

1 STATE OF NEVADA  
2 DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES  
3 COMMISSION FOR CULTURAL CENTERS AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
4 PUBLIC MEETING  
5 TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2022

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

8 OSTROVSKY: Hello.

9 PALMER: Good morning, sir.

10 OSTROVSKY: Hello.

11 PALMER: Or good afternoon, I guess.

12 OSTROVSKY: Good afternoon.

13 PALMER: My apologies.

14 OSTROVSKY: That's all right.

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

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

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

24 OSTROVSKY: All right.

25 PALMER: We're having technical issues with the --

1 the computer. (Inaudible), so I am going to have this member  
2 of the public here with me. If I can get this thing to work  
3 (inaudible). Sorry about that. Okay. Gonna do that way.  
4 There we go. So I'm in the screen and so is Janice  
5 Beerwinkle. I can't answer that phone. Okay. I'll mute  
6 myself.

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

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

12 BROWN: No problem.

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

21 OSTROVSKY: That's fine.

22 PALMER: So we -- we have notified the public with  
23 a sign on the door saying the mood -- mood -- meeting has been  
24 moved to my office and the member of public is sitting right  
25 behind me. You can see her in the screen here. So if any

1 more members of the public need to join, they'll have to join  
2 in my office, and we have made provisions for the public to  
3 notify us if they wish to be at the physical location.

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

6 PALMER: Sir, we -- I'm -- I'm counting six  
7 commissioners.

8 OSTROVSKY: That are present?

9 PALMER: Yes.

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

16 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.  
17 Yes, it has been.

18 MALE: And would you, please call the roll?

19 PALMER: Yes, sir. I will. Commissioner Hoferer?  
20 Commissioner Rappa?

21 RAPPA: Commissioner Rappa's here.

22 PALMER: Commissioner Olmstead?

23 OLMSTEAD: Present.

24 PALMER: Commissioner Otlet -- Ortlipp?

25 ORTLIPP: I'm here. Ortlipp.

1 PALMER: My -- my apologies, sir.

2 ORTLIPP: That's fine.

3 PALMER: Com -- Vice Chair Stoldal?

4 STOLDAL: Present.

5 PALMER: And Chairman Ostrovsky?

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

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

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

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

15 ORTLIPP: Yes.

16 PALMER: My sincerest apologies. I forgot  
17 Commissioner Cavanaugh.

18 OSTROVSKY: Oh, Commissioner Cavanaugh.

19 CAVANAUGH: Present.

20 OSTROVSKY: Okay, great. So we're just missing one  
21 commissioner. Thank you very much. With -- just as a  
22 housekeeping matter, we would hope that this meeting would not  
23 exceed one hour. A number of other people I know have  
24 commitments and, I think, the agenda could be clearly handled  
25 in that or less time. This is -- we go onto item number 3,

1 public comment. Public comment will be taken at the beginning  
2 and the end of the meeting. I will also take public comment  
3 before taking any action on an item. Public comments may  
4 limited to three minutes, at the discretion of the chair.  
5 Comment will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action  
6 will be taken on any matters raised during public comment  
7 period that are not already on the agenda. Is there anyone on  
8 the phone, on the internet or present in the hearing room that  
9 would like to make comment -- public comment at this time? I  
10 see none. Staff, do you identify anyone that's either raised  
11 their hand or --

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

14 OSTROVSKY: All right. Well, thank you very much.  
15 Seeing no public comment, we will take public comment clearly,  
16 later during the -- during the hearing. So we'll move on to  
17 agenda item number 4, which is a discussion and decision to  
18 request the sale of bonds in accordance with NRS 3603.530.1.  
19 In -- in both state fiscal years of 2022 and 2023, the  
20 combined request for general obligation bond sales in these  
21 two will not exceed 4 million. I know my phone is doing  
22 strange things. Hang -- hang just a minute. I'm sorry,  
23 having a little problem there. My watch is talking to me if  
24 you can believe it. The proceeds of the bond sale will be  
25 deposited with the state treasurer to be credited to the fund

1 for preservation and promotion of cultural resources and will  
2 both be -- and will both be granted to successful applicants  
3 and support the administration of the grant program for the  
4 period 2022, 2023 grant cycle. This is an action item.

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

8 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.  
9 The treasurer's office has indicated that they are going to  
10 hold a very unusual spring bond sale. Usually their bond  
11 sales are in November, but this year because of other, like  
12 the state infrastructure bank needing bond proceeds, they are  
13 going to conduct a spring bond sale. This is fortuitous for  
14 the commission because in any one calendar or any one calendar  
15 year, the commission decides how much they want to award, and  
16 then in either one of the fiscal years, they can sell up to \$3  
17 million in I -- any one fiscal year. So the 4 million that  
18 you will find in one of the agenda supplement items in the  
19 executive budget, 4 million for CCCHP pro -- projects in the  
20 biennium is still available for bond sales. The treasure has  
21 indicated that they can sell it in two increments, one in the  
22 spring bond sale in fiscal year that we're currently in '22,  
23 and one in November, which would be fiscal year '23. And they  
24 can either be equally split amongst the fiscal years, '22 and  
25 '23, which is what I put in the draft letter to the state

1 board of finance. Alternatively, they could be split either  
2 with 1 million in the first fiscal year and 3 million in the  
3 next fiscal year. The commission should be aware that by  
4 placing these in two separate fiscal years, there will be two  
5 separate requirements to expand the proceeds of the bonds, and  
6 so to ensure that they're appropriately expanded, staff would  
7 recommend a sale of 1 million in state fiscal year '22 -- 2023  
8 and 3 million, which is the maximum allowed per fiscal year in  
9 state fiscal year 2023. However, the commission can decide in  
10 any other increments that it wishes, as long as the total  
11 request of -- in any fiscal year is no more than the 3 million  
12 allowed by statute.

13 OSTROVSKY: And -- and I believe, you will find that  
14 in appendix nine, you'll see listed bonds for conservation and  
15 natural resources, historic preservation at 4 million. The --  
16 the challenge, of course, for staff is getting the money out  
17 appropriately to the -- to the successful grant applicants.  
18 Timing wise, it -- it's a lot of work to get a million dollars  
19 out, and usually, as it turns out for when -- when we award in  
20 a grant, there's a time lag between the award and the actual  
21 ability of the -- of the applicant to start to expend those  
22 funds for various reasons, going back, getting final bids,  
23 whether they have to get building permits. The staff still  
24 needs to -- to get the appropriate documents, contracts  
25 signed, covenants filed and so on. It's -- correct me if I'm

1 wrong, but I think, staggering it a bit makes it easier for  
2 staff, for example, if we start with a million dollars, which  
3 would have to be -- would be available in a couple of months  
4 and followed by the other 3 million might be a better for  
5 staff. I don't think it'll make any difference to the  
6 grantees. Would -- would you agree with that, Rebecca?

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

14 OSTROVSKY: Right.

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

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

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



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

25 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Let me just respond. I -- my -- my

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

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

17 STOLDAL: Yeah.

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

21 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Commissioner Cavanaugh, question?

22 CAVANAUGH: I have two questions. The first question  
23 is when let's say that we do the sale of bond, approve the  
24 sale of bond, is there a penalty for us not to expend all \$4  
25 million of that funding for -- that's my first question. The

1 second question is, do we have to limit our grant making to  
2 one session or could we do two?

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

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

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

15 PALMER: For the record --

16 OSTROVSKY: -- a policy decision.

17 PALMER: -- for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.  
18 Yes. The final window closes at three years.

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

25 OSTROVSKY: They'd be a six month lag, I think,

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

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

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

15 STOLDAL: Okay.

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

23 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.  
24 The only limit is what's in statute and that is 3 million per  
25 fiscal year. So it could be 3 million in the first fiscal

1 year and 1 million in the second fiscal year. The difference  
2 between the two sales is six months only. So the -- all the 4  
3 million will be available by November of this year.

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

6 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.  
7 No.

8 RAPPA: Okay.

9 PALMER: There are no bond proceeds available right  
10 now.

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

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

25 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.

1 The answer is yes, because first it has to go before the board  
2 of finance to make sure that there is sufficient debt capacity  
3 to sell bonds.

4 OSTROVSKY: Right.

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

24 MALE: Okay.

25 STOLDAL: I'm -- I'm trying to -- you have a sense

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

22 PALMER: For -- for the record, this is Rebecca  
23 Palmer. Sir, that is correct. You could do 3 million in the  
24 spring sale and 1 million in the November sale. This is --  
25 for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. This is a good trial

1 run for what the commission will need to do if the executive  
2 budget has more than \$3 million in any biennium because this  
3 will have to be done every single time. So I'm -- staff  
4 recommends -- I -- any -- any increment we can work with, and  
5 this is a good trial run to see if -- if -- if the commission  
6 chooses three and one, whether that works for the applicant,  
7 and if it doesn't then the next by biennium it could be  
8 reversed, and it can be one and three or -- or two and three,  
9 de -- you know, if the commission we're so graced with  
10 additional --

11 STOLDAL: Right.

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

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

25 OSTROVSKY: Any other (inaudible) --



1 STOLDAL: Chairman -- okay. If -- if we're talking  
2 about one and three, are you still thinking about all the  
3 money is -- is allocated, all 4 million and -- and then we  
4 divide it up into one in three?

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

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

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

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

25 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Does any other Commissioner have a

1 comment? If not, I would certainly entertain a motion. Any  
2 commissioner like to make a motion?

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

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

12 RAPPA: This is Commissioner Rappa, I second.

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

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

22 OSTROVSKY: Well, I -- I totally -- totally agree and  
23 -- and they -- they -- they do -- they do have experience that  
24 they're gonna have to learn from, as -- as was pointed out by  
25 staff earlier. Is there any member of the public, either in

1 the hearing room, online or on the telephone that would like  
2 to make a comment before we take a final vote on this matter?

3 PALMER: Sir, sir, for the record.

4 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

5 PALMER: I have one hand raised.

6 OSTROVSKY: That's fine. Why don't you permit them to  
7 speak, please?

8 PALMER: Okay. Ron Applegate, you're on and can  
9 speak.

10 APPLEGATE: Yeah, I -- you going through this, I, you  
11 know -- I kind of, you know, appreciate the troubles you're  
12 going through there to help us out there. The thing I with  
13 was -- was thinking about is, especially with the, Stoldal  
14 comments, is that fact is that if you had more money in head  
15 in there, those things such as roof repairs and stuff like  
16 that, you know, won't have to go through another wet season  
17 like we did last time with our roof repair, and that might be  
18 -- maybe that's how you're gonna choose who gets what first,  
19 you know, ones that are really need the money. That's my only  
20 comment.

21 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mr. Applegate. Any other  
22 comments? All right. You've heard the motion. All those in  
23 favor, please say aye.

24 MEMBERS: Aye.

25 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? All right, the motion

1 carries. The Chair votes in favor. Thank you very much.  
2 Item 5, review of the Western Missionary Corporations request  
3 to modify their grant and the grant is 19-25 to redirect the  
4 entire grant award scope of work and budget of \$165,000 from  
5 roof replacement to architectural and engineering services.  
6 This is an action item. Rebecca, like to give us a little  
7 background, please.

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

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

22 STOLDAL: Chairman.

23 OSTROVSKY: Mr. Stoldal.

24 STOLDAL: Rebecca, you said that the language you  
25 used was that this application meets the request of this

1 commission. Does it meet the standards required by the bond  
2 process and by the existing rules and regulations of -- of --  
3 of the Commission of Cultural Affairs and Historic Places? I  
4 know there's -- there's detail of -- of each of the -- a  
5 budget to some degree of -- of each of the elements that's in  
6 this overall budget. Does it meet the proper standards for us  
7 to move forward and take a vote?

8 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.  
9 Sir, yes, it does.

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

12 CAVANAUGH: I'll second. This Commissioner Cavanaugh.

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

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

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

23 RAPPA: This is commissioner -- this is  
24 Commissioner Rappa. I just have a question for Rebecca.  
25 Rebecca, did they apply for review for April? Do you know?

1 PALMER: For -- for the record, this is Rebecca  
2 Palmer. I don't understand the question.

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

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

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

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

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

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

17 MEMBERS: Aye.

18 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The Chair votes in favor.  
19 It's unanimous for the approval of agenda item number 5. A --  
20 agenda item number 6 is a review of the grantee's progress to  
21 date, discussion decision stand the May 10th, 2022 project  
22 deadline for grantees requiring additional time to complete  
23 their grant from the projects. This is an item that I kind of  
24 been -- been in the background for some time now. I think the  
25 commission has talked about it before about the difficulty

1 grantees are now having -- getting contractors or getting  
2 materials to finish their progress reports for our per our  
3 agreements with them. It was not my intent to go through  
4 every one of these. I -- I will have staff, however, whether  
5 there's anything unusual or -- or -- or any concerning request  
6 that you have in the list that you had before you, which --  
7 which indicates the status and those that will need some  
8 extension. To staff, any -- any comment?

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

12 STOLDAL: Chairman, I did have a question.

13 PALMER: Yes.

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

1 extend it. How -- how far are we extending it, and are there  
2 different extension requests for the different applications?

3 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.  
4 Staff would recommend a single extension date for all  
5 applicants or all -- excuse me, all grant -- grants. That's  
6 why all existing grants will expire on May 10th of 2022.

7 Staff recommends based on feedback we have received from the  
8 grantees, who still have work to complete, that the extension  
9 be to January 3rd, 2023. This will accommodate every single  
10 grantee.

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

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

17 STOLDAL: Okay.

18 ANTHONY: Yeah. Thank you.

19 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. They -- the January 3rd date, by  
20 the way, new year's is Sunday, Monday's generally a holiday  
21 following that, so this is really the first business day of  
22 the year in 2023 and that's how that date ended up January  
23 3rd, as opposed to the second, for example.

24 STOLDAL: Oh, I'd like to make a motion to extend  
25 this, uh, to January 3rd, 2023, staff's date any, uh,



1           CAVANAUGH:        Second, Commissioner Cavanaugh.

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

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

7           OSTROVSKY:        Yeah.

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

15          PALMER:           For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.  
16 Thank you for that excellent question.  Yes, there is indeed a  
17 concern across the state, and fran -- in fact, across the  
18 nation on finding contractors who can work on historic  
19 buildings.  It is becoming critical.  Historic preservation  
20 projects require knowledge of historic buildings and  
21 appropriate treatments, and across the nation, we are  
22 experiencing a shortage, of craftsmen, of contractors.  And so  
23 our state preservation plan has in it a proposal to support  
24 training opportunities at the universities and at trade  
25 schools, so that we can grow the next generation of

1 contractors, and we are already experiencing this with our  
2 current grantees in finding contractors willing to work on  
3 historic buildings is becoming increasingly challenging. So -  
4 - and I -- this -- I do not believe that will change in the  
5 near -- in the future staff.

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

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

1 extension?

2 PALMER: Sir, I have --

3 OSTROVSKY: Yes, ma'am.

4 PALMER: -- one -- one hand raised in the  
5 attendees.

6 OSTROVSKY: I see no -- no further questions from the  
7 commission. Now would be the appropriate time for the public.  
8 If someone has raised a hand, could you Rebecca, bring them on  
9 please?

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

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

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

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

25 OSTROVSKY: Is there any other public comment, either

1 online, by the phone or in the hearing room? I -- I hear num  
2 -- none. All those in favor of the motion to approve agenda  
3 items 6, please say aye.

4 MEMBERS: Aye.

5 OSTROVSKY: Anyone opposed? The Chair votes in favor.  
6 It's unanimous, made carried and ask staff to take the  
7 appropriate steps to prepare those dates and to notify the -  
8 the grantees of -- of the change in their -- their  
9 requirements under their grant. Now would be appropriate time  
10 for further public comment. We would encourage public comment  
11 and may limit its time to three minutes if necessary, the  
12 Chair's request. Is -- is there anyone member of the public  
13 in the hearing room, online or on the phone that would like to  
14 make a public comment at this time?

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

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

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

25 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Any other Commissioners?

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

15 MALE: Well done, everyone. Thank you.

16 FEMALE: Have a nice day, be well.

17 FEMALE: Thank you. Bye-bye, everybody.

18  
19 [end of meeting]  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25