

STEVE SISOLAK  
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA



Address Reply to:  
901 S. Stewart St, Suite 5004  
Carson City, NV 89701-5248  
Phone: (775) 684-3448

Chairman  
ROBERT OSTROVSKY

Vice Chairman  
ROBERT STOLDAL

PATRICIA OLMSTEAD  
GAIL RAPPA  
E'SHA HOFERER  
ANTOINETTE CAVANAUGH  
DAVID ORTLIPP

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES  
COMMISSION FOR CULTURAL CENTERS AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION

MEETING MINUTES  
Tuesday, June 14, 2022, 9:00am

*The Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation (CCCHP) meeting is open to the public and may be attended in person or via Zoom. Only the first floor of the Bryan Building is open to the public without an escort. If any member of the public plans to attend in person, they must arrive at least 10 minutes prior to the start of the meeting and wait in the lobby of the Bryan Building. A staff member will escort attendees to the meeting.*

Location:

The Richard Bryan Building  
Bristlecone Conference Room  
901 S. Stewart Street, Suite 5004  
Carson City, NV 89701

Please click the link below to join the webinar as an attendee:

<https://us06web.zoom.us/j/88248756949?pwd=d1Y1eGVrcmQvS0lxVmp6TGxPckpOQT09>

Passcode: 954137

**NOTE:** *This option does not require a computer with audio and video capabilities.*

*The public may also join the meeting by dialing the following:*

669-900-6833 or

253-215-8782 or

346-248-7799 or

929-436-2866 or

301-715-8592 or

312-626-6799

Webinar ID: 882 4875 6949

Passcode: 954137

*Additionally, public comment or testimony can be submitted via email to [ccloud@shpo.nv.gov](mailto:ccloud@shpo.nv.gov) or leaving a voice message at: (775) 684-3448. Voice messages received during the meeting will be transcribed and read to the Commissioners during the meeting. The Commission will make reasonable efforts to include all comments received by email and voicemail into the record. Please try to provide email or voicemail comments by 2:00pm February 1, 2022. Comments are limited to 3 minutes per person.*

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

**Items on this agenda may be taken in a different order than listed. Before any action or vote is taken, the Chairman will ask for public comment. Public comment will be allowed after Commission discussion of each action item on the agenda.**

1. Call to order by Chairman Robert Ostrovsky (The Chair)

2. Public comment.

Public comment will be taken at the beginning and end of the meeting and may be taken at the discretion of the Chair on agenda items listed for possible action. Public comments may be limited to 3 minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair. Comment will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action will be taken on any matters raised during the public comment period that are not already on the agenda. Persons making comment will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record.

3. Roll call and determination of quorum.

4. Staff announcements and summary of the status of Commission grants for the FY19-20 cycle.

The meeting recording began at item 4.

The Chair asked Rebecca Palmer to provide a quick review of the 2019 and '20 grant cycle.

Rebecca Palmer provided an overview of the 24 grants awarded to buildings within the state, indicating that of those 24, nine have completed their projects and successfully submitted final reports, which will eventually be posted on the website. Rebecca Palmer indicated that three additional grantees have submitted final reports that are in the process of being reviewed: Genoa Courthouse; Pioneer Hotel: the Brewery Arts Center. Rebecca Palmer explained that the Ely City Hall was extended to 9/30/2022 per the request of the Commission and that nine grants were extended to 3/3/2022. Rebecca Palmer brought three of those grants to the attention of the Commission, beginning with the McGill Depot and Transportation Building, which is two separate grants, one to the McGill Depot and one to the Transportation Building. Rebecca Palmer indicated that construction has not yet commenced. Rebecca Palmer further indicated that staff has not yet received the architectural drawings or other required information. Rebecca Palmer next explained that the Goldfield High School is still working on bids for the roof with contractors.

Chair Ostrovsky asked the Commissioners if they have any questions.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked Rebecca Palmer to clarify how much time a short time to complete is.

Rebecca Palmer indicated the time remaining for the grants for both these projects is through 3/3/2023.

Kristen Brown added that the transportation building did recently submit their drawings and that they are on track with the drawings even though construction has not yet begun.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if there is a point that the grant money will be lost if the projects are not completed and/or started.

Rebecca Palmer explained that there are varying opinions as to when the money needs to be spent. Rebecca

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Palmer explained that Construction has three years from the date of the sale of the bonds, but development has two years, thus making this a question of interpretation. Rebecca Palmer indicated that at this point, January 3, 2023 is the drop-dead date. Rebecca Palmer indicated, however, that if the project is not completed by the drop-dead date, the grant money will not be lost, but it would be ill-advised to provide any additional extensions.

Chair Ostrovsky asked Rebecca Palmer if the Commission should be thinking about establishing an earlier deadline to show progress that would indicate completion by the date, and if this criteria is not met, if the Commission can withdraw the funds and reallocate them.

Rebecca Palmer responded that withdrawing the funds is an option but that the Commission had anticipated that the extension would be the last one and as such, put in place multiple progress report requirements that must be submitted, the next of which is August 1, 2022.

Chair Ostrovsky asked Rebecca Palmer to update the chair and vice chair of the status following the August 1 deadline.

Chair Ostrovsky asked for additional questions from the commissioners. Seeing none, Chair Ostrovsky asked Rebecca Palmer to bring the Commission up to date on the bond sales for this current cycle.

Rebecca Palmer informed the Commission that the first bond sale for \$1 million has occurred but that the proceeds have not yet been deposited into the account. Rebecca Palmer indicated that the second bond sale for \$3 million will occur in October.

Chair Ostrovsky asked for confirmation that as today's money is granted, the expenditures need to be planned over time as the money is not all available quickly.

Rebecca Palmer confirmed that this is the case.

Vice Chair Stoldal suggested asking today's applicants as to whether or not they are shovel-ready.

Chair Ostrovsky concurred with that suggestion.

Antoinette Cavanaugh asked Rebecca Palmer to explain why funding is an anomaly this year.

Rebecca Palmer explained that the interpretation of parties at the Treasurer's Office for many years was that there needed to be grant awards made first and then bond sales to support the grant awards but that this is not a correct interpretation of statute. The statute very clearly states that the Commission will determine how much it wishes to award in an upcoming grant cycle request, that bond sales in that amount be sold to the Board of Finance, and then the grant cycle will begin. So for many years, the interpretation was that the grant awards had to be made first but that's been reinterpreted and now, the grant award cycle is occurring after the Commission has decided to award \$4 million and that's the reason for this anomaly. Additionally, the Treasurer's Office usually only has one bond sale per calendar year. In this particular cycle, because of the needs of a different program, the infrastructure bank, there are actually two bond sales in this calendar year, one in the spring for the infrastructure bank, and then the normal bond sale in October. The state statute very clearly says that the Commission can receive no more than \$3 million in any fiscal year, so we're receiving \$1 million in this fiscal year, FY22, and we will receive the \$3 million in FY23, and so that's the explanation for

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

the anomalies.

Chair Ostrovsky asked Commissioners if they had any other questions.

Rebecca Palmer stated that there are no other staff announcements at this time.

Chair Ostrovsky explained that the Commission will take a break somewhere around 10:30 or 11:00, and then would like to squeeze in a 30-minute lunch break around noon, 12:30, depending upon the way it goes. We do have a lot of work to do. I'd like to get it done in a one-day hearing, which I believe is very possible to do. We'll just go kind of the flow of the meeting.

5. Approval of minutes from previous meetings. **(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Chair Ostrovsky asked if anyone had any questions, comments, or other concerns regarding the minutes.

5a) November 3, 2021

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

**Motion passed unanimously.**

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

Chair Ostrovsky asked Vice Chair Stoldal to provide a quick review of the Commission's statutory responsibilities.

Vice Chair Stoldal explained that the focus of today's activities, which is the granting of funds, NRS 383.500 through 520 includes the creation of this Commission, but also has details regarding the program of awarding financial assistance, and the state law provides the Commission with the authority to (1) award financial assistance to government entities and nonprofit corporations formed for educational or charitable purposes, including, but without limitation, the preservation or promotion of cultural resources, (2) financial assistance may only be awarded for the actual expense of preserving or protecting historic buildings and here's the criteria on which the proposed projects will be judged, according to state law. The criteria must include, but is not limited to, a consideration to the degree the proposed project (A) may be able to move forward without the necessity of future state financial support, (B) a project that will be accessible to the community, (C) a project that will promote tourism in the state, (D) a project that will promote or preserve some historic or prehistoric feature of Nevada and (E) will have multiple uses for many types of cultural organizations, (F) the project will supplement training in the classroom in the arts and humanities, and (G) incorporates various disciplines directly associated with cultural resources. Also number 4 within the NRS 383.50, the Commission will give priority to projects of statewide historic, prehistoric, or cultural significance, which demonstrates the ability to raise financial support from sources other than the State of Nevada. The Commission will give priority to those projects that have the ability to raise and sustain support. That, however, must be weighed against the relative means and abilities of the applicant and the Commission in the past has also, as policy, given projects that are actual emergencies, we've given

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

them top consideration, and we've also looked at those projects that can be completed by the grant.

Chair Ostrovsky stated that this section of the agenda, we'll talk about scoring methods and grant review process and in doing that, we need to talk generally about the applications that we received. We have a very detailed manual on how to submit an application and what's required and staff that has taken a considerable amount of time in the past and present to work with applicants that have questions, concerns, don't understand, or make some assistance in following the outlined guidelines.

Vice Chair Stoldal interjected that he had inadvertently left out page 3 of his interview and noted that the Commission on Cultural Centers and Historic Places has the authority to award a sum greater than originally requested by the applicant if it is in the best interest of the building and the overall project. The CCCHP also has the authority to fund and request the applicant prepare studies from seismic to archeological, as well as architectural report in preparation of specific suitable plans to be used for estimating cost, biddings, and permitting the repair, restoration, or rehabilitation but not limited to the essential elements of the building, the structure, the foundation, the walls, and the roof. The Commission has looked at those elements of the structure, the foundation, the walls, and roof as well as asking for reports on those elements before actual construction grants are made, and the last one is the Commission has the authority to request the applicant return to the Commission at a later date with the requested documents to determine a final grant award.

Chair Ostrovsky noted that the Commission needs to keep all those points in mind as it goes through today's grant applications. Chair Ostrovsky asked if other Commissioners had comments about the applications in general.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that the grant cycle is a wonderful opportunity to visit parts of the state and specific projects and learn about the history of these projects and into the communities, and they're at different levels. The grant manuals are very clear. The applications are very clear. And then there's a question of the audits, and the audits are clearly required. There's two or three or four places where it says an audit, and if you don't have an audit, tell the Commission why there's no audit. Explanations are just really helpful within this application process.

Chair Ostrovsky asked if any other commissioners have comments. Chair Ostrovsky noted that some requirements will be placed upon applicants for approval. As such, the Chair urged applicants to spend ample time and fill out the applications carefully so that staff can be as productive as possible without having to chase after information. Chair Ostrovsky next discussed scoring and explained that the scoring method by which the budgets needed creation to determine what portion of funding could be achieved with limited dollars would not be used in this cycle. Chair Ostrovsky noted that the total bonded amount is going to be \$4 million minus the set-aside for administrative costs. The Chair further noted that the Commission has more funds than it has requests and can grant additional monies where it thinks it's required up to the \$3.8 million available. The Chair indicated that the Commission will want some reassurance that what the applicant wants to do is a first step or second step and if it's a second step, will want additional clarification. The Chair noted that through the grant review process, the Commission will be calling each grant request to make short comments. The Commission does not permit submission of new grant projects, but we've had indications where some requesters have received funds from another source, which have changed the numbers that have received new bids, which have changed the numbers, or something has happened to the facility since its grant application was

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

submitted, and the Commission does take those into consideration. The Chair called for further comments from the Commissioners.

7. Review and testimony regarding the FY21-22 eligible applications **(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**.

Note: The Commission plans to take applicants in order of receipt (as represented below and on the attached spreadsheet below). The Commission reserves the right, however, to take applicants out of order.

<u>CCCHP Application #</u>	<u>Building Name (may be abbreviated)</u>	<u>Organization (may be abbreviated)</u>
CCCHP-21-01	Storey County Courthouse	Storey County
CCCHP-21-02	CCF Visitor Center	Comstock Cemetery Foundation
CCCHP-21-03	Douglas County High School	Douglas County Historical Society
CCCHP-21-04	Historic Fourth Ward School	Historic Fourth Ward School Fdn
CCCHP-21-05	Fallon Theatres	Fallon Community Theatre, Inc.
CCCHP-21-06	Galena Creek Schoolhouse	Washoe County Parks/Open Space
CCCHP-21-07	Tonopah Mining Park	Tonopah Historic Mining Park Fdn
CCCHP-21-08	Reno First United Methodist	Reno First United Methodist
CCCHP-21-09	Carson Brewing Company	Brewery Arts Center
CCCHP-21-10	Ely L.D.S Stake Tabernacle	White Pine Community Choir Assoc
CCCHP-21-11	St. Mary's Art Center	St. Mary's Art Center
CCCHP-21-12	Boulder Water Filtration Plant	City of Boulder City
CCCHP-21-13	Ely City Hall	City of Ely
CCCHP-21-14	Cactus Theatre	Old Glory Theatre Co
CCCHP-21-16	New Ruth Club	White Pine County
CCCHP-21-17	El Rancho Hotel and Casino	City of Wells
CCCHP-21-18	Old Catholic Church	City of Carlin
CCCHP-21-20	Engine House/Machine Shop	Nevada Northern Railway Fdn, Inc.
CCCHP-21-21	The Pioneer Hotel Building	Western Folklife Center
CCCHP-21-22	Goldfield High School	The Goldfield Historical Society
CCCHP-21-23	Carlin School House	Carlin Historical Society

The Chair called for a representative from Storey County Courthouse.

Honey Menefee, Storey County Community Relations, indicated that there are no changes at this time from the original application that was submitted and highlighted the parts of the application that make the proposed project significant. Honey Menefee explained that the courthouse is home to most of the county government, and all of these offices may be accessed by the public during business hours. Election voting also takes place in the building. Further, the Slammer and Museum, which is free of charge, exhibits the history of Storey County from its inception through today, and it is open to the public Monday through Friday. More than a million tourists visit Virginia City annually, and tourism plays a vital role in the economic success of the region, and the Slammer and Museum is a popular attraction. Throughout its 145 years, the Courthouse has undergone periodic technological upgrades to allow for the continuous operations of the county government. Much of the electrical wiring in the courthouse remains in critical need of rehabilitation and poses a fire hazard to the historic building, its contents, and records. The proposed project is for the removal and replacement of the hazardous outdated wiring, outlets, and other devices. This includes tracing, rerouting, and relabeling the current circuitry, which is necessary due to past upgrades, wherein the outdated and unused wiring and outlets were left in place. The old and unused wiring and outlets create confusion in tracing current electrical issues when they occur.

The Chair called for questions from the Commissioners.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Vice Chair Stoldal pointed out that the amount of money quoted in the bid, \$95 per hour, exceeds the figure of what the Commission is allowed to give.

Rebecca Palmer noted that the maximum rate allowed by the Commission is \$82.57 and any portion above the maximum cannot be reimbursed by the Commission.

Vice Chair Stoldal inquired if that is a state number that the Commission could change and if it is updated on a regular basis.

Rebecca Palmer explained that the amount is what is the allowed rate under the federal grant and deferred to Attorney Walsh regarding whether or not there is a requirement in state statute, noting that if not, perhaps the Commission could raise that.

Attorney Walsh noted that he is not aware of any statutory provision that would prevent that type of change.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked if there is an exception to the federal amount due to factors around COVID costs.

The Chair noted that the Commission could likely make an exception should it decides it wants to.

Honey Menefee noted that this is not a Public Works project. This project will go out to bid. Most likely, United Electrical Services will be putting in a bid to do the work. They have done much of the electrical work in the past on the courthouse and are very familiar with the courthouse's needs. Public Works will be overseeing the project, but United Electrical Services or another contractor that wins the contract for bid will be taking care of the work.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked for confirmation that each application would be taken on a one-by-one basis.

The Chair confirmed that this was correct.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-01: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Cavanaugh. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Chair Ostrovsky asked for a representative from the Comstock Cemetery Foundation for the Visitor Center Water Waste System.

Candace Wheeler, Executive Director for the Comstock Cemetery Foundation explained that last week, contributors, volunteers, and county staff were invited to view the visitor center, all of whom were asked to fill out a survey to assess process so far, 100 percent of whom gave a five and above for the ability to share Comstock architectural history, the potential to educate the public, and to make a contribution to the community's visitors, and for our teacher's design programming for fourth graders. The Center's purpose is not just for public education, but also a research center largely dedicated to genealogy and to the best of our knowledge, when we open, we will be the only historic cemetery interpretive center in the State of Nevada. The work to date brings us very close to opening. It's been largely completed with local crafts people and over 40 volunteers. We're looking for plumbing,

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

sewage, and a design for a public toilet. We were not so lucky to discover that we could not hook up to the town sewage system because it was about a half a mile away through bedrock, required a pump, and would be about a \$250,000 ticket item. However, given our location, we are prime candidates to utilize a septic system. Besides the plumbing and the sewer request, we also included a professional design for a public toilet that would be adjacent to, but detached from, our visitor center. Also the VCTA will tell you a number one visitor concern is the availability of public toilets in Virginia City and we want to make sure that it fits the characteristics, it doesn't disrupt from the visual corridor, and, of course, we have the ADA compliance. By allowing us to determine that design now, it will really determine where we go with the septic and the plumbing lines.

The Chair asked for an overview regarding ownership of the property.

Candace Wheeler noted that the Cemetery Foundation has a 99-year lease from Virginia Consolidated Mining who owns all the mining properties on the land and also included with our grant was a letter given to us in 2015 by Storey County Management that says clearly that we own the mining cabin, and the reason it's kind of up right now is that for insurance purposes, safety, and just resources, we're looking at developing an MOU with the county and then asking to convey that lease to the county. It hasn't been accomplished yet but that is our end goal.

Chair Ostrovsky staff is this was adequate.

Rebecca Palmer explained that the requirements of the IRS is that the property be owned by a private nonprofit or a local government. The land ownership in Virginia City is challenging because of the numerous patented claims held. My understanding is that the property would hopefully transfer to Storey County within the life of this grant. However, it is not owned by a nonprofit or the parcel itself is not owned by a nonprofit or a local government.

Candace Wheeler indicated that it is leased for 99 years and the building is owned.

The Chair asked the other commissioners if they have questions.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked how we can go forward when one of the requirements is the owner has to sign the covenant and in reading the application, it seemed like there were two and if I understood it right, there's a mining claim on the cemetery.

Candace Wheeler indicated that the ownership in Virginia City is very challenging and without going to court, one could say that a mining patent owner has the surface and the mineral rights. One could also say that the lots and blocks take precedence and so what we have decided to do in partnership with the county is to work with Mr. Marshall, who has the mining patents, but the county also owns lots and blocks, so it depends who you're sitting in front of to work with them so that at the end of the day, the lease for the land would be given to Storey County, surface rights only. The House will maintain ownership with the Comstock Cemetery Foundation, and we will have an MOU which allows us to manage the property, the land, all the events, and the house is going to remain in our ownership.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that Ms. Wheeler understands the challenges and is trying to resolve those and stated that it's my understanding also that Storey County independently of whatever it's trying to do with you is, is



MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

also trying to clean up the 150-year history of the ownerships of land within Virginia City.

Candace Wheeler confirmed that this is correct.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked how close Ms. Wheeler believes they are in wrapping that up as that would give us some security, some sense that (A) that Storey County is going to be cleaned up or at least say, this is who owns what, and we're the legal entity, and then the second part, when do you think you would be able to get that MOU done?

Candace Wheeler indicated in no more than two months.

Vice Chair Stoldal questioned if the MOU is received and given to Storey County and the county signs that MOU with the foundation if that would satisfy the covenant issues.

The Chair noted that it does because the covenant runs 25 years. The Chair asked the construction schedule for this project, noting that Virginia City can be difficult in the winter.

Candace Wheeler explained that this is largely dependent on when we get the funding, but we have the resources and we have the people that are going to do this already selected, so we can go pretty much pretty soon, and honestly, the climate, I've never seen that really stop anything. We're not digging a huge basement or anything and, like I pointed out, we're lucky enough that the Comstock Historic District Commission already brought lines in, so we have a nice infrastructure set up.

The Chair asked Commissioners for additional questions.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-02 pending the approval of the MOU between Storey County and the Comstock Cemetery Foundation: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from the Douglas County historical Society.

Dennis Little explained that the Carson Valley Museum and Cultural Center is one of the central iconic historic buildings that is still left in the downtown corridor and I also enjoy sharing that we're more than a museum. We house the Van Sickle Research Center, which contains many of the diaries, ledgers, notes, and personal effects of our pioneer families. We also host a youth education program, highlighting the history, the culture, our DCHS young Chautauqua program. Our proposal on the restoration of the exterior fascia and painting is a lot more than just cosmetic. We're starting to see a lot of water intrusion in some of the window frames leading to wood rot. We've had two very interesting problems with the deteriorating fascia where we've had a bat infestation, which was a very interesting program to mitigate, and we also have had a nice colony of bees who decided to live in our attic. We are shovel ready. We currently have a 60-day bid from one of the contractors. We put out bids to six contractors. In this day and age, five were unresponsive. We did have one responsive licensed contractor.

The Chair asked for comment regarding discrepancies in how the budget was prepared and asked if the request is correct or needs to be modified.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Dennis Little noted that the request is correct.

The Chair asked about the existence of an itemized breakdown as none was included.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the discrepancy of \$1850.

Dennis Little noted that we're contributing \$1850 towards the project, which is what we have left in our building maintenance fund as of the moment.

The Chair asked for confirmation that this answered staff's questions.

Rebecca Palmer noted that it does.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if a seismic study has been produced recently for this building.

Dennis Little explained that no, at the moment, we are operating under the original 1991 seismic study and rules that were in place when we undertook the restoration of the building, and at that time, we were completely seismic compliant.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the overall condition of the six columns.

Dennis little responded that they're showing significant drying, cracking. What worries us, we're getting water intrusion that's actually going into the columns and then going down to the deck and finding its way into the museum, so that's one of our concerns in getting the fascia material and the columns put back together as quick as possible.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked who will overall manage this project.

Dennis Little indicated that he will be managing the contractors and Janice Beerwinkle will manage the financial aspect.

The Chair asked for questions from other commissioners and noted that we didn't get the complete resumes that, that we requested, so in the future, please provide those as required, and, and any breakdown of costs that specific that the staff can contract would be appreciated.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-03: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Cavanaugh. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from the Fourth Ward School.

Nora Stefu, Executive Director of the Fourth Ward School Museum informed the Commission that the Fourth Ward School is a historical landmark in Virginia City community and holds an important architectural essence representing the Victorian-American architecture, architecture of 1876, which is the state-of-the-art school building and innovation of its time that accommodated students and teachers, and is the last of its kind in the State of Nevada and the United States. The community successfully has rehabilitated the original structure of

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

the building with the help of the Nevada State Historic Preservation, Storey County, and donors. Today, it is important to continue to maintain the integrity of the building by restoring the exterior wood windows and the roof surfaces and architecture elements from weather deterioration, which continues to battle to prevent the deterioration in sealing the wood surface of this 1876 wood building from the Northern Nevada harsh weather conditions. The building is a historical attraction and a cultural center that provides historical information for the Comstock community and the State of Nevada and travelers who come and visit Virginia City. We continue to have programs for preservation, inviting and educate the public of the importance of the Comstock story. We have developed programs educating the importance of the Nevada history for fourth and seventh grade students by visiting the museum and also providing digital programs that are produced at the premises, and most important is archival center that holds the historical artifacts and historical information of the Comstock community. The rehabilitation project is essential to secure the building exterior walls. We were fortunate to preserve and the west front elevation of the building last year. At this point, we feel it's essential to continue rebuilding the rest of the building, the south, east and the north elevation. It's crucial to be restored, especially we leave the south and east elevation of the wood, it's deteriorating -- deteriorating. So we have granted a Storey County building support to restore the south side and we, we are ready to start in July. At this point, we feel it's essential to start rehabilitating the east and north, and even if the north side of the building is less deteriorated due to not prominent sun and wind and weather exposure, we believe the funds are available and we can do all three sides by next spring. Our contractors have been proven and they can finish the project. Also, we have experienced that from the 2019 to 2020 grant cycle, the cost of the construction has risen 20% more in the price, so definitely, we believe if we have the funds and the funds are available, we can finish the project.

The Chair indicated that this facility has received grants from this Commission and its prior Cultural Commission for a long time, but it still didn't excuse the applicant from not providing us a printout of the assessor's website, which is required, and there's no audit attached, so my question is -- one is just something that needs to be done, the assessors printout. The other, though, was the audit information. Do you know when the last audit was or what the audit plans are for the foundation?

Nora Stefu explained that from my understanding, Commissioner, we were not required for an audit, a professional audit because we don't meet the threshold to provide a professional audit. However, though, every quarter, the Board pretty much sees our financial statements and we hire professional accounting firm for the IRS taxes.

The Chair invited Commissioners to ask questions.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that we're not the IRS, we're the Commission on Cultural Centers and Historic Places, and it's clear within the application in the grant manual that we require an audit, and I will tell you, quite frankly, surprises me that there hasn't been an audit on any nonprofit that has this kind of importance. The money that this Commission has invested in it has been substantial, so, this is not a requirement of the IRS, but it's clear in the grant application for the Commission on Cultural Affairs and Historic Places that we require an audit. Now, the little asterisk that's attached to that is an explanation and, and I think that you have provided that explanation, but that should have been part of the application so we would understand what the foundation does as far as making sure that one and one adds up to two and it's spent properly. The other question was who

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

actually owns the building and the land?

Nora Stefu indicated that Storey County does.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if they would be able to provide that list of the AP number and asked staff if Storey County would sign the covenants.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that they would and indicated that staff heard something that we felt that the Commission should be aware of. The presenter for the Fourth Ward School stated that the county had given money for the south elevation. If that's the case, then the grant application should reflect that money has come in for that south elevation and therefore the award may need to be reduced.

The Chair asked what the county has contributed.

Nora Stefu explained that Storey County has passed in their budget to give us the money for the south side of the building, however, we don't know exactly the process yet, so this is all in the future tense that we will know all the requirements that we need, and our request also doesn't include the south side. Our request was for the east and north side of the building on our grant report.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted his understanding that Storey County owns this building and that a request was made by the foundation to Storey County for \$160,000 and that that grant has been approved and some paperwork needs to be done, and I thought that was, in fact, for the south side.

Nora Stefu confirmed that this is correct.

The Chair noted that the letter of submission to the Commission says, 'rehabilitation and restoration of the exterior south, east and north elevations'.

Nora Stefu indicated that we explain what the needs in in our grant proposal are. However, we believe that we explained that we requested the east and the north from SHPO grant money, but we wanted to explain what we requested for the Storey County as well. So just to see what are requesting for the building to be fixed.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that if I read the figures correctly, you're asking for the east side \$305,870, and for the north side, \$198,778. Are those the figures we should be looking at?

Nora Stefu confirmed that they are.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that the Chair mentioned earlier that this Commission and its predecessor has given several hundred thousand dollars, recognized the importance of the Fourth Ward School. One of the last applications and grants was for \$228,633, and that included the mansard roof. We're going to fix one side. We're going to fix another. Part of it was already fixed. What is the condition of the mansard roof right now?

Nora Stefu explained that all the wood links are deteriorated. Some parts are deteriorating to where they need to be pulled out and sealed and repainted.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked why the roof itself was not a major project rather than fixing one side at a time.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Nora Stefu explained that the issue was money and that the major construction of rehabilitating the north-south side of the roof was completed, but not all the shingles.

Vice Chair Stoldal questioned then in taking consideration the mansard roof, the condition, if you had the choice between the east elevation or the north elevation, which is the one that needs attention right now?

Nora Stefu indicated the attention right now is the east.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked so you'd work on the east side and then the south side, and then potentially later on ask for a grant for the north side?

Nora Stefu confirmed that this is correct.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked regarding previous grant awards, when they were made, how was it determined that they were eligible for funding if there was no audit report attached to those applications, and if there was no grant or if there was no audit report, what was the justification for the grant award being made? I'm assuming that there was some justification that rested well with commissioners who made the previous grant awards and I just want to know what the difference is.

The Chair noted that from his point of view, we've always accepted their proposal based on their accounting firm and their Board, but it looks to me that the feeling of the Commission is beginning to change a bit more than it was in the past, and that we think, particularly projects of this size, which we've invested more than hundreds of thousands and over a million dollars in this building, that we should encourage their Board of Directors to spend the money to have an audit done to reassure the public and us that these funds are all expended appropriately. So I think it's a change in the Commission's attitude a bit. The asterisk has been Okayed. We had an explanation of why not, but I think this Board is beginning to ask more questions, particularly on the larger projects, which have got funding available or resources in order to achieve that. I don't know if the staff has any further comments, Rebecca, on, on the audits.

Rebecca Palmer noted that audits have always been required by the Commission. The Commission can choose to waive the requirement or the Commission can choose to seek an explanation for the lack of an audit, and so I would be happy to do the research for the prior grant cycles to determine what happened at the various meetings, but staff has noted and will continue to note where required elements are missing.

The Chair asked for any further comments.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that the audit is really clear throughout the application and this is an application to the State of Nevada, not an application to the IRS, and I think the applicant explained that every quarter there's an auditing firm that comes in and makes sure one and one is two. That should have been included in the application, and, and I want to make sure because I don't think that staff could make it any clearer that audits are an important element of the application, but maybe we just need to put it all in capital letters, all in red ink and put it at the top or something to make sure that this is important. And I think the Chair also is correct. Spending the money properly, whether it's \$10,000 or, or a million dollars is important. This is taxpayer's money, but the spotlight, the magnifying glass, gets a little more focused when the money is a quarter million dollars or more rather than \$10,000.

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

The Chair noted that we will get an opportunity at our next meeting to establish the grant procedure application procedure for the following year's grants and if we want to tighten the language around audits and be specific about what the Commission requires and what are acceptable exceptions to that requirement, we can do so at that time.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-04: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

At the discretion of the Chair, a short break was taken.

The Chair called the meeting back to order following the break and asked for a representative from the Fallon Community Theater.

Mike Berney indicated that the Fallon Theater is just turning 102 this year and the Fallon Theater is pretty much the draw of downtown Fallon, so it's a huge part of our communities. So, our current grant that we're asking for or put in an application for basically is to continue on with the second phase of our seismic retrofit as recommended by Mel Green and Associates. We've also asked about a new heating-cooling system for our lower theater mainly because the unit that's in there, the cooling unit, is just a huge unit that's probably from the 1930s, which basically is falling apart and is probably more expensive to try to repair it as, what the HVAC contractors have told us, than to just put in a new unit. And also with that, we were looking for new heating and cooling in the conference area and what was the old apartment upstairs to provide better heating flow through that unit, especially since all the plumbing's been redone in there. And the last thing that we've asked for on this was an electrical upgrade, which would be for our stage. We have a lot of bands. We have comedy shows. We have lectures. We have all sorts of things going on on our stage and that electrical, especially when we have bands, we definitely need that upgraded and that would also go into the sound booth, which we would take that electrical into there. And that bid also covers the electrical that would be needed for the HVAC installations.

The Chair indicated that in future cycles, an audit should be included with the application and opened the floor to Commissioners for questions.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that he would like to hear from the applicant as far as how they balance their books or who sees, and their understanding that an audit or some sort of explanation of the process they arrive at to make sure everything adds up and it's spent properly.

Mike Berney noted that although he does not disagree with the Commission's ask of an audit, the problem is that the organization does not have the amount of money to spend on the \$10,000 to \$15,000 cost of an audit. As such, Mr. Berney indicated that we have a treasurer who handles our bills and basically puts together the books for us. We look at those on a monthly basis. We also have our accountant take a look at that to make sure everything looks okay.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated the Commission's understanding of the financial challenge of conducting an audit and noted that the process that is used should be included. The Vice Chair asked if you get the approval and the money flow is available, that you could start this right away.

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Mike Berney noted that that I can probably start part of it right away. I'm sure the electrical can fit us in pretty quick. The HVAC guys, the guys that did our seismic, they have to work with the roofers and the roofing company is D and D Roofing out of Reno, so it, it just depends how they can fit us in.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if there is any sort of communication between the various historic theaters around the state.

Mike Berney indicated that he does not believe he's heard from anybody.

Stu Richardson stated that we've heard from other people doing some restoration work with the Commission, but, no, not between the theaters.

The Chair called for additional comments.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-05: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from Galena Creek Schoolhouse or Washoe County Park Department.

Joanne Lowden, Natural Resource Planner with Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Space, explained that our project today is the Galena Creek Schoolhouse. If you're not familiar with it, the schoolhouse is located in Washoe County. It was constructed in 1940 by the Works Progress Association and it was used as a rural schoolhouse until around 1959. It is strongly associated with the Callahan Ranch and the Callahan family. It was also owned by local Reno poet, Joanne De Longchamps from about 1971 to 1982 and supposedly inspired some of her famous schoolhouse poems that were published in 1975. This building was listed on the National Register of Historic Places in 2011. Washoe County purchased the property in 2006. We had an initial report completed to document the history and condition of the schoolhouse. That was done in 2009. We were also working on completing an updated master plan for Callahan Park, which was finished in 2011. As part of that master planning process, we had an assessment done on the schoolhouse and they included some recommendations for restoration. It also included some improvements for the surrounding area that would help tie the building into the bigger park, so as part of that process, the county did solicit and incorporate community feedback as far as what they'd like to see done with that site, and it was decided that the best way to proceed was to turn the Galena Schoolhouse into a reservable public facility. We'd really like to stabilize and restore the schoolhouse \to create a public reservable facility that would become part of Phillip and Annie Callahan Park. We've split the work into three phases. Phase 1, which is really the subject of this grant application, would include the initial design work that would include structural retrofitting and stabilization, removal of modern additions and abatement of hazardous conditions. Phase 2 would really be focused on interior and exterior finishers to restore historic character, again, to when the building was used as a schoolhouse and then also additional amenities to make the building suitable as a reservable facility. Once the improvements to the building are complete, then we'd be focusing on Phase 3, which would be improvements to the surrounding areas shown in our master plan. Those include an outdoor classroom, some additional parking, some pathways, seating, interpretive signage, and landscaping. And so really our goals for this facility, again, turn it into a public reservable facility and what that means for us is a space that's available for the public to reserve for things like small meetings, special events, interpretive education. It's also a space that can be used by park ranger staff and our partners to host educational, interpretive, and

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

entertainment programming, and it also would just serve as a park attraction, which would include exterior interpretive signage. So just another way to kind of bring people into the park and have another amenity available.

Thank Chair called for questions from the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Stoldal commented that this does not sound like a shovel-ready project.

Joanne Lowden confirmed that this is correct.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated concern about the fact that the master plans are more than a decade old. What some of it does say is you're going to take out all of that interior, all those modern things, and get rid of the stove and it looks like a small apartment, but do I also understand that you're going to maintain plumbing and electrical once this project is done? Because it says you're going to take that out, but I assume if you're going to use it for meetings, you're going to put that in down the line?

Joanne Lowden noted that this is correct and that we would put in just enough to make it suitable as a reservable facility, so normally, that's some lighting, heating, and then occasionally toilet facilities.

The Chair asked if the county has to pay permitting fees.

Joanne Lowden indicated that they do, both to themselves and to the city of Reno or whoever has jurisdiction in that area.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted his belief that they do not need to pay the one to state lands.

Joanne Lowden disagreed.

Rebecca Palmer that state lands would not need to issue a permit and therefore, the \$5000 permit identified as Nevada Division of State Lands would not be necessary in this case.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that we need an updated plan and, and I'm ready to make a motion to approve Phase 1 for \$110,607, to really get an updated plan for construction and understanding what this building is like now. Even with that, though, it sounds like, according to the document, we wouldn't get that plan until early next year at the earliest that we would get the results of that. So I think the best thing to do would be to support a detailed plan on how to move forward with this project even though that plan won't be ready until, I think, June of next year, if I read the process that the county has to go through in order to put it out for bid, so to speak, and review all the applications.

Joanne Lowden indicated that the building was assessed back in 2011 as part of that master planning process, and they did make some recommendations. And as part of that, you know, they looked at seismic. They looked at a lot of other things, and so we really have a pretty comprehensive list of what the needs are and really what we're looking for is that specific design work where we bring in a historical architect, have them specifically identify material, and put together a detailed construction plan. And that's what we use to go out to bid with, and that's pretty standard for what we do with most of our projects. So I just want to make sure that,



## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

you know, you realize we are a little further down the road, I think, that I'm hearing. That we just, you know, again, we really had those initial assessments already done and really nothing has changed in that time because that building has really just sat there for the last 10 years, you know, in the same condition that it was. So I just wanted to make sure that that was understood.

Vice Chair Stoldal read from the narration supplied by the applicant and made a motion to approve Application #CCCHP-21-06 for the amount of \$110,607.

The Chair asked staff if we were to approve the \$110,000 and change, would there be time in this grant cycle, if we set aside the remaining portion for them to come back to the Commission with a better cost estimate based on the new study, would there be time for this Commission to act under this grant cycle.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that there might be. At this point, we are identifying May the 1st, 2024 as the termination date for most of the funding agreements. So as far as I can see from, from what's required, there are really a couple of alternatives that could be chosen, and I make this broader statement because I think you're going to begin addressing that as we move through the grant applications. The Commission can either say that when the information available for clearly identifying the requests is available, then you can meet and review that additional information. So it could be you get, you know, an award of a certain amount and then when that documentation is available, the Commission will meet to review the other phases of the grant request. Alternatively, the Commission could decide that in some circumstances, the documentation can be reviewed by staff who can provide that information to the commissioners and they can decide that it is sufficient for the needs of the building and for this agreed funding. So you could condition the receipt of the original grant upon a future meeting or you can condition it upon receipt of the documents by staff and review by staff. I guess those are the two alternatives.

The Chair summarized that the alternative here is to authorize the full amount with requirements. One, staff review appropriateness or, two, Commission review. That would allow them to expend \$110,607 now, and then would take further approval either from staff or from the Commission to expend further funds of that grant.

Vice Chair Stoldal clarified that this is an important building, so there's just no question about that. The challenge that I have is the assessment and the documentation is 10 years old. What the county is asking for is \$110,000 now to get a fresh plan. My concern then is if the county's able to go through their normal process, fund the consultant report. The consultant has time to present it to the county. The county then has time to analyze it and then the county may say, you know what, we want to do this phase first, and it's going to cost \$110,000. We want to do this phase second, \$120,000. I'm not ready to grant numbers that are a little foggy. The one number that's not foggy is the request for the study, a construction plan. And again, reading the presentation, it doesn't sound like that's going to be ready until June of next year. I think reading minds here, I think that Storey County is going to get that document, look at it, and say, well, the clock's ticking, it's now close. We only have less than a year before the funding of, of May 1st 2024 gets done. We can only get this much done in that period of time. We're going to ask the CCCHP for another \$125,000 to do this. I suggest we get this study done and Storey County figures out a way to jack the speed up and get that work done as quickly as possible and then come back with as much time as still is available for the bond money. The quicker it gets done, the more time that they're going to have time to get the construction work done. The less time they get

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

that report and then decide to come back with whatever number it's going to be, they're going to have less time, so that's where I was going with the initial thought on \$110,000.

The Chair asked staff if it is possible for the Commission to do what the Vice Chair is proposing.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that this is an available alternative and advised that the meeting be held sometime following the close of the legislative session in 2023 so that the Commission will have to establish a new grant cycle if there is funding in the approved executive budget for the next grant cycle. So there will be a need for a meeting anyway, and, if, in June, the county, Washoe County, is aware of what next phase they might want to tackle in the remaining time, yes, you could then obligate that additional funding at that point. The funding agreement would only be executed for the amount the Commission granted today.

Commissioner Cavanaugh indicated his desire to go ahead and approve the grant amount for \$340,050 minus the \$5000 for the permitting because the grant application itself meets the requirements of the application process.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that I don't disagree a hundred percent with that and when I did the math, I'm left over with a considerable amount of change, and, and for the first round that we're all sort of working on, and that's going to be left over with some money, and there may be some projects that the commissioners will likely give more or less money as we go through. But in either case, it's likely we're going to wind up with a considerable amount of change, and part of my concern is getting this report back from the consultants for the county. The way the process outlined in detail in, in, in, in, in this report, which is many pages long, says that they're not likely to get that until June of next year. That's not going to give them time to finish Phase 2 and 3. Once they get the report back, they're going to have to go out to bid and that's going to take another period of time. So I don't want to lose the money, but I think that, that we need to keep the money for this project in reserve, so if they're able to speed the process up and they think they can get Phases 2 or 3 or whatever phase they come back with, if they can get that done, then we'll have some money to fund it.

The Chair asked Commissioner Cavanaugh if he could accept some kind of a motion that allotted the \$110,000 and set aside of reserve of \$234,000 for this project to be made available on the completion of the study.

Commissioner Cavanaugh indicated that he could.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-06 for the amount of \$110,607 with a set-aside of \$234,443: Commissioner Cavanaugh; second by Commissioner Olmstead.

Vice Chair Stoldal expressed his worry of shifting the Commission's responsibility of a quarter million dollars to a maybe.

Amended Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-06 for the amount of \$110,607 with a set-aside of \$234,443 following the convening of a Commission meeting to make approval for the rest of the funding: Commissioner Cavanaugh; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from Tonopah Mining Park.

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Ann Carpenter, Chair of the Tonopah Historic Mining Park Foundation explained that the Foundation raises money from visitors who donate, board members who donate, local and regional businesses, and folks living in the region, the mining industry, local, statewide, and affiliated support industries to the mining industry have helped to support our efforts up at the park, and we have been laser focused lately on the head frame restoration. The park is an outdoor museum open to the public. The Foundation, again, working closely with the town of Tonopah, is regularly making repairs and improving exhibits to ensure the history of mining, and Tonopah remains preserved and accessible to the public. The Foundation has successfully completed many projects in partnership with the town as well as industry partners over the years since its inception to preserve and protect the property. The grant will reopen two buildings on the Tonopah Historic Mining Park property, the Silver Top Hoist House in Grizzly, and continue work to allow accessibility to the third iconic feature at the park, the Desert Queen Complex. This will allow visitors to more fully immerse themselves in the history of mining in Tonopah and in Nevada, especially focused on central Nevada, creating a better visitor experience and fuller understanding of the historic significance of mining of the park and of Nevada. Stabilization, arrested decay and preservation of the features. Currently there's limited access due to animal infestation and some additional stabilization work that needs to be completed. The town lacks personnel and funds to clean and restore consistently, so the Grizzly must remain closed to the public until we complete the restoration and the work that we are proposing. The Silver Top Complex, we want to reinstall the ore tracks on top of the trestle, install lighting in the mine shaft to allow for public viewing like we have down at the, at the Mizpah, reinstall the elevator, and reinstall the cable bell and guide cable. Final completion of the full Silver Top Complex, including the grizzly, will allow increased public access and increased experience. The Desert Queen. Stabilization work on the Desert Queen initiated again by the town. We need additional help to complete that work on the hoist house, the head frame, and the attached grizzly. Final completion of the full Desert Queen area will allow public access and from that, a better learning experience from the historic mine projects.

The Chair noted that this project lacks an audit and asked for information regarding money and how the books are handled.

Ann Carpenter indicated that there is a nine-member Board that meets quarterly and reviews financials through the Executive Assistant and Treasurer and uses the town's accountant. In addition, we provide very detailed accounting back to SHPO in the form of a final report, and we account for all of the expenditures, the fees, the supplies that were purchased right down to the details. So although it isn't a formal audit, we are structured very formally as a board and operate as such.

The Chair asked what year the park originally opened.

Jeff Martin indicated that the park was started in 1992 as a gift from Echo Bay.

The Chair called for questions from the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the Silver Top project and the safety issues between having a spread stabilization and piers.

Ann Carpenter explained that the piers are for the structural stabilization of the head frame posts, and then the buildings themselves that need to be stabilized. The Desert Queen is on flatter ground whereas the grizzly of the Silver Top is up on very high stilts.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

The Vice chair asked if this is a safety issue or a geology issue.

Ann Carpenter responded that it is an engineering issue and that both are safe.

The Vice Chair asked if there was a need to choose between the Silver Top and the other one, what would be the choice.

Ann Carpenter noted that she would lean towards finishing the Silver Top.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-07: Commissioner Cavanaugh; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from the Reno First Methodist Church.

Ron Applegate indicate that the rain gutter systems are pretty well rotting out, are corroded, and need to be rebuilt, which is the first phase. The second phase is the electrical switch, which involves bring control switches outside the breaker box. The final phase is to rebuild the worn-out trifold doors between the parlor and the sanctuary.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that the applicant is correct in the assumption that prices may have risen due to COVID, but indicated the need to stick with the requested amount rather than add to it.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-08: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Cavanaugh. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from Brewery Arts.

Mike Wiencek discussed the needs of the Brewery Art Center and explained that the request is to finish the restoration of the brick on the building.

The Chair noted that staff has many questions regarding the restoration work.

Vice Chair Stoldal questioned the proposal for \$537,431, of which \$200,000 is allocated for wastewater disposal.

Mike Wiencek explained that we received a grant from the Brownfield's program, from the State EPA where they've approved us up to \$200,000 to handle the wastewater removal. My understanding is, is when the brick was restored last time, the city allowed them to just let the wastewater go down the drains, but then upon further testing, they realized the lead content was too high and they would not let them do that again. So then the State EPA said that they would fund the removal and treatment of the wastewater that comes off from the steam process, removing the lead paint.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that the quote includes repointing 100 percent of all mortar joints, but point 14 says this proposal specifically includes reappointing.

The Chair noted that it says excludes reappointing.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Mike Wiencek confirmed that it excludes masonry repair and noted that I'd have to double check with the contractor on that point, but I don't know if that just means the concrete work that's around the building, that they wouldn't be repairing that where it meets the brick, but I'm not that sure.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that this needs to be cleared up and asked once the bricks are done, does the foundation have a policy of what can be put up on the walls.

Mike Wiencek indicated that there are no plans to ever do anything to or mount anything on the brick.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if this has to be financially phased in, which set of walls do you recommend. West and south or west and north walls?

Mike Wiencek indicated the west and the north walls are the most important with the aim being for next spring, but noted that the contractor wouldn't get into any kind of dates until funding was secured.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked how long it would take to get done.

Mike Wiencek was not provided that information but confirmed that it would be within a year.

The Chair asked if any other commissioners have questions.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-09: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Cavanaugh. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from White Pine County Community Choir Association.

Mary Eldridge, Grants Director for the White Pine Community Choir Association explained that we have applied for funding to continue the restoration of the Centennial Fine Arts Center. The restoration of the building creates a venue for groups currently having no other options. The proposal before you today requests \$83,200 to stabilize the subsidence in the foundation in the Southwest corner of the building. We have sought the expertise of a structural engineer with experience in foundation restoration to develop the plan and budget. This includes the necessary excavation and placement of helical spears to relevel the corner and prevent further deterioration. This project aligns well with the Commission's efforts to ensure historic buildings are structurally sound and safe to be enjoyed by many more generations of Nevadans.

The Chair asked how they arrived at the amount and whether or not they have firm bids.

Mary Eldridge indicated that we do not have firm bids, but we did talk with the structural engineer who was recommended to us by the architect that we have worked with previously that has experience in restoring foundations, and these are the figures that he gave us, the steps in the process, and the figures that he gave us for the work to be completed.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that my challenge is that there are almost a dozen things missing from this

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

application, and there's no firm bid. The dollar figures are really a guesstimate. While on the face of it, I think this is clearly based on working, I think, in past years, this building has all the elements to fit a funding request, but we don't know who the engineering company is. We don't know who the stabilization plan is and whether a full seismic, is it just one part of the building or are we doing patchwork? Has there been an examination of the foundation, the structure that's on, so we're not just going around and patching stuff up? My notes are to delay funding on this and put some reserve money in so this applicant could come back with more details and again, 11 pieces, critical pieces, are missing from this application, and I don't quite understand that, but I think that the project, based on previous grant application, has value to both the state and the community, but I'm not ready to give money just based on this application.

The Chair asked for comments from other commissioners.

Commissioner Cavanaugh echoed the concerns of the Vice Chair and recommended that the staff work with the White Pine Community Choir Association to make this grant whole to the extent that they get a list of the things that are required for this application. Commissioner Cavanaugh noted that I would be amenable, as suggested by my colleague, Mr. Stoldal, to set aside some funds for them if they become compliant with all grant application requirements.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked the Attorney General's office if it was possible to make a motion is to delay a vote on this matter without prejudice, so that the applicant could work with staff to come up with a complete application and, and, Chair, do you have a sense of when this Board may meet again? Within 90 days? Before the end of the year?

The Chair indicated no later than September 1.

Attorney Walsh indicated that he is comfortable with that motion.

The Chair asked staff if they are comfortable with providing them a list of the missing items from their application and indicating, or this commission is indicating, that they need to get quotes, firm quotes, for the foundation engineering work.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that staff is comfortable with this and willing to work with the applicant.

Motion to hold the funds and delay a vote on Application # CCCHP-21-10 until the next Board meeting, no later than September of 2022: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Cavanaugh. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Rebecca Palmer read Ann Carpenter's chat into the record. Ann Carpenter here for the Tonopah Historic Mining Park Foundation. We very much appreciate your continued support and efforts, and thanks for your approval of our grant request. We are shovel ready and begin work relatively quickly as all of the engineering work has been completed. I wanted you to know this, as I forgot to mention this detail in my presentation, thank you again.

The Chair called for a 30-minute break for lunch.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

The Chair called the meeting back to order following the lunch break. The Chair noted that we wanted to make sure that staff was keeping track, a running total of what we've granted and what we've saved and so on, and staff assures us that they'll be able to provide that at the end of the meeting of the grant process that we know exactly where we have with our financials.

Rebecca Palmer read Candace W.'s chat into the record. I have a clarifying question. The CCF currently has the 99-year lease on the Silver Terrace Surface Rights and currently the CCF, Comstock Cemetery Foundation, is the only owner of the Visitor Center. At the end of our work with the county, the lease will be conveyed to the county for the surface rights, and an MOU will exist between the county and this and the Comstock Cemetery Foundation to handle develop of land and full property management, not unlike the Fourth Ward and St. Mary's Art Center. However, the Visitor Center for now will remain in Comstock Cemetery Foundation ownership. As the majority of the grant is for work on the Visitor Center, who would sign the covenants?

Rebecca Palmer indicated that when we executed the covenants for the FY19 grant cycle, included with those covenants was a quick claim deed from the property owner to the Comstock Cemetery Foundation. Those are usually when a property owner wants to release a claim on a property, and so with that quick claim deed, we had the Comstock Cemetery Foundation sign the covenant agreement. I would assume that once the MOU is executed and Storey County is the underlying surface owner of the property, it would be Storey County who would sign the covenants just as we would do with the Fourth Ward School and, and St. Mary's Art Center.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that there seems to be two issues here. One is the, the applicant is making a difference between the ownership of the building and the ownership of the land. Do our covenants cover both those elements or are we assuming that whoever owns and controls the land also controls the structure?

Rebecca Palmer explained that the covenants are written on the parcel in question, the land and the property on top. The Commission has not executed covenants on the property, the building alone, in the past.

The Chair asked staff if there are concerns about that, to make a formal request.

Attorney Walsh noted that ideally, the covenants would apply to both the building and the land. So to the extent that there is prohibitive ownership between the building owner and the landowner, if they're the same entity, then I think there isn't a complicated issue there.

The Chair asked for a representative from St. Mary's Art Center.

Arika Perry gave an overview of St. Mary's Art Center and explained that this work that we're applying for was previously approved for funding by the Commission in the previous grant cycle. However, due to the extreme increase in construction pricing, we had to remove the window scope of work in order to fully fund the critical leaking front porch, print room, and chimney repointing work. So with that, it is now our top priority in this grant cycle to focus on the rehabilitation of 18 windows on the east facade, specifically the second and third floors. These windows really are in the state of severe deterioration and beginning to rapidly increase in decay due to the weather and sun exposure. So this is making the window operations increasingly difficult for guests and staff, and is impairing the appearance of the property, but even more importantly, it's allowing the elements and drafts to infiltrate our interior, and it's making it very difficult for our guests to open the windows, which is

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

the primary source of fresh air and breeze, particularly in the warmer months, since we do not have air conditioning, and our work will follow the methodology found in the National Park Service Preservation Brief Number 9, and we have a construction quote from Simerson Construction, who is currently completing the work for the porch, print room, and chimney, and that includes some lead paint mitigation, which will be required since that has been identified on the framing, and then we would also respectfully request that if additional funds are available, there are six other windows on the fourth floor on that east elevation that would benefit from repairs as well as other windows on other elevations, which we could proactively address.

The Chair asked if there is an estimate on the cost of per-window basis or average cost of a window repair.

Arika Perry indicated that we could create one based on the 18 windows and the \$100,000 cost. There is a small contingency included within that for potential surprises, but we had not focused on the other elevations until we had learned that you may have surplus funding available, but the four windows on the fourth floor on that same east facade would benefit from being addressed. They are not in quite as severe decay, so the contractor was hoping that they may be able to fit that into the current pricing, but they will not commit to that until they see the extent of damage to the others that they've already taken a look at, and as I said, they're continuing to decay even from the last time that they gave us an updated quote, which was earlier this spring.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that I'm going to be making a motion to increase the funding to \$127,597 based on the details and the application and the quote it's likely there are some 18 windows on the east side that will require more work than others, but the average cost for those 18 windows per window is \$5400. And the application mentions there are six other windows on the east side that would "benefit from repairs", but are not as damaged as the 18 that are in the dire need of repairs. So taking the \$5400 for the 18 and using an estimate then of \$5000 for the ones that are less damaged for the other six and the contingency cost, so the really damaged one \$5400, the increase in prices and less damaged windows and all that I put in \$5000 per window and that's how I came up with \$127,597 to increase the award to that amount.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-11 for a total amount of \$27.597: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from Boulder City.

Michael Mays, Boulder City Community Development Director, explained that as part of the Boulder Canyon Project, which included the construction of Hoover Dam, it was determined by the Bureau of Reclamation that housing was needed near the project to house construction workers. The filtration plant building's lack of use over the past 40 years has resulted in needed rehabilitation efforts to help preserve this important piece of Nevada history. The filtration plant is a contributing resource to Boulder City Historic District, as determined by North Wind Resource Consulting. Further, North Wind believes the filtration plant is eligible for individual listing under the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion A, Engineering and Community Planning and Development. Boulder City Council approved \$125,000 to hire a consultant to prepare a historic structure and assessment report for the filtration plant. The city selected LGA Architecture and North Wind Resource Consulting to do the report. Based on the report's recommendations contained in your packet, they recommend the city focus on lead paint and asbestos mitigation, window rehabilitation, and tuck



## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

pointing to allow the building to be more accessible to the public. A detailed cost estimate of the LGA recommended improvements is provided on page 267 of your application. These recommended improvements stabilize and protect the cortical original building. Boulder City Council also approved as part of the Fiscal Year '22 capital improvement plan \$300,000 for building restoration with the hope that approximately an additional \$200,000 could be provided through a CCCHP grant. It is anticipated that with these improvements, it will become a key feature for a future local cultural center that includes an existing community garden and sculpture park. It will allow the city to better tell the role the building played in the early construction of Boulder City and Hoover Dam.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that the building has been under consideration by the city. At one point, there was an effort to make it go private and turn it into a saloon, what do you see the end state for the public usage? When all said is done, what's going to be the cultural function of this building?

Michael Mays explained that the priority has been with preservation first and building upon the existing activities that have occurred there with the ultimate use for this building to help promote the history of the community and be able to have a more functional building that can be more accessible to the public to help promote that history.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that the question is based on the title of this organization, which is the Commission on Cultural Centers and Historic Places, and its function is to not just restore buildings, historic buildings, but bring life back into them and extend their life, so as we move forward, that's going to be a key question for how is this building going to be used. When you're restoring it inside, what sort of plumbing facilities and those kinds of things will be important to this Commission as we move forward, and by the way, you clearly have employed some of the top organizations, whether it's LGA or North Wind, which gives me confidence in reading these reports, so thank you.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked if this is an estimate of probable cost from a contractor or your estimate of probable cost based on the additional funds that you'll receive for assistance for mitigation of the asbestos.

Michael Mays indicated that what we have is the cost estimate that was included in the report. Based on that cost estimate and if we're successful obtaining the grant funds, we would have approximately a half million to move forward with going out to bid for this project. We believe that we could complete the project, including the bidding process within 11 months.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-12: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Cavanaugh. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from the City of Ely.

Nathan Robertson explained that only two city halls in use are left in the state of Nevada that were built in the early part of the 20th Century, Ely and Fallon. Ely City Hall has been a center for a lot of things in our community and the city of Ely is committed to making sure that it continues as that for the next hundred years, and over the last 10 years, we've addressed a number of the issues facing the building, including weatherization projects, maintenance, making sure the building has been adequately studied, listed on state and national historic registers. As I said, we completed a historic structures report. Our next step in this, really now that the building has been kind of stabilized and,

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

of course, it's still in use, is to have a comprehensive plan completed and that's what we're asking for in this grant application are funds to hire architects and engineers, do the community scoping that needs to be done as well as interviews and scoping with the various city departments and other entities that use the building to make sure the project not only meets the needs of the community, but that we can assemble a project that meets the budget of the community, and, of course, stands up to the historical standards that a project like this will need to meet. Planning is always a hard sell in rural areas. The standard estimate for engineering on a project should be between 10 and 15% of the total project cost. From our historic structures report and from other architects we've had down to look at the project, we're looking in the \$4 million range to complete this project, so consequently, we're looking for a portion of that, this \$300,000 in conjunction with other grants we've received in the meantime as well as contributed monies from the City of Ely to be able to complete this. A well-planned project is going to cost the community and any of the participating agencies that are giving us money, less money in the long run, and like I said, we'll make sure that the project meets the highest possible standards, and hopefully keep our city hall around for another hundred years at least.

The Chair asked how the \$300,000 figure was arrived at.

Nathan Robertson indicated that industry standards for project design is between 10 and 15. I have no doubt that this is going to kind of err towards the higher side of that just because of the unique nature of a restoration project versus like a new construction type project. With a possible project cost, what we're looking at, like I said, in the \$4 million range. That would put engineering around \$500,000. Like I said, there's other contributing entities and grants into this factor. If the Board has extra money they'd like to throw at this, we would certainly take it. We did, since I made the application, get another \$15,000 grant from Great Basin Heritage Area. The city has tentatively committed \$50,000 of their general fund monies towards this phase of the project as well. There may be some extra money there that we could use if this phase starts to go a little bit more expensive than that, but it's the best industry standard that we could use coming up with that cost.

The Chair opened the floor to the commissioners for questions.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that my question really along the same lines. It was just a series of six questions but they're all basically the same question. How did you get to this point? How did you get to this number? And this is kind of an awkward situation in the sense that we normally have, here's the project, here's the bid, here's the dollar figure, and then this Commission is able to say, okay, yes or no, or we can't pay for that or that's too much or we're going to do it in phases, but this is requesting we sort of throw \$300,000 into the pot of something that's going to cost, we don't know, and clearly everything that the applicant just said is correct. It's a challenge these days on any number of levels. Plus, this Commission has already funded elements of the city hall and we know how important it is and we know the type of work that the applicant and the city does and how much the city of Ely and White Pine is doing to preserve its history and promote it, so I lean towards granting this, but I'm just worried about setting some sort of a precedent or just putting money into a pot. We don't know exactly what the deliverable is.

Nathan Robertson explained that one of the things that the Commission funded previously was a historic structures report. As part of that report, the engineers involved came up with an engineer's estimate of what it might take to address the issues with the building and make the necessary adjustments to continue serving the community, and at that time, and this was several years ago at this point, the estimate came in below \$400,000.

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

It was around \$3.5 million, so we started with that basis of a cost. With that, we had other architects come in in the meantime, look at it, give us some cost estimates. That brought us to around, of course, with material cost going up in inflation, certainly around \$4 million. Based on that, which we felt we had a pretty good ballpark estimate on, we used the industry standards and I have a degree in construction management and probably 15 years now in project management. The industry standard for these kind of projects is right between 10 and 15% of your project cost for engineering and architecture. That being the case, that's how we arrived at that number and I certainly see the issue where we're just asking to throw money into a pot to help us complete this phase. Be that as it may, that's why we asked what we asked. The \$300,000 wasn't the entire amount. We're looking to make up the rest of that with some other grants and other funding opportunities, but we know it will cost at least that much.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked what if we said, okay, fine, but we're going to hold \$300,000 or \$400,000 in reserve, but please come back with a specific piece of the action that this Commission could put its arms around and say, this is where the taxpayer money's going to go. It's going to go to restore the third floor or it's going to take care of the roof, or the foundation. Is any of that in a timeframe that would make sense to this project that you could come back to this Commission with?

Nathan Robertson explained that this application is specifically for hiring the architecture and engineers and getting this planning portion done. None of it is considered in the construction cost at this time, because we need this tool to be able to budget and phase this project down the road. Without a comprehensive plan, without being able to address the seismic issues, being able to address utilities and all that, we'd just be making shots in the dark, so to be able to come up with a plan that's doable for the community, we have to have this planning phase first, and, and that will present us with the deliverable that at the end of this is a set of construction drawings.

Commissioner Cavanaugh stated my understanding is that you have estimated that the probable cost for an engineer and architect to come up with the plans for construction is going to be \$300,000, and that's what you're asking us to cover.

Nathan Robertson clarified that what we are estimating is it will probably be more between \$400,000 and \$500,000 based on the estimated project costs. We're asking the Commission to fund \$300,000 of that.

The Chair noted that he too could support it, but with the understanding that the \$300,000 is not thrown into a pot but is reimbursed for the actual costs from contracts from the qualified engineers and architects and so on.

Nathan Robertson noted that this is acceptable to the City of Ely.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if we approve the \$300,000 right now, would the City of Ely be able to come back and ask for an additional dip into the bucket.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that it could.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-13 for up to \$300,000 reimbursement once the costs have been submitted with the understanding that they may come back during this funding round for additional funding requests: Commissioner Cavanaugh; second by Commissioner Stoldal. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

The Chair asked staff to advise the Commission on the applicant's eligibility for grant as a nonprofit.

Rebecca Palmer explained that staff has no additional information since the notes were prepared and has a question of the eligibility whether they were properly organized under the IRS code. We requested, as we note in our staff notes, articles of incorporation and we have not received those to date.

The Chair asked for a representative from Old Glory Theater Company.

Kansas Bowling indicated that the project has been properly amended and I actually only received the amended document this morning, so I'm really sorry about the delay in that, but I can send that over.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that there were deadlines to get this done and as the deadlines were not met, I'm not sure that I would be comfortable in even taking any action on this other than delaying it without prejudice to a later date. There was a deadline, I think, of May 22nd. That deadline was passed. Now, I know things take time, but having it before this Commission without the AG's office getting a stamp of approval, I wouldn't be ready to vote on it at this point without a firm stamp of approval from the AG's office.

The Chair noted that what he is hearing from Vice Chair Stoldal is that your preference here is to set it aside without prejudice, wait for all the documents to be received and cleared from the Attorney General's office to be sure that its eligibility is there and take it up at our next meeting. Is that correct?

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that this is correct.

Kansas Bowling apologized for the delay and indicated if you would like to discuss other things right now, I am ready to, but if you would like to wait, I'm fine with that as well.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that there are other pieces of the application that not all the things were checked off, so I would just recommend that the applicant take the time between now and the next meeting to work with staff to make sure that the elements of the application as well as the nonprofit status are all cleared up and we can look at this application.

Attorney Walsh indicated that reviewing the document to ensure it is compliant with the guidelines as well as NRS is appropriate.

Motion to hold Application # CCCHP-21-14 without prejudice until the next meeting of the Cultural Affairs and Historic Places so that the nonprofit status can be verified by the Attorney General as well as the applicant completing the proper application of areas that haven't been filled out: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from White Pine.

Tabatha Hamilton informed the Commission that \$80,000 is requested to complete a preliminary engineering report on the building to accurately understand what it will take to restore the building in a way that will be historically accurate while also meeting current health and safety standards. The end goal of the New Ruth

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Club is to have the building restored in order to be used as a museum and a local food pantry. This report will also help us understand what it will cost to do this. These buildings are two of the few remaining historical buildings still standing in Ruth. They were known as the New Ruth Club and the Commercial Club. The New Ruth Club has since gone through a handful of private owners before finally being deeded to the county through tax delinquency in February 2022. The preservation of such original history is vital to the protection of the culture of White Pine County, and not to mention, the town of Ruth. White Pine County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy has one of Ruth's goals as working toward expanding and diversifying the economy, including, but not limited to, attracting a small grocery store, minimart, and/or gas station, or in this case, a food pantry that will provide the immediate needs of citizens without having to travel to Ely. It also mentions working to correct blighted properties and, in this case, we are correcting the blighted New Ruth Club to make Ruth more attractive to visit and to live it. Finally, it discusses developing a Ruth Park to celebrate the history of Ruth by obtaining donations of mining equipment. In this case, we are creating an expansion of the Ruth Mining Memorial Park that is located directly across the street from the New Ruth Club. This project also enhances historical tourism within the area. The location is significant because it is located at the base of the Ruth Robinson Mine, which will highlight the building significance as the mine's previous company town. Again, it is also located across the street from the Ruth Mining Memorial Park, which is currently being remodeled to show off the historical significance of the area and to memorialize those who have passed away in relation to local mine.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked how the estimate of \$80,000 was determined.

Tabatha Bowling explained that the estimate is based off of a few of our most recent preliminary engineering studies. They've all had different scopes, but they've all been around the \$75,000 range, and then with anticipated inflation is how we ended up coming up with each of the numbers.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked was your estimate of probable cost rendered from professional engineering groups.

Tabatha Bowling clarified that it was.

Vice Chair Stoldal commented on the importance of work being done on New Ruth and asked which part of the building says New Ruth Club from the original. On the left side of the photograph, that was a clothing store and on the right side, it was a barber shop. Which part of what is now the New Ruth Club, which part of the building is that, do you know?

Tabatha Bowling indicated that she did not know as she was not aware that that was the uses of the Old Ruth Club.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if there is a sense of and if any study has been done regarding what tracks are still available between New Ruth and Ely in order to reconnect Ruth with the Northern Nevada Railway.

Tabatha Bowling indicated that she believes that there is a set of tracks that still operates between Ely and Ruth, and it's my understanding that they, like the Halloween Ghost Train, follow those tracks up to the Ruth Depot and then back into Ely.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Vice Chair Stoldal asked the location of the depot.

Tabatha Bowling indicated that she is not sure where the Ruth Depot would be.

The Chair encouraged the county to dig into the history because we're very interested in that, researchers are, and we hope to attract tourism, which will also be educating them on how this Central Nevada developed and why it became so important to the state

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-16: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from the City of Wells.

Jordan Tilley discussed the El Rancho Hotel and Casino. As a result of the 2000 earthquake here in Wells, we lost an entire front street along our railroad historical buildings. We don't have many more of those left in town, so to get the El Rancho back open will be a significant morale booster here in town and increase our community pride. The building will continue to be utilized in town and become that entertaining Mecca it once was. We'll have annual events, classes, meetings, weddings, Quinceaneras and other large gathering events will take place there. There's also a plan to have some space for some new and emerging businesses to use as type of incubator space there as they get their feet under them. Our goal and our aim is to help our residents and businesses succeed, and this is really one way that we can facilitate that objective is providing that chance for those residents. Additionally, you know, there's a farmer's market takes place across the street from the El Rancho, and they've approached the city about opportunities for indoor access. The El Rancho, up to this point, they haven't been able to use because there's no power in the building. Completing this electrical will be a significant step towards allowing that public to once again occupy and enjoy that El Rancho Hotel and Casino. Addition, so the City of Wells and our local main street program are both heavily invested in the project. Our public works employees have spent upwards of 1400 hours working on the building or moving drywall, stabilizing the roof and the walls after the earthquake. They've done what's called pinning the framing to the brick of the outer structure to help stabilize and earthquake-proof as much as we can here with the building, and the main street has spent over \$10,000 to have the two old neon signs refurbished. Additionally, the building's been nominated for the historical status and that's what we're still working through now, but that will ensure its presence now and far into the future. Just a side note that I discovered through my research after submitting the application is the El Rancho is the first building in town here designed to be illuminated by electricity, so that was interesting as we're working on the electrical again. That was the first building here. Prior to that, it was kerosene lamps and whatnot. We've also completed a design for all of the electrical, so we're ready to go. We have received one preliminary quote. We'll just wait on two other quotes and then whichever's the lowest, we're ready to go. We don't have to go through the whole bidding process as we're under that \$100,000 threshold there, and if there's any necessary extra funds there, we have budgeted out of our capital outlay to cover if it's a little bit higher, and that's just based on everything going on with, with pricing right now so we have some money set aside to cover any additional there. As we were putting this application together, we had a lot of turnover here at the city, and I think we missed adding the audit in, but we complete an audit every year through Eide Bailey, and if necessary, we can supply that.

The Chair opened the floor to the Commission for questions.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that it seems that we're talking about not fully completing the electrical work, but getting a, a really a good start. I wrote down here changing this number to from \$50,000 to \$75,000 to get all the electrical work done. Is that an appropriate number?

Jordan Tilley indicated that it is.

Commissioner Cavanaugh thanked Jordan Tilley for the work being done to restore the El Rancho, indicating that I'm appreciative of the fact that the City of Wells is taking a purposeful proactive step towards revitalizing that key piece to Northern Nevada's history. So thank you for the work on getting that done, and if my co-chair, Mr. Stoldal, puts forth that motion to increase the amount, I would support that. At your earliest convenience, submit that audit to our staff so that we have it on record so that we're in compliance with the laws that we're supposed to follow.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-17 in the amount of \$75,000: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Cavanaugh. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

Rebecca Palmer read a chat from Honey Menefee, Storey County into the record. Due to the availability of excess funding, would it be possible to ask the Commission for an increased award amount for the Storey County Courthouse? On our submitted bid from United Electrical Services for \$80,418, there is a section of work that was excluded from pricing. If I obtain the cost of the excluded items, permits, fees, drywall, carpet, and other surface repair, concrete work, cutting, removing, patching, trenching, and backfill, and payment and performance bond, would I be able to present an updated bid estimate to the Commission for increased award funding consideration?

The Chair indicated that the Commission will later in the meeting talk about how to move forward as we will have excess funds. We will be able to award additional funds to projects which have been approved in this cycle at a future meeting, so I would certainly encourage her to be prepared to make that application when we decide they should become available.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that it would help if a dollar figure were presented.

The Chair noted that he would I'd rather have them do their homework and bring it to us, because we know we're going to have another, at least, small cycle of rounds here coming.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked if 21-15 had been done.

The Chair noted that 21-15 had been removed as it did not meet the minimum qualification for a grant.

The Chair asked for a representative from the City of Carlin.

Madison Mahon indicated that in front of you today is an application and architectural engineering study application for the amount of \$20,000 for our Old Church on Main project. The project is for an old Catholic church that was built in 1910, and it's located on the east end of our Main Street and faces the 10th Street railroad crossings. This old historical building on Main Street has been part of the visual landscape of Carlin and it's probably the single most recognized historical structure in our

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

community. It remained in private ownership until 2019 when it was seized by the County of Elko for unpaid property taxes. The city council voted unanimously to request the building be sold to the City of Carlin for the unpaid taxes. So in 2019, we were able to obtain the property. As I mentioned before, the structure is over a hundred years old. The building stands; however, preservation and rehabilitation measures need to be taken as soon as possible. This architectural and engineering study needs to be completed prior to moving forward with any construction projects. The roof is our primary concern right now. It's been temporarily tarped in order to prevent any further damage to the structure and to the building. We hope that upon completion of the architectural study, we can rehabilitate the building so that it can be used as a community and event center enjoyed by visitors and our citizens. We do have a current quote from a local architectural firm, R6 Studio, and that is where our, our budget number did come from. We anticipate the architectural study to take between two and four months. The firm has actually stated it can be done within 30 days. Upon completion, we hope that the church can be used as a community and performing arts center. We currently do not have a space that acts as a community and performing arts center, so the building will be managed by the City of Carlin, but its programs and activities will be managed by a Parks and Recreation board that already exists within the city structure and hopefully down the road, a private nonprofit organization to fully manage the building. We've had several contractors provide bids for the roof to stabilize the building though we don't feel comfortable moving forward until we have more information on the integrity of the building. So this architectural and engineering study will help us move forward with what needs to be done to stabilize the building. So right now, as I mentioned before, the tarp was installed through community help and through help of our local co-op, Wells Rural Electric Company.

The Chair opened the floor to questions from the Commission.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked are you going to be able to get all of the necessary seismic and structural stuff done? I wrote down an additional figure of \$10,000 as a potential change from the \$20,000 that you're asking to \$30,000. The question is, can you get this all done in 30 days in time to come back by our September meeting to actually request specific funding for the foundation, the walls, the roof, I guess, which is now just a tarp? Can you update that a little bit for us?

Madison Mahon indicated that she hopes to be able to come back before the September meeting and if not, would have to wait until the next cycle.

Vice Chair Stoldal explained that the next cycle after September will likely be two years.

The Chair asked for confirmation that the tarp was installed by the city.

Madison Mahon indicated that it was, with the help of the public works department, Wells Rural Electric, and volunteers, we had tarping measures and then the Wells Rural Electric Company was able to lend materials and lifts in order to tarp the roof itself. Before the tarp was on, the building was in much more dire shape. We had immediate weather concerns. Now that the roof has been tarped, we believe things are a little bit more steady and we believe we've bought ourselves more time to take a look at the architectural and engineering side of the building.

The Chair pointed out that the Commission would need to know the cost of adding a new roof prior to moving forward. The Chair asked the Vice Chair if he felt that the \$20,000 requested was inadequate for a study.



## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that this is low compared to what other studies cost, especially throwing in a seismic study, architectural and engineering study. With the focus on the key structures, there's no sense in putting a roof if the foundation needs to be repaired, and I'm also asking that if we can add some money to it, if that can speed up the process, and I really think important, based again on the application, City of Carlin comes back before this Commission at its September meeting with a report and a potential request for funds for you, the foundation, or the roof, or whatever the report says is the essential next step.

Commissioner Cavanaugh recommended that if they can speedily get those reviews done and have a plan for maybe a Phase 1 project and get that back to us before our next meeting for consideration.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-18 in the amount of \$30,000: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from Northern Nevada Railroad.

Mark Bassett explained that previous grants from the Commission have allowed us to stabilize the engine house/machine shop building, including a seismic stabilization. The engine house/machine shop building was built in 1907 to repair the locomotives and railroad cars. For the past 115 years, it has served as the heart of the railroad in the heart of our national historic landmark. All of the repair work on the railroad's locomotives and cars have been done inside the building. In 1940, the railroad remodeled the building. The building received a new roof, windows, and roof drainage. Now 82 years later, those improvements are failing. The roof has multiple water leaks that have been addressed in a Band-Aid manner. In a recent heavy rainstorm, water leaked into the machine shop and engine house in various locations, and saying the water leaked in is an understatement. In places, the water poured in. The water soaked the steam locomotives being restored. There were leaks over the historic machine tools and lathes, and they had to be tarped to protect them. These machines cannot be moved because they're bolted to the concrete floor. The leaks ran onto high-voltage wires, causing them to spark and short out. Needless to say, the situation is very hazardous to the employees, volunteers, and visitors. The engine house/machine shop building does not have a single roof. Rather, it has 14 different roof levels with a mixture of roofing surfaces. These different roof levels make this, a challenging project, even more complicated and this will increase the cost of the overall project. In addition to repairing the roof itself, some of the parapet walls are crumbling and need repairing too. As part of the roof structure, there are smoke jacks. The purpose of the smoke jack is to allow the smoke from the steam locomotive to exit through the roof of the engine house. It takes four to six hours from once the fire is lit to move the steam locomotive out the door. During this time, the steam locomotive is producing smoke that is vented through the smoke jack. Furthermore, when the steam locomotive comes back to the engine house, if it's going to be used the next day, the fire in the steam locomotive is banked. That means the fire has smothered and smokes overnight. Unfortunately, not all of the smoke jacks are operational. This forces us to use only two of the 12 possible railroad tracks that are in the engine house leading to the possibility of trapping a steam locomotive in the engine house. Repairing additional smoke jacks will give us the flexibility to use additional engine house tracks when an issue happens with one of the existing doors or tracks. In addition to roof repairs, we need to address the weatherization of the engine house/machine shop windows. Most of these windows face south and west. These windows are industrial design, rather simple metal frames, holding the individual panes. The windows do open for ventilation, allowing the smoke out. After 80 years, the weather seals around the windows and on the panes that are open are pretty much gone. The

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

engine house/machine shop building is our largest building on the complex. The roof area covers approximately 36,000 square feet. Incorporated in the roof structure are drains to remove the water from the roof. These drains are positioned around the building and flow into a storm sewer system that is failing. Repairing the roof will divert more water into the failing storm sewer system. As part of this project, it's imperative to repair the storm sewer system across the east wall of the engine house. This grant is to completely repair the 1940 roof on the 1907 engine house/machine shop building, including the crumbling parapet walls, repair the roof drains, improve -- repair the storm sewer system, and also renew the engine house/machine shop windows and replace the roof.

The Chair opened the floor to the Commission for questions.

Vice Chair Stoldal veered off the topic momentarily and asked about the tracks between Ely and Ruth and the depot at the other end of Ruth.

Mark Bassett indicated that the tracks no longer go to New Ruth and the depot in Ruth was in Old Ruth and went away when New Ruth was created. We are working with the mine to open up the railroad to the mine. I have no prediction on when that would happen.

Vice Chair Stoldal returned to the grant application asked why the application page was altered to remove the property owner name and address.

Mark Bassett noted that he recreated the form and that this was an oversight on his part. The property is owned by the Nevada Northern Railway Foundation and the City of Ely.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if a seismic study has been done on this building and noted his belief that what needs to be done first is we fund you enough money to do a study on what should be done first, second, and third, whether it's the roof fixed, the crumbling walls, fix the windows.

Mark Bassett explained that the previous Commission has actually funded the study that was done, in 2008, 2009, and we actually implemented the results of that study and had a structural engineer, so we seismically retrofitted the building.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked specifically about the ability to delineate between repairing the roof and repairing the windows, or are those separate?

Mark Bassett noted that I submitted a budget form with it and that has demolition at \$20,000, repair the parapet walls at \$18,000, repair the smoke jacks at \$28,000, repair and winterize the building windows at \$16,000, repair the downspouts and storm sewer at \$40,000, and install a new roof at \$125,000.

Vice chair Stoldal asked if any of that can be phased in or if they need to be done in some order.

Mark Bassett indicated that I would do the roof and then basically do it in almost reverse order. Do the roof and the down spouts and the storm sewers. The parapet walls would be part of the roof, so those three items would have to be done almost together. I mean, it would be very nice to repair the smoke jacks, so I have more

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

availability. The, the problem is, you know, the big doors weigh two tons and they do fail periodically. And they usually give us a warning when they fail, so I can move equipment left or right to another track, but to move a steam locomotive, I got to move it onto a track with a smoke jack and without a smoke jack, it just smokes up the entire engine house.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if this project were funded, would it be able to get done.

Mark Bassett noted that I actually spoke to the roofing contractor who helped me prepare this on Saturday and he wished me good luck for today, so he's standing by and we are ready to work on that. On our current grants, they have been a challenge. There's no ifs, ands, butts about that, but the good news is I should have a contractor hired by the end of this month and the other thing is some of the work has already started, like up at the McGill Depot, we've already started the sewer water connections and the other big advantages too. All of the construction work that we're looking at in both the transportation building here in Ely and the McGill Depot, that's all interior work, and so that's not going to be weather dependent. So the short version is we will have our two current grants finished probably on January 2nd at 11:59 p.m., but they will be finished by January 2nd, 11:59 p.m., 2023 and, like I've mentioned, I have the contractor standing by on this one so we can jump right on this.

Commissioner Cavanaugh thanked Mr. Bassett for the specificity of the application in lining out the project.

Commissioner Cavanaugh suggested adding the City of Elko in the grant application in naming the grant application awardee as part owner of the building.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-20, and adding the City of Elko in the grant application awardee as part owner of the building: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from Western Folklife Center.

Carolyn Trainor, Development Manager for the Western Folklife Center, provided a history of the Pioneer Hotel Building. The primary goal for the Western Folklife Center over the next year is to expand its reach by welcoming back past patrons and reaching new audiences through its signature national cowboy poetry gathering and other year-round programming. At the same time, the Western Folklife Center will achieve financial sustainability through increased earned and contributed revenue streams. For this project, the repair and restoration of the ceiling and the basement storage spaces and upgrade of lighting and emergency exit signage will provide a more fire-safe environment for the building. The ceiling area to be repaired includes spaces where we store tables and racks, chairs, exhibit cases, equipment, tools, and gathering-specific displays. Along with storage space, we also have a woodworking area and a green room for artists when they are here to perform at our events. This restoration will bring the building into compliance for items identified during the Elko Fire Department's annual building inspection and will improve the safety of the building. This project is shovel-ready, but we can wait at the discretion of the Commission.

Commissioner Cavanaugh thanked Ms. Trainor for submitting a complete and thorough application and providing all necessary documentation.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-21: Commissioner Cavanaugh; second by Commissioner Stoldal. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from Goldfield Historical Society.

John Ekman, President of the Goldfield Historical Society, indicated that our requested funds for this round are to continue with the second phase of the high school roof reconstruction project. As you mentioned early on in this meeting, we are currently working on the first phase of the project or the current phase, which is rebuilding the timber and masonry structural elements, releveling the building center, including the flat roof, the skylight, the light shaft, recovering the flat roof, and doing 50% plus of the sloped roof steel sanding seam roof, and hopefully, if we can get some bids back here in the next couple of weeks, we should be getting started on that directly.

Vice chair Stoldal indicated he'd like to get the roof finished so as to then work on the interior without damage. How much more is it going to take to get the roof done financially? I know you have a challenge with contractors, but if there's some additional money and they see it's a bigger project, assuming this part of it gets done, how much more needs to be done and at roughly what cost?

John Ekman explained that assuming that the current project is adequately funded, we'll find out when the contractors respond to the bid request and assuming that this current request for \$170,000 is adequate considering all the various other costs that are evolving as you've discussed throughout this meeting today, we should be pretty close to complete. We may still have some work on the sheet metal, the soffits, the gutters. They're quite complex. They're somewhat aesthetic and ornate, but as far as actually keeping the water out, they will be actually superfluous to that point, although they would direct the water off of the roof to various downspouts. So in answer your question, our intention is that the funding that is currently available and that we are asking for in this proposed project, our intention is that this will cover the roof to the point where we can keep the water out.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about an estimate of the cost to fix the gutters.

John Ekman explained that this cost is indeterminate right now as he is not familiar with the cost but explained that on two sides they are very complex and two sides are less complex.

The Chair reiterated that if we do have another round where we have some leftover funds, I think it would be wiser on your part to get some experts in and get a good handle on what it might cost to complete that gutter work, which is important in the long run to keeping a roof in good shape.

John Ekman indicated that he would do that.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-22: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair asked for a representative from the Carlin Historical Society.

Ella Trujillo, Treasurer of the Carlin Historical Society explained that we were lucky enough to receive funding

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

from the Commission this last grant cycle to start restoration work on the schoolhouse, and it looks like our contractor is going to be able to pour concrete starting tomorrow, and so all of our concrete sidewalk and other elements will hopefully be done by the end of the week. And then it's just installing the hot water heater to go forward, so we are looking to the future, and this grant application, you can see is directly related to the exterior of the building, which is the priority. The interior is in really good shape. Obviously, it needs some work, but it's serving the purposes for the building right now, so we're looking at the brick restoration and the rain gutter system replacement, and then some planning, including some architectural plans and an architectural study for the roof, so, the building itself, briefly, more recent research has revealed that the building may be older than we originally thought, which is fascinating for us. I hope the Commission will consider funding the whole project, but, as we laid out in our application, we did list everything by priority, so we will be content with whatever the Commission decides to do for us.

The Chair noted that there seems to be some question about how the brick and other masonry is intended to be restored and asked are you familiar with the staff's concerns.

Ella Trujillo indicated that she is not but will do her best to address them.

The Chair indicated that the staff believes you need additional information.

Rebecca Palmer indicated the application of water repellants to brick is usually not recommended and we would not approve such an application. The application of water repellants could significantly damage the historic fabric, and we really need far more information concerning that, but perhaps I could beg the indulgence of the Chair and really address more broadly the proposal. After looking at the proposal by my staff, one whom is a qualified architect, we really believe that this proposal is somewhat out of order. We think that the activities perhaps could be reprioritized and, for example, item number 1 really should be the architectural study to determine the deficiencies, including the seismic study since this is likely an unreinforced masonry building. The roof really should be replaced first before any other construction work is done because if the roof is replaced after or all the construction occurs and penetrates the roof, it could certainly void the warranty. Drawings and specifications should be prepared for estimating the cost, bidding and permitting for the new roof. You know, if the goal is to reconstruct the bell tower and the widow's walk, those elements should be reconstructed during the installation of the new roof. If seismic strengthening is needed before the roof is installed, that should be part of the specifications and study. Then the new rain gutters, downspout system should be installed during the roof installation, and then all the proposed masonry work should be done after the roof is completed, and then finally, the ADA accessible entrance should be done last. This would be our recommended prioritization.

Vice chair Stoldal indicated that this is clear logic and asked what roughly staff believes the cost of the suggested study would be.

Rebecca Palmer recommended that given the unusual economic circumstances, perhaps the applicant could get some estimates on what the seismic study could be and I would hesitate to guess what a possible seismic study might cost for a building this size.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that I'm going to make a guess because I think we need to have a figure that they

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

can use to go out and immediately get started to work on this, so we have a plan, a presentation that's going to come back in June, July, August, September in the next 90 days so we can look at helping restore the roof because the bell tower, all those things, the gutters, need to be done at roughly the same time. If I said \$75,000, do you think that kind of a study can be done within that figure?

Rebecca Palmer indicated that there is nothing in the statutes or in the operating policies and guidelines of this Commission that prevents the Commission from awarding a grant for an activity, and then when the costs are available, we would then inform the Commission. So perhaps the award could be for the seismic study up to a certain amount, maybe \$75,000, and then when the actual costs come in, we would inform the Commission of what that cost was at the next meeting. So rather than put a dollar figure on it at this point, award the activity up to a threshold, and then staff will work with the applicant to get that study estimate prepared for which we would then come forward at the next meeting.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that I want to make sure that the Commission is asking for a very specific report, more than just seismic, but this expanded study would include -- what elements is the staff recommending that the new study include? What are the things that we are going to be asking for them to come back for?

Kristen Brown, SHPO, pointed out that the application already includes a study and there is a dollar amount attached to that, there's already an architect based in Elko that has proposed doing this study for a certain amount of money, for \$18,600. So I think the question would be what did that architect intend to include for that \$18,600 and what can be added onto that to make it something very usable for the city? Because, you know, seismic is a key element. We need to make sure that the walls are tied to the roof, and we need to make sure that kind of thing is done. It's not a huge building. I don't think it's going to take a lot seismic-wise, but then we want to know if the roof structure is capable of supporting the reconstructed bell tower and widow's walk, and then we would like to get enough drawings and specifications so that it could go out to bid to get quotes on the reinforcement of the roof structure, the tying, you know, putting in a diaphragm, tying the roof to the walls to achieve seismic stabilization, and then putting the roof on and reconstructing the bell tower. So all of that really has to be done kind of at the same time. When the roof is off, one of the things that we were concerned with is putting a roof on too soon and then going back a couple years later to reconstruct the bell tower is not a good idea because it might void the roof warranty because you're going to be introducing a bunch of penetrations into that roof. So we would really like to see if the goal is to reconstruct those items on top of the roof, it would be really, really nice to do all of it at once. Tie it together, seismic bracing, reinforce any sort of roof framing members, rebuild that bell tower and widow's walk, and put a new roof on with all the flashing that's required at the same time. So getting that study done, there's already a study being created, so the question is how can we get it to the next level to be able to go out and get bids on doing the work? So as we just need the drawings and the specifications, so I think it's a question for the architect. Does the architect need to subcontract with an engineer for this, for seismic stuff? You know, those are the questions.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that R6 Studios is saying what they're going to do for the \$18,600. They're going to complete a structural analysis of current deficiencies, description of work to be performed to correct structural and architectural issues, structural and civil analysis will be completed by Far West Consultants out of Elko, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical analysis will be included but a detailed in-depth analysis of these systems is not included in the report. This proposal does not include architectural or structural construction drawings.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

We will assess the entire building, but focus in-depth on the roof, the foundation, and original windows. It sounds like we're halfway there with this, but we're not getting all the things necessary to give Carlin what you need to do next and to come back and ask for more money. Chairman, I'm not sure what the next step is other than take what Kristen just said and list those and add it to this, and then go out to bid again.

The Chair noted that he would be happy to support some number not to exceed, say, \$60,000 and hope they can come back to us with more detail that we could then awarding our next meeting or as soon as possible.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked staff if \$50,000 is a reasonable number.

Kristen Brown noted that she believes so and pointed out that Mel Green is present on the call and might have some insight if the Commission would be interested to hear from him.

Mel Green stated I think that you're going in the right direction and they need to know what the issues are before they can produce the drawings and the designs necessary to mitigate those and to restore the structure. So from this conversation, seems logical to me that what Kristen has said is the right path to have the architect-engineer team do such a study. They can guide the City of Carlin or the Carlin Historical Society. There's been a lot of conversation about budget and it seems to me like the \$18,000 might be low for what they're thinking about, so I would think if you're going to ask for such a study, you need to increase perhaps \$40K because I would bring in more mechanical engineering. They had civil engineered survey.

The Chair asked if Mr. Green would add \$40,000 or if this is a total of \$40,000.

Mel Green noted \$40,000 total should be an amount the architect could work with.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked Mel Green if this would require having a seismologist do an analysis of the building and if a completely different person comes in to do that piece.

Mel Green indicated that for design of buildings, the US Geologic Survey has prepared seismic probability maps for the entire country. So within the building code or the available provisions of the building code, the structural engineer will get the design values for evaluating and designing the building. So such a player is not required.

Commissioner Cavanaugh asked for clarification that this would then allow them, once they've received all of the plan, done the seismic study, and developed a plan for this project, to come back and apply for additional funding.

The Chair noted that this is correct.

Motion to approve Application # CCCHP-21-23 to fund up to \$45,000 for studies on which staff would work with Carlin to include construction and other necessary documents in order for the Carlin Historical Society to come back to the Commission with specific dollar figures for the project: Commissioner Stoldal; second by Commissioner Cavanaugh. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

8. Discussion and awarding of grants **(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

The Chair asked if staff's had a chance to compile the total for grants awarded and the remaining balance.

Hitchcock indicated that \$3,335,895 has been awarded and the remaining balance is \$454,105.

The Chair asked for confirmation of the \$200,000 set-aside for administration.

Hitchcock confirmed affirmatively.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that in addition to the reserved funding available in this grant cycle, it is likely we will have about \$80,000 remaining in FY19 and '20 to re-grant. In discussing this with the treasurer's office, we can re-grant to any applicant in the, in the FY21-22 cycle, who was also a grantee in the FY19-20 cycle, so there's an additional \$80,000 to consider at that point.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked for confirmation that this money includes money the Commission set aside for grants, citing Washoe County as an example.

Hitchcock confirmed that it does include the money set aside for future approval.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that the number that I have that we have firmly granted, we have indicated we're going to hold some money pending coming back and, and they could apply for that, so we sort of set that aside, but that's not a lock that they're going to get it. They still have to come back. The same thing with Carlin. But so far that we have hardcore granted, the number I have is \$2,800,418. I don't know if that matches with staff to drop out all those things other than what we have done today.

The Chair indicated that I will make sure that staff double checks this and then sends it out, distributes to the Commissioners, so they've got a reference table to look at and double check their own thinking and prepare for a future meeting.

The Chair asked for questions from staff.

Rebecca Palmer indicated staff has adequate guidance and noted that right now, we have \$1,080,000 available in bond proceeds. The rest will be available in November.

The Chair delegated the authority to staff to dole out funds to the shovel-ready projects.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if anything needs to be done regarding Storey County.

The Chair noted that the award needed to be reduced because it exceeded the dollar value and approved for \$80,418.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that staff had indicated that the estimated hourly rate was higher than the Commission had originally established in their grant manual and in this particular case of CCCHP-21-01, the Commission decided to award above the rate originally identified in the grant manual.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked for confirmation that they are asking for additional funding because there's a section



MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

that was excluded from pricing.

Rebecca Palmer confirmed that this is correct.

Vice Chair Stoldal reread the chat and indicated that there's no action needed beyond what has already been done at this meeting and would be addressed in September if an updated bid estimate is presented.

9. Election of Chair and Vice Chair consistent with NRS 383.500.2(a) (**FOR POSSIBLE ACTION**)

The Chair opened the floor for nominations for Chair.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that under NRS 383.500, the Commission on Cultural Affairs and Historic Places is required to elect a Chair from its membership and nominated Robert Ostrovsky.

Commissioner Olmstead seconded the nomination.

The Chair asked for a nomination for Vice Chair.

Commissioner Olmstead nominated Robert Stoldal for Vice Chair.

The Chair asked for additional nominations for either position. There were no additional nominations.

Vote to support the reelection of Chairman Ostrovsky and the reelection of Vice Chairman Stoldal. No Commissioner comments. **Motion passed unanimously.**

The Chair thanked the Commission and noted that the Commission does valuable work and many states wish they had commissions like this to do that, and we should always remember when we talk to our members of the legislature, thank them for giving us these funds to make available to do this work and encourage them to keep giving to a good cause. We get a lot done and we will get a lot more done with these larger numbers that we've been able to produce. These projects are vastly important to the state, to its history, and to the government, to the folks out in the rural, and even urban areas that put their heart and soul into these projects.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that I look at not only these being historic because we have the two functions, which preserve and restore the history, but bring life back into these buildings, but as the state is doing that, it creates a stimulus in this community, a financial stimulus, in the short term and in the long term. In the short term, the construction that's going on, whether they're the construction teams come in, they're spending their money in town, resources, and it's all taking place in a community and many of them rural. And then secondly, it's a longer term stimulus package in the sense that visitors may stop over and get lunch, get gas, stay overnight in these communities, so it's really more than just bringing cultural affairs and historic places to life. It is an economic stimulus to these communities and I think that's part of what we need to make sure we tell our legislators.

Commissioner Cavanaugh added that these projects bring back social stimulus of community pride. We've lost

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

a lot of that over time and when we talk about our history and we talk about the longstanding development history of Nevada and how things came to be, it really helps to instill that community pride and so that becomes a social construct within our community that brings the glue back to us living truly as a community. So I would just like to add that to Mr. Stoldal's comments because I think that too instills that pride of who we are as Nevadans.

10. FOR DISCUSSION ONLY: Ideas for possible modifications to the grant program in future grant cycles (e.g.) multiple properties on a single application, numbers of grant cycles in a biennium) and the application/grant manual.

The Chair indicated that the multiple property issue, such as Brewery Art Center, currently requires a single application and opened the floor to discussion as to whether or not the Commission would want to consider changing that. The Chair noted that we need to take it up, I think, at our next meeting, decide and when we put out the next grant cycle, how we will get these folks guidance on how to do that so we don't have confusion out there in the community is to what they want to do if they want to add an ancillary building. We've been pretty focused on single buildings requiring another application for another building on the same property. That's one of the items I think we need to discuss in the future. I don't know what other commissioners think about other items or that item.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that the challenge has sort of stemmed from the Northern Nevada Railway Foundation just because it's such a massive project that goes from potentially Cobra all the way down to Ely over to Ruth to McGill, even though it's out of the Nevada, although I think that Mark Bassett indicated that they don't own the rail line between Ely and Ruth, but it's a complicated process. So basically we have told Mark, if it's a different location, you, you can submit separate applications, but if it's from the primary place, the depot area, that's got to be one application. Same thing with the brewery in Carson City. There was some feeling that was kind of unfair, that they were sort of cutting and dicing and slicing, and this Commission has left it to where, if it's the main area, we can only accept one application from there, but if it's an outlying area like McGill or someplace else, we'll accept the second application. I think it's worthy of having an additional discussion. The second thing is we sure had a lot of non-edit audits and a lot of different explanations and quite frankly, most of the explanations were pretty straightforward and really honest. I don't mean honest and dishonest, but they were really straightforward in what they do and how they sort of check their books and all they had to do was write that into the application, and I think it would've been fine. I looked at both the grant application and the grant manual. It's really clear. You need to do that. You need to tell the State and this Commission how you balance your books, what's your financial, so I think we should look at that, maybe move it up and maybe have a little bit more explanation. If you don't have an audit, tell us what you do. Something like that. Maybe we can have that discussion as well.

The Chair noted that audits are expensive, particularly for very small groups and agreed that we need to have some discussion about how strict we want to be in the future on complete and accurate applications. I think we need to make a firm policy decision about how much latitude and what will happen if you don't provide all of the information as required. So I'd like to have that discussion too.

Commissioner Cavanaugh indicated that I was fully prepared today after going through our notes, our packet

## MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

that we have from our staff to not approve some of these grants because they were missing components of the grant. I think it makes it cleaner for us if we just say if you have an incomplete grant, it will not go to the Commission and if it doesn't come to the Commission, we're not put in a position to have to split hairs about it and if we do that, we tell our staff if it's an incomplete application, it will not come forward to the Commission for a review. And if the applicants know that, guess what's going to happen? You're going to get complete applications. It happens. That's how it works. The word on the street now will be, well, my application wasn't completed, but they awarded the funds anyway. So we have to decide how we're going to move forward. I would recommend that we have that conversation and we delineate it for our staff so that they know that we mean we're going to stand by whatever we say we're going to do. I think we're responsible for these funds and awarding these funds and I feel like we're at the mercy of those people to provide those documents now to our staff as we move forward. But with that said, I know too that we were really in a position to have to make some awards today because we don't want to see that funding go to the wayside. We want it to be purposefully used throughout the State of Nevada. We don't want to be stuck with it, and I feel and understand that as well.

The Chair agreed that we need to have that and make a firm decision because when you don't have rules, it becomes very gray, and gray is not where we want to be.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that these were some of the worst applications that we've ever had. They were not up to snuff and I hope that what Commissioner Cavanaugh said, so they don't go out there, well, we don't have to fill it out. They're going to approve it anyway. That's not true. The Vice Chair pointed out that these are all relative and important questions.

### 11. Public Comment:

Public comment will be taken at the beginning and end of the meeting and may be taken at the discretion of the Chair on agenda items listed for possible action. Public comments may be limited to 3 minutes per person at the discretion of the Chair. Comment will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action will be taken on any matters raised during the public comment period that are not already on the agenda. Persons making comment will be asked to begin by stating their name for the record.

The Chair opened the floor for public comment.

Mark Bassett commented that that a lot of these organizations that have submitted are volunteer organizations and they're doing this because they want betterment for their community and everything else. One possible idea might be that in the next grant application cycle, you give a 45-day review period. In other words, let's say for sake of argument, the grant is due December 31st and if you want a complimentary review, you have the grant to, to SHPO by November 15th and then that gives SHPO a chance to review it and maybe pick up all of these. But the other thing that happens too is that we've had other organizations have a Zoom meeting for the grantees to go through and review the grant process at the beginning and other organizations have made that a mandatory Zoom meeting. So just another thought too. So again, thank you for your time and I appreciate your support.

There was no additional public comment.

MEETING NOTICE AND AGENDA

June 14, 2022 9:00AM

12. Adjournment (**FOR POSSIBLE ACTION.**)

The Chair adjourned the June 14, 2022 meeting of the Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation.

**NOTICE: Items on this agenda may be taken in a different order than listed, combined for consideration by the Commission, or removed from the agenda.**

**CCCHP Meeting Minutes  
February 1, 2022, 1:00pm**