not place covenants on a property if it does not award actual proceeds.

MALE: Okay.

STOLDAL: I'm -- I'm trying to -- you have a sense
of -- of just the actual -- the actual dates of -- of -- of when the first grants hearing would be held or -- or when the -- back it up, even when we would staff would send out a note to saying, this money is available, whether it's a million or two or three, and then you need to have your grants in request in by this date, and then we would hold a public -- a public hearing. And then there is the cycle -- after that as the one that the money that would be available, and they would be different dates for whether we have a million dollars in front, two or three. I -- I don't have a -- a calendar sense of -- of -- of starting off of which is best for the client, which is best for the grantees, which is best for the people out in the trenches trying to get these things done, when is -- when is the -- the -- the most people can get the most -- the most money. I was trying to write down some dates, but I just -- I can't -- I don't have a good tracking of -- of each of those potential options before this commission. The one year now, or the 1 million or the 2 million or the 3 million. I know we can't do four, but we can do one, two or three in front. And then what another million. If we go with three in front, we can do another million, six months later. Yep.

PALMER: For -- for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Sir, that is correct. You could do 3 million in the spring sale and 1 million in the November sale. This is -- for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. This is a good trial
run for what the commission will need to do if the executive
budget has more than $3 million in any biennium because this
will have to be done every single time. So I'm -- staff
recommends -- I -- any -- any increment we can work with, and
this is a good trial run to see if -- if -- if the commission
chooses three and one, whether that works for the applicant,
and if it doesn't then the next by biennium it could be
reversed, and it can be one and three or -- or two and three,
de -- you know, if the commission we're so graced with
additional --

STOLDAL:    Right.

PALMER:    -- bond proceeds. So this is a bit of a
trial run and staff will work with whatever the commission
decides.

CAVANAUGH:    This is Commissioner Cavanaugh. I -- I
would concur with -- with Commissioner Rappa. The -- the
staff has recommended a one and a three, and given that it's a
trial process, I -- I would like to honor their request to go
with a one in three to work through this situation that has
this blessing, this fortuitous event to -- to see how we can
work through it. I -- I think they have a better idea on what
the staff can handle and what we need to go through
procedurally to make this work in the most efficient and
successful way.

OSTROVSKY:    Any other (inaudible) --
STOLDAL: Chairman -- okay. If -- if we're talking about one and three, are you still thinking about all the money is -- is allocated, all 4 million and -- and then we divide it up into one in three?

OSTROVSKY: This is my thinking, but see, yeah, we -- we would allocate the entire 4 million in one hearing process, and it's just a matter when those funds are distributed out to the grantees.

STOLDAL: And the -- and the gap between the two, if I understand correctly, would be six months?

OSTROVSKY: That's my understanding, is that correct? Rebecca, approximately six months? I don't know where Rebecca went, but that's what she said, six months.

RAPPA: This is Commissioner Rappa. Just for clarification. So really what we're just -- we're talking about this is a normal biannual cycle that we're on, it's just that we have more money, and that we can't allocate the whole amount because of fiscal year limitations. So it's not really, I don't think that different than what we normally do, it's just that we're gonna have a little bit of a time gap before the second round of money comes through. And I guess, especially given what we have later on the agenda of -- of all of these asking for extensions, it just seems like, you know, I don't -- I don't we're by postponing that second.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Does any other Commissioner have a
comment? If not, I would certainly entertain a motion. Any commissioner like to make a motion?

    STOLDAL: Well, I think we -- what I would recommend that we, it sounded like, the best way to go would be the staff's recommendation of -- of one in -- one in -- one in three with the concept that we would allocate all $4 million at one grant hearing, but some would get it in the first slice, and then the next would be six months or whatever the time period is would get the in -- in -- in the second slice.

    OSTROVSKY: Right. (inaudible). Is there a second to the motion?

    RAPPA: This is Commissioner Rappa, I second.

    OSTROVSKY: Any commissioners have questions or comments about the motion?

    CAVANAUGH: I only have one comment. For the record, this is Commissioner Cavanaugh. I want to be careful that when we --- when we proceed with this that we -- in -- make sure that the staff is able to handle $4 million worth of allocation in -- in the grant cycle. They -- I wanna make sure that they feel free to let us know whether or not they have the capacity to make it work. That's (inaudible).

    OSTROVSKY: Well, I -- I totally -- totally agree and -- and they -- they -- they do -- they do have experience that they're gonna have to learn from, as -- as was pointed out by staff earlier. Is there any member of the public, either in
the hearing room, online or on the telephone that would like
to make a comment before we take a final vote on this matter?
PALMER: Sir, sir, for the record.
OSTROVSKY: Yes.
PALMER: I have one hand raised.
OSTROVSKY: That's fine. Why don't you permit them to
speak, please?
PALMER: Okay. Ron Applegate, you're on and can
speak.
APPLEGATE: Yeah, I -- you going through this, I, you
know -- I kind of, you know, appreciate the troubles you're
going through there to help us out there. The thing I with
was -- was thinking about is, especially with the, Stoldal
comments, is that fact is that if you had more money in head
in there, those things such as roof repairs and stuff like
that, you know, won't have to go through another wet season
like we did last time with our roof repair, and that might be
-- maybe that's how you're gonna choose who gets what first,
you know, ones that are really need the money. That's my only
comment.
OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mr. Applegate. Any other
comments? All right. You've heard the motion. All those in
favor, please say aye.
MEMBERS: Aye.
OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? All right, the motion
carries. The Chair votes in favor. Thank you very much.

Item 5, review of the Western Missionary Corporations request to modify their grant and the grant is 19-25 to redirect the entire grant award scope of work and budget of $165,000 from roof replacement to architectural and engineering services. This is an action item. Rebecca, like to give us a little background, please.

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. In the commission's last meeting, they asked this grantee who requested to modify their entire grant from a construction proposal to a development document prose -- proposal to review the proposal and come back to the commission with a revised scope of work and budget to address the grant. We believe that this submission, previously provided to you and available in the supplemental materials, meets the original request of the commission.

OSTROVSKY: I -- do any commissioners have a question about the -- we -- we're the ones that actually triggered this request, asking for them to submit this to us. The Commissioners have any questions about their submit -- submission or -- or the process?

STOLDAL: Chairman.

OSTROVSKY: Mr. Stoldal.

STOLDAL: Rebecca, you said that the language you used was that this application meets the request of this
commission. Does it meet the standards required by the bond process and by the existing rules and regulations of -- of -- of the Commission of Cultural Affairs and Historic Places? I know there's -- there's detail of -- of each of the -- a budget to some degree of -- of each of the elements that's in this overall budget. Does it meet the proper standards for us to move forward and take a vote?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.

Sir, yes, it does.

STOLDAL: Okay. Straightforward answer. Pending any further discussion, I'd make a motion to approve.

CAVANAUGH: I'll second. This Commissioner Cavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second. Approved item number 5. Any other commissioners have questions or comments?

ORTLIPP: This is Commissioner Ortlipp. I -- I would concur with the -- with the discussion there. It seems to make sense to be a little bit more thoughtful and not have a situation where we piecemeal this and kind of make -- make the best use of public money, and this seems to be the best way to do that so.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank you. (inaudible) --

RAPPA: This is commissioner -- this is Commissioner Rappa. I just have a question for Rebecca. Rebecca, did they apply for review for April? Do you know?
PALMER: For -- for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I don't understand the question.

RAPPA: For the next grant review. I mean, have they applied again?

PALMER: For -- for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. We have only received one application and it is not this grantee.

RAPPA: Okay, got it. Okay. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Seeing no other questions from the commission, anyone member of the public online, on the phone or in the hearing room like to make a comment?

PALMER: Sir, this is Rebecca Palmer. I see no hands raised.

OSTROVSKY: All right, fine. Given that opportunity, now, we have a motion in a second before the Commission. All those in favor, please say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The Chair votes in favor. It's unanimous for the approval of agenda item number 5. A -- agenda item number 6 is a review of the grantee's progress to date, discussion decision stand the May 10th, 2022 project deadline for grantees requiring additional time to complete their grant from the projects. This is an item that I kind of been -- been in the background for some time now. I think the commission has talked about it before about the difficulty
grantees are now having -- getting contractors or getting
materials to finish their progress reports for our per our
agreements with them. It was not my intent to go through
every one of these. I -- I will have staff, however, whether
there's anything unusual or -- or -- or any concerning request
that you have in the list that you had before you, which --
which indicates the status and those that will need some
extension. To staff, any -- any comment?

PALMER: Sir, for the record, we have no comment,
These, as you very clearly and concisely stated, these are
supply chain and contractor issues, primarily.

STOLDAL: Chairman, I did have a question.

PALMER: Yes.

STOLDAL: In the past -- Stoldal for the record.
I'd asked his AG's office just for a -- a -- an -- an opinion
about whether or not we can, in -- in fact, 'cause we're
exceeding, I think a couple hundred thousand dollars here,
whether or not we can take this as a clump because there are
different requests in here, and -- and let me back up,
Rebecca, what's the -- the -- the item 6 says, discussion and
decision to extend the May 10th deadline. So there's -- there
is different -- the extension is -- is to -- are all the
extension requests to the same deadline or to the same date,
or are we just generically extending them to some -- to -- to
some -- to some point because it -- I -- we're asking them to
extend it. How -- how far are we extending it, and are there
different extension requests for the different applications?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Staff would recommend a single extension date for all applicants or all -- excuse me, all grant -- grants. That's why all existing grants will expire on May 10th of 2022. Staff recommends based on feedback we have received from the grantees, who still have work to complete, that the extension be to January 3rd, 2023. This will accommodate every single grantee.

STOLDAL: Great. Okay. And so then just back to the original question, Anthony is -- is can we do this in one big clump or do we have to -- are these individual requests and we need to deal with them individually?

ANTHONY: I think that's articulated clearly enough for the record to be taken in one group.

STOLDAL: Okay.

ANTHONY: Yeah. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. They -- the January 3rd date, by the way, new year's is Sunday, Monday's generally a holiday following that, so this is really the first business day of the year in 2023 and that's how that date ended up January 3rd, as opposed to the second, for example.

STOLDAL: Oh, I'd like to make a motion to extend this, uh, to January 3rd, 2023, staff's date any, uh,
CAVANAUGH: Second, Commissioner Cavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Does anyone have any questions about any of the -- the -- the listed grants here on this -- that were included in the agenda?

STOLDAL: I just had one Chairman. Stoldal, for the record.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

STOLDAL: And -- and that is Rebecca, generically, or overall, you said this is a -- an issue with getting contractors. Are there any other issues that this commission should be aware of as we move forward in this new day and age of -- of other things that are coming up that -- delay getting these projects done? Are -- are you seeing anything other than not being able to get contractors or prices going up?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Thank you for that excellent question. Yes, there is indeed a concern across the state, and fran -- in fact, across the nation on finding contractors who can work on historic buildings. It is becoming critical. Historic preservation projects require knowledge of historic buildings and appropriate treatments, and across the nation, we are experiencing a shortage, of craftsmen, of contractors. And so our state preservation plan has in it a proposal to support training opportunities at the universities and at trade schools, so that we can grow the next generation of
contractors, and we are already experiencing this with our current grantees in finding contractors willing to work on historic buildings is becoming increasingly challenging. So — and I -- this -- I do not believe that will change in the near -- in the future staff.

STOLDAL: Staff, I -- and Chairman, I -- I -- staff already has plenty of work to do, but I -- I think it would be very valuable if this commission could get a presentation on this particular topic from staff with the -- with one of the solutions and -- and that's a -- a training. Something similar was going -- is going on with the -- with railroads, historic railroads. Staff that -- and people that are able to repair these historic trains are -- are -- are not in -- they don't exist, and -- and so there's training programs and a whole -- whole separate silo of -- of craftsmen that are being being developed. But I think it would be beneficial for this commission to get a -- a real good understanding of that so if -- if the opportunity comes up, we could be very supportive at the legislative level.

OSTROVSKY: Well, that's fine. I -- It's a good idea. And I would ask staff to add it as an agenda on our discussion at a future meeting. There may be things we can do that -- that you -- as you indicate, support -- basically supporting our grantees now and in the future. Any other questions about any specific item on the list agenda as -- as in item 6 for an
extension?

PALMER: Sir, I have --

OSTROVSKY: Yes, ma'am.

PALMER: -- one -- one hand raised in the
audience.

OSTROVSKY: I see no -- no further questions from the
commission. Now would be the appropriate time for the public.

If someone has raised a hand, could you Rebecca, bring them on
please?

PALMER: Okay. Ella, you have been brought on.

TRUJILLO: Hi. For the record, this is Ella Trujillo
with the Carlin Historical Society. I am curious with the
extension, if -- if it passes, will staff be indicating to us
when additional progress reports will be due, or is that
something that the board will be deciding or I -- it may be in
statute, I don't know?

OSTROVSKY: Good question. I -- I will take the
time out to let staff try to respond to that.

PALMER: Okay. For the record, this is Rebecca
Palmer. The grant manual indicates that if a grant is
extended, additional progress reports will be required. So
when we extend your grant via amendment to the grant, we will
incorporate the dates upon which those additional progress
reports will be due to our office.

OSTROVSKY: Is there any other public comment, either
online, by the phone or in the hearing room? I -- I hear no one. All those in favor of the motion to approve agenda items 6, please say aye.

MEMBERS: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Anyone opposed? The Chair votes in favor.

It's unanimous, made carried and ask staff to take the appropriate steps to prepare those dates and to notify the grantees of -- of the change in their -- their requirements under their grant. Now would be appropriate time for further public comment. We would encourage public comment and may limit its time to three minutes if necessary, the Chair's request. Is -- is there anyone member of the public in the hearing room, online or on the phone that would like to make a public comment at this time?

PALMER: For the record, sir, I see none.

OSTROVSKY: All right. Any commissioner like to make any comment under public comment?

CAVANAUGH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is Commissioner Cavanaugh. I would like to thank the staff for putting that list together and keeping us updated on the progress of the projects that we have granted. This really does help add to our fiduciary responsibility as commissioners to oversee how those funds are expended, so I'd like to extend my gratitude to all of the staff who worked on putting that together.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Any other Commissioners?
Hearing no other comment, that is the -- the end of our agenda. I -- I do appreciate everyone's participation today, and we will let you know the next date that we can try to get everyone on board for the next -- the next step in the process of moving along that exciting $4 million. It's a lot of money and, it will be very helpful to the various communities to get the money out as quickly as possible and as appropriately as possible. So I really look forward to that opportunity to have a little room in our budgetary process. Hopefully, we'll also bring in some, maybe new applicants, so it'll be challenging for us, but at the same time, very rewarding. I thank you very much for taking the time out today and wish you all a happy February. Bye folks. Thank you and meeting adjourned.

MALE: Well done, everyone. Thank you.

FEMALE: Have a nice day, be well.


[end of meeting]