OSTROVSKY: We'll discuss. And you should indicate that this is a public meeting that's actually being recorded, so understand that when you speak, you will be part of that record. The -- would you like to give us a quick review of the 2019 and ’20 grant cycle, Rebecca, as indicated on the agenda?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I'd like to give a quick overview of what remains from the FY19-20 grant cycle. There were 24 grants awarded to buildings within the state. Of those 24, nine have completed their projects and successfully submitted final reports. Those final reports will eventually be posted on the website so that they'll be available for the citizens of Nevada to see the work that this commission funds. Three additional grantees have submitted final reports but they are in the process of being reviewed and once they are complete and accepted by staff, the remaining 10% of their grant award will be released. Those are Genoa Courthouse, Pioneer Hotel, and the Brewery Arts Center projects. The Ely City Hall was extended to September the 30th of 2022 per, per the request of
the Commission. There are nine grants that were extended to January 3rd of 2022. Of those nine grants, staff would like to bring to the attention of the Commission three. The first one is the McGill Depot and Transportation Building. It, it's two separate grants, one to the McGill Depot and one to the Transportation Building. Construction on those projects has not yet commenced. In addition, the staff has not received the architectural drawings or other required information specified in attachment A1 of the funding agreements. This is concerning given the short time remaining to complete those projects. The Western Missionary Museum Corporation recently posted social media -- on social media that they are closing the building. We have no confirmation of this, but that concerns us and we will continue to watch this unfold. And then finally, Goldfield High School is still working on bids for the roof with contractors expressing concerns about the distance to travel from their home bases. This is concerning for us particularly given the limited amount of time remaining. We will continue to watch these, these and all -- these three and then all of the other grants that were extended and we'll update the Commission at their next meeting. And that's the summary of the FY19-20 grant cycle.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Rebecca. I, I'm going to ask you in a moment to update us on the bond sales, but before that, I'd like to ask the commissioners if they have any
questions of staff related to prior cycle, the F19-20 cycle.

Mr. Stoldal, I see your hand raised.

STOLDAL: Rebecca, the -- you used the phrase specific -- for a couple times, but specifically for McGill, used the phrase 'short time to complete'. How much time is that?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. The time remaining on those grants is January 3rd, 2022, so there -- it --

STOLDAL: '22 or '23?


It's just --

STOLDAL: So, so is that for both the projects out of the Nevada Northern Foundation or just the McGill?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. It's for both of those projects.

BROWN: May I -- this is Kristen Brown for the record. May I add something to this conversation?

OSTROVSKY: Certainly.

BROWN: I apologize. The transportation building did submit their drawings recently, just this month. So I apologize that that information wasn't forwarded to Rebecca. We did look at the -- they are on track with the drawings. The construction has not started yet on that building, but we
did have an opportunity to look at the drawings just recently.

STOLDAL: So if I understand correctly, Stoldal for the record, that you've re -- there are two grants out -- outstanding. One is for McGill and we haven't received anything for that.

BROWN: I believe we are still waiting for some final clarification on the Depot project --

STOLDAL: Okay.

BROWN: -- with the applicant but, like I say, neither -- the work has not started yet, but we have been in communication.

STOLDAL: And the transportation building, that's separate and you have received some --

BROWN: We -- correct. We -- this is Kristen Brown. We did receive drawings recently just this month and we did take a look at those and we're waiting to hear back when those will be going out to bid and when they expect that the work will start.

STOLDAL: Rebecca, my question is -- a second part of the question is, the buildings and, and, and the projects are, are important, but so is the money. Is there a, a point that we will lose this, this grant money if these projects are not completed and/or started? Help me get a better understanding of the timeframe of, of when the money needs to be spent.
PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.

There are varying opinions as to when the money needs to be spent and that is because this is a combination of development plans and construction. Construction has three years from the date of the sale of the bonds, but development has two, so it, it's, it's a question of interpretation. We've always given them as, as much time as we have available. At this point, January 3rd, 2023 is the drop-dead date. Because these are general obligation bonds, there, there is a deadline. I'm just alerting the Commission that progress needs to begin sooner rather than later so that these projects can be completed by that January 3rd, 2023 date.

STOLDAL: So I, I, I'm still not understanding though. The January -- I've got that date, January 2023, that the project needs to be completed, but let's assume worst-case scenario, it is not. Do we lose the money?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.

No.

STOLDAL: Okay.

PALMER: There is a slight bit more wiggle room, but we -- it would be ill-advised to give them any additional extensions.

STOLDAL: Chairman Ostrovsky, what -- where I'm going with that is, yes, January 20 -- of '23 is the time the project needs to be done, but, but if they're not done, what
happens to the money and if we've only got a couple of weeks
to spend it or a month or so to spend it or two months,
shouldn't there be an earlier timeframe that, that, okay,
folks, you're not going to get it done, so we could reallocate
that money to some projects that may be shovel-ready or, or we
weren't able to fund them fully?

OSTROVSKY: This is Bob Ostrovsky. Yeah. That --
interesting point. Rebecca, if we -- if they fail and, and --
to complete by the January date and we tried to reallocate,
there's, there's no project that can get done that quickly.
Should the Commission be thinking about establishing a -- an
earlier deadline that would give us -- to show at least
progress, which would indicate completion by the date? Or
could we then withdraw the funds if they don't and we could
reallocate that?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
Withdrawning the funds is certainly an option. However, the
Commission had anticipated that the extension to January 3rd,
2022 would be the very last that this could be extended and it
-- as a result, the Commission very wisely put in place
multiple progress report requirements, so as we move forward
through the construction season, there are required progress
reports that must be submitted by those who had received the
extension, so we will be able to catch projects that aren't
making adequate progress in those reporting periods. So the
next reporting period is August the 1st, 2022, and it -- I would, I would recommend to staff that by August the 1st, 2022, if adequate progress has not been made, then the Commission could make a different decision.

STOLDAL: And, and just for the clarification, Rebecca, I think you, you use the, the date January ’22 again. I think you meant ’23?

PALMER: Oh.

STOLDAL: Sorry, sorry. Just so the record’s clear.


STOLDAL: No, no.

OSTROVSKY: Rebecca, if you would, after that August deadline, would you advise the Chair and Vice Chair of this Commission of the status of those, those grants so that we could make a decision about whether or not we need a -- another meeting of the Commission to take whatever action is necessary to see that, that -- those funds are properly made available and expend -- expended in the appropriate time? So if you would notify us, we could make that decision?

PALMER: For the record, the his is Rebecca Palmer. Yes, we will do that.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, do you know -- Stoldal for the record -- if the applicant from Goldfield, or Rebecca or
staff, if that person is online or intending to join this
meeting? Do we know?

PALMER: Yes. Goldfield is on the line.

STOLDAL: Okay. All right, great. 'Cause I think
you bring up a great -- a challenging question for a lot of
the grants and that is getting contractors at, at some of
these places to, to come out and, and do the work, even though
it's -- anyway, thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Well, I think we will hear from Goldfield
later on the agenda, unless, Bob, you want to ask them that
question now. You're more than -- you can do that if you'd
like.

STOLDAL: Yeah, I think I'll, I'll wait, 'cause we
got a lot of, a lot of work to do.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Any other commissioners have any
questions of staff? Seeing none, Rebecca, could you, could
you bring us up to date on the bond sales for this current
cycle?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
The first bond sale has occurred. That was for $1 million and
I don't believe the proceeds have been deposited into the
account yet, but we're awaiting that, and we'll -- I will
update when the proceeds are actually deposited. The second
bond sale for $3 million, so that the total of $4 million is
available, will occur in October. And the proceeds should be
deposited sometime in November. So there's two separate bond sales. This is an anomaly that I sincerely hope will only happen in this grant cycle. It's due to some different interpretations of, of when the bond sales should occur and so this is in a unique circumstance where $1 million will be available relatively quickly and then $3 million will be available in November.

OSTROVSKY: I have a little background noise here, but temporary. So that, that influences, and as we grant the money today, it means we have to plan that expenditures over time. It is not all available quickly. Is that right?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Yes, that is indeed the case. There will be a million available now and 3 million in November. For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer as well. I -- depending on, on how the economy continues or does not in the future, this may be a more common occurrence.

STOLDAL: Chairman, I --

OSTROVSKY: Yes.

STOLDAL: -- I'm wondering whether or not it would be appropriate as, as we go through each of these applicants to simply ask them the question whether or not they're shovel ready. I, I note that, for example, I think Fallon already has bids in or he has a local contractor and they're just waiting for the money, but I wasn't able to tell on the other
grants, whether or not they've got people just standing by. I’m wondering if that would be appropriate to ask that question. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: That certainly would, and, and for those folks listening in, we'll think about that because we'll be asking that question as we go along and you'll understand why, because we've got this little cash flow issue that we need to make sure we manage properly.

PALMER: For, for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Chair, I see Antoinette Kavanaugh's (phonetic) hand raised.

OSTROVSKY: All right. Please, Commissioner.

Questions.

KAVANAUGH: For the record, this is Antoinette Kavanaugh. Rebecca, I have a question. Well, I think I know the answer because we had discussed this before, but I think for the edification of those in attendance, it would be valuable to explain why this is an anomaly this year.

OSTROVSKY: Rebecca, could you answer that --

KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible) why this, why this fund -- why this funding is an anomaly this year.

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. The, 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. That
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 and -- however, that's been reinterpreted and now, the grant award, as we did -- are we doing this cycle is occurring after the Commission has decided to award $4 million in -- or minus administrative requirements. 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 of which we were able to participate at $1 million, and then the normal bond sale in October, where we would normally participate where $3 million we -- the Commission will receive in proceeds. 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 the anomalies.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Rebecca. Any other questions? Just let me double check that I've got coverage here. Any
other staff announcements? You all right, Rebecca?

PALMER: For the record, I have no other staff announcements at this time.

OSTROVSKY: Only personal -- we will take a, a break somewhere, you know, 10:30 or 11:00, and then, I would like to squeeze in a lunch break around noon, somewhere around noon, 12:30, depending upon the way it goes, a 30-minute lunch break. 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, but just so your planning purposes, lunch around noonish. We’ll just go kind of the flow of the meeting. The next agenda item is item 5. That's approval of the minutes from the previous meeting of November 3rd, 2021. They were distributed and are available on the website. Does anyone have any questions, comments, or other concerns about the minutes?

STOLDAL: I do not. Would make a motion to approve as they stand.

OSTROVSKY: Motion by Commissioner Stoldal. Anyone like to second that motion?

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead, second.

OSTROVSKY: Commissioner Olmstead, second. Any further discussion? And we’ll call any members of the public that have any comments about the minutes? Seeing and hearing none, all those in favor of approval of the minutes, say aye.
MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chairman votes in favor, so they are adopted and made officially part of the record. We will now move on to item number 6, discussion of Commission scoring method, grant review process, and review of statutory responsibilities of the Commission. I'll go in reverse order and ask Mr. Stoldal, who usually does this for us, to give us a quick review of our statutory responsibilities.

STOLDAL: Sure. Thank you. Pulling out the, the focus of today's activities, which is the, the granting of funds, 5 -- NRS 383.500 through 520 includes the creation of this Commission, but also has details regarding the program of awarding financial assessment -- assistance, and the state law provides the Commission with the authority to (1) award financial assessment -- 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 moving -- 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 a 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, Chair

Ostrovsky, the, the Commission in the past has also, as policy

given projects that are re -- actual emergencies, that are

really emergencies, we've given them top consideration, and

we've also looked at those projects that can be completed by

this -- the grant. So those are the, the details, both

operational policy and, and NRS that we operate under.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mr. Stoldtal. Now that we've

had that review, this section of the agenda, we'll talk about

scoring methods and grant review process and, and I think in,

in doing that, we need to talk generally about the, the
applications that we received. We have a, a very detailed manual on, on how to submit an application and what's required. We have staff, which has taken considerable amount of time in the past and currently to work with applicants that have questions, concerns, don't understand or, or make some assistance in following the -- their guidelines that we've outlined.

STOLDAL: Chairman Ostrovsky, I, I apologize. I -- where you're going is really important and, and I think we need to do that, but I left out page 3 of, of my overview. If I could -- you want to jump back or do you want to finish?

OSTROVSKY: No, go ahead.

STOLDAL: The, 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 CCHP also has the authority to fund and request the applicant prepare studies from seismic to arch -- archeol -- arche -- well, archeological, as well as agricultural -- not agriculture -- architectural. Maybe an arch, arch -- agriculture would be, but, but this says 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 -- this Commission has looked at those elements, the -- 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.

Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Bob 'cause all of those will come into play today, almost every point that, that Bob made -- that Commissioner Stoldal made. I'm sorry. So we need to keep those in mind because if, if you go through these grant applications and, and I have an opinion, and I know some other commissioners may have an opinion about how those grants were prepared and submitted in this cycle. I'll hold my comments for just a minute and see if other commissioners want to make any comments about the applications in general, not specifically. We talk about specifics because we're going to review each one eventually, but I think some statement needs to be made about them. I know, Bob, you had some points and I'll make some others.

STOLDAL: Chairman, I, --

OSTROVSKY: Right.

STOLDAL: -- I look at, at these grants when the, the grant cycle really as a, as a, as a wonderful opportunity
to visit parts of the state and specific projects and learn about the history, really deep dive into the history of, of these projects and into the, into the communities. And they're at different levels. Some, some applicants have made applications before, so they've been through the process, so they understand what the grant manual says. The grant manuals, by the way, are very clear. The applications are very clear. It's like a checklist. Fill this in, fill this in, fill this in. This time around, this was a little bit -- while I still enjoyed visiting all parts of the, all parts of the state vicariously through these grant applications, and some of them, of course, are that thick and some of them have accompanying reports, master plans, and, and all kinds of helpful information. On the other hand, some of them just weren't -- were totally incomplete. I mean, one, they, they just -- they miss all of the key elements in order for this Commission to understand what the project is and, and, and what the, what the funding and, and, and how the, the funding figures were arrived at along with critical things like who owns the land, who owns that building. I mean, how can we give money to, to where we don't -- because we require -- before the grants are, are -- actually the money is given out, that they sign covenants, the owner sign covenants to, to, to protect the, the properties. And, and then there's a question of the, of the audits, and the audits are clearly required.
There's two or three or four places to where it says an audit. And -- but then there's also some room where he's saying, If you don't have an audit, tell us why. I mean, it's not, it's not a, a, a capital offense not to have -- 'cause some of the smaller nonprofits may not do an audit every year, but just -- tell, tell (Inaudible), tell the, the, the Commission why, why, why there, why there's no audit. Explanations are just really helpful within this application process. So this time, there were lots of them that. It was just a struggle to, to -- and, and, and I make a practice not to call the applicants or communicate to -- directly in, in, in any way and, and just use the application form. So, a lot of questions today, so maybe you -- we ought to plan a dinner break as well as lunch.

OSTROVSKY: This is Bob. Any, any other commissioners have comments? Yeah, I, I have similar comments to Bob and, and therefore I think you'll see, we may put some requirements on some applicants that, that make it approval, but they're going to be some requirements they provide certain information. I, I was just sort of disappointed. After many years on this Commission, I, I find it difficult that a number of, of grant requests where, as Bob said, just had holes, just missing information. Not saying, Hey, I, I couldn't get it or I'll have it next month or we'll get an audit next spring or we had one two years ago and just to, just to sort of pass
over it, was really not acceptable. Made it difficult for
staff, made it difficult for at least myself to make some
decisions about these, and we'll talk about decisions because
in one way they're more difficult, in another way, they're,
they're, they're easier. I just -- I, I urge those folks out
there who, who make -- who do these applications, spend some
time. Be careful about them. I -- and I've always
understood, there are people out there, local governments and
state governments, that have staff and, and they can put
together the 400-page application and submission. We've got
some groups out there that are relatively small, have very
limited resources, and I take -- take that into consideration
when I look at the application, but blank holes are not, not
acceptable. So you've got to, you've got to give us the
information. If you don't have it, you got to tell us why
not, or that you're going to get it. So we'll be going --
we'll talking about that today as we go, so just a point made
and, and, you know, staff has limited time and, and they're
trying to put it together the best they can, and we'd like
staff to be as productive as possible, so -- without having to
chase, chase after information that should have been submitted
in the first place. Let's talk for a moment about scoring. I
know, as in the past cycles, we've had to create budgets and
determine what portion of the funding we can achieve with
limited dollars. That scoring method will not be used in this
cycle. For, for fairly obvious reasons, the, the total bonded amount is going to be $4 million. We've got a $200,000 set-aside for administrative costs, so we have got $3.8 million available for grant awards. We only received $3.3 million, $562,067 worth of request, so we actually have more funds than we have requests, so getting back to Commissioner Stoldal’s review of the statute, our -- and, and our operating policies, we can grant that amount. We can grant less if we think the projects are not viable or we think there's some -- that, that we can only fund a portion of them because that's all the, the Commission wants to do, but we do have available funds to grant all of this. We can also grant, as Mr. Stoldal indicated, additional monies where we think it's required up to that $4 million number, actually $3.8 million available for distribution, so I will not be asking the commissioners to establish a separate budget to submit, and, if you know, we had that process of comparing all of our notes, but we will be making decisions along the way. We may have to talk about wanting to distribute extra dollars if necessary. We may also want to talk about having some requirements before we’ll allot all the money, whether a study may be required, a seismic study, an engineering study. I think some questions will arise that this Commission will want some reassurance that what the applicant wants to do is really a first step or a second step, and if it's the second step, we need to talk
about, well, have you done the seismic work, for example, so we will get, we will get to those as we go along. As a grant review process, we will be calling each grant request to make very short comments. I'm particularly focused on any changes that have taken place since the grant request was made, were there any factors we need to consider. We do not permit or this Commission does not permit submission of new, 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, something has happened to the facility, a, a roof problem, a window, water damage, that has arisen since it's grant application was submitted, and we do take those into consideration. So, does any other commissioner have comment about that before we go on to calling the grants forward? Again, when we call you forward, give us a very brief overview of the project. I can assure you every one of these commissioners have read these grants more than once, and so they'll have questions of you. So if you could keep your comments relatively short, introduce yourself, tell us a little bit -- any changes to the grant, anything that you think is absolutely significant that we know, and then give us an opportunity to raise questions to you, that would be great. So with that, I would move on to item 7, which is, in fact, the review and testimony regarding these grants. These -- we
will take them in the order that they were received and the first grant, which is identified as 2101, Storey County Courthouse. Let everyone get their notes together. Is there someone here who, online or otherwise, that's available to address us on Storey County Courthouse?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. One moment. I'll bring them on.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you.

HITCHCOCK: Honey, you are on. You can unmute yourself.

MENEFEE: Okay. Can you hear me?

HITCHCOCK: And I brought Lara Mather on as well in case she needed to speak too.

MATHER: Are you, are you able to hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED: I can hear you.

OSTROVSKY: Yes.

MENEFEE: Good morning, Commissioners. Honey Menefee, Storey County Community Relations for the record. We have no changes at this time from our original application that we submitted to you. I would just like to highlight a few parts of our application and why we feel that our proposed project is significant. The Storey County Courthouse in Virginia City is the oldest continuously operating courthouse in Nevada. Construction began on the building in 1876 after the Great Fire of 1875, which destroyed a third of the town.
Virginia City at one time was considered the richest place on earth and since then has gone through various periods of booms and busts after the initial discovery of gold and silver in the 1850s. Throughout the years of great economic success and subsequent -- subsequent declines, the Storey County Courthouse has remained in operation. Providing services for all of Storey County, the courthouse is home to most of the county government, including the District Court, Human Resources, County Commissioners, Planning, Assessors, Department of Motor Vehicles, Recorder, Clerk-Treasurer, and the County Manager, and all of these offices may be accessed by the public during business hours. Election voting also takes place in the building such as today. Further, the Slammer and Museum, which is free of charge, exhibits the history of Storey County from its inception through today, and it is 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. In the past, portions of the electrical wiring were upgraded in phases with the most recent upgrades made possible by
Commission for Cultural Affairs grants and Historic Preservation Fund Grants between 2010 and 2014. The remaining wiring, which has not been upgraded, poses a fire hazard to this historic building, its contents, and records. Our 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. And that is the end of my record. And I am available for questions.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you very much. Commissioners, it's appropriate now to ask questions of the applicant.

STOLDAL: Chair, Stoldal for the record. I, I, I don't have -- the, the application is, is complete. It's, it's clear. I did have a question though for staff regarding the, the dollar figure, the amount of money that, according to the, uh, the, the bid that's in here is quoted at $95 an hour, but -- and, and that exceeds a, a figure of -- that we're allowed to give, either the Commission is allowed to give, SHPO, or the State of Nevada or all or one in the same.

OSTROVSKY: You have comment, Rebecca?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. The maximum rate allowed by this Commission is $82.57. The
estimate for -- from United Electrical Services has a code of $95 per hour. Any portion above the maximum cannot be reimbursed by the Commission.

STOLDAL: Where, where -- how, how is that -- is that a number that is a state number or something that the Commission could change or how, how -- where do the -- is, is that updated on a regular basis, the $82.57?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. The amount comes from our federal grant, which is -- that's the allowed rate under our federal grant. However, there is -- I would defer to Attorney Walsh if there's a requirement in state statutes. That, like I said, that number came from our federal grant, but perhaps there is a limit in state law. If not, then perhaps the Commission could raise that.

STOLDAL: Thank you.

WALSH: Thank you, Rebecca. This is Anthony Walsh for the record. I'm not aware of any statutory provision that would prevent that type of change discussed.

STOLDAL: I, I appreciate the, I appreciate source of the number and, and the, the ability of, of this Commission to, to potentially grant the full grant $80, $80,000, so thank you, Mr. Chair.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. I have a question. First, Commissioner Kavanaugh? Your hand raised?

KAVANAUGH: Thank you. My question -- this is
Commission Kavanaugh for the record. My question would be, is there an exception to the federal amount due to factors around COVID costs? We've, we've seen such an increase in cost for product as well as hourly professional costs. Is -- could that be an exception?

OSTROVSKY: Well, I think this Commission could make an exception if it decided it wanted to. My, my question for Honey is this -- Honey, is this a Public Works project?

MENEFEE: This is not a Public Works project. You -- this project will go out to bid. Most likely, United Electrical Services will, 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.

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, Stoldal for the record. Did I hear you correctly that you -- we wanted to take each of these applications on a one-by-one basis rather than wait until the end?

OSTROVSKY: Yes.

STOLDAL: Thank you. Now I just -- I would -- I don’t know whether we, we make a motion, but I just make a motion to, to grant the, the full amount of $80,418 to Applicant 21-01 Storey County Courthouse Electrical
Renovation. I'm not, I'm not sure if that's --

KAVANAUGH: I'll second.

STOLDAL: -- the procedure you want to go for.

OSTROVSKY: That's fine. We can use that procedure.

We'll take them one at a time. That would be fine.

STOLDAL: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Seconded by whom? I'm sorry.

KAVANAUGH: Commissioner Kavanaugh for the record. I second.

OSTROVSKY: Kavanaugh second. Any commissioners want to further discuss 21-01? Anyone make public comment regarding 21-01? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor of approving 21-01 in the full amount of $80,418, please say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chairman votes in favor.

It's unanimous. Thank you very much, and looking forward to, to visiting the Storey County Courthouse. If you haven't been there, you should make an attempt. Thank you very much. I'll give you one second to clear your desk here and we'll get on to two. All right. We, oh, application 21-02 is the Comstock Cemetery Foundation for the Visitor Center Water Waste System. Is there someone available to speak regarding the Comstock Cemetery Foundation?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I'll bring on Candace Wheeler.
candace, you're on. Go ahead and unmute.

WHEELER: Can you hear me?

OSTROVSKY: We can. Thank you for being here and now's your opportunity.

WHEELER: Okay. I'm Candace Wheeler. I'm the Executive Director for the Comstock Cemetery Foundation. Last week, we invited contributors, volunteers, and county staff to take a little peek of our visitor center in the making. We had about 70 people during which we took an opportunity to take a little survey to assess our process so far. One hundred percent of the responders gave us a five and above for our 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 according to the World's Tourism Organization, genealogical tourism is the fastest growing travel category for the next three to five years. 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. Our current request is not quite the cherry on the top, but it's definitely the whipped cream. We're looking for
plumbing, sewage, and a design for a public toilet. We are lucky that water was brought to the cemetery in 1995. We're lucky that we are only dealing with two toilets and three sinks, and we're lucky to have local skilled people to accomplish the work. 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, Lady Luck came in again and, 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. Why? Well, because it services the community and the public. We get an average of a hundred visitors a day and the number two question after, is there anyone famous buried there, is where can I pee? And that's about a half a mile away. Also the VCTA will tell you a number one visitor concern is the availability of public toilets in Virginia City. We're lucky that most of our in--in-house plans, we were able to do without seeking a lot of expensive professional help. However, when it comes to a public toilet, 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 and the -- my last four seconds, I just want to thank SHPO for all the help over the past two years, and for Carla dealing with my mathematical inabilities. That's it.

OSTROVSKY: Well, thank you very much and, we, we noted we, we had to -- there was -- so little math problems. We got those figured out. I'll ask the other commissioners, but first, I mean, very quick. Could we talk about the ownership of the property and we --

WHEELER: Yeah.

OSTROVSKY: -- we think Storey County owns some and your foundation owns some. Could you give us just a quick review of that?

WHEELER: Sure. It, it's a kind of a work in process. Right now with the reporter, 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 Mr. Marshall (phonetic) to convey that lease to the county. It just makes better sense. It hasn't been accomplished yet but that is our end goal.
OSTROVSKY: Could I ask staff whether that's adequate?

PALMER: This is Rebecca Palmer for the record.

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

WHEELER: It is leased and we actually own the building.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. We, we understand, and, and it's leased for a period longer than the covenant.

WHEELER: Ninety-nine years.

OSTROVSKY: Yes. I'll, I'll open it up to other commissioners, so if you have questions, now would be the appropriate time.

STOLDAL: Sure, I, I -- Stoldal off the record. I'm still foggy on, on, on how we can go forward 'cause one of the requirements is the owner has to sign the covenant and in reading the application, it seemed like there were two and I was, I was a bit -- if I understood it right, there's a mining claim on the cemetery. The ceme -- how, how --

WHEELER: Rebecca, Rebecca summarized it pretty
well. 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 we straighten this out, 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.

STOLDAL: I, I, I think that you, you, you, you have -- you, you realize what the challenges are and you're trying to resolve those.

WHEELER: Yes.

STOLDAL: And it, it's my understanding also that Storey County independently of whatever it’s trying to do with you is, is also trying to clean up the hundred -- well, we're way past that, 150-year history of the, the, the ownerships of land within Virginia City? This is --

WHEELER: That is exactly correct. They have their hands full, but they're doing a good job.
STOLDAL: How, how close do you think that they are in wrapping that up? That would give us some security, some sense that (A) that Storey County is going to be -- clean up or at least say, this is who owns what, and, and we're the legal entity, and then the second part, when do you think you would be able to get that MOU done?

WHEELER: Just talking about our thing, it was actually put on the agenda for the last commissioner's meeting and then we found a few little blips that Austin (phonetic) and I wanted to straighten out, so I would say that we are within two months of completing both of those activities. Everybody's on board. Everybody wants it straightened out, and, yes, they do have their hands full, but in relation to us, I would say no more than two months and it would be pretty clear.

STOLDAL: And, Chairman, would -- is, is, is -- if they get that MOU from the mining guy, he gives it to the, to the county, the Storey County, and county signs that MOU with the foundation, Comstock, is, is that going to -- is that satisfy our covenant issue?

OSTROVSKY: Well, from my perspective, it does because the covenant runs, I think, 25 years --

WHEELER: Mm hmm.

OSTROVSKY: -- (Inaudible), is that right, Rebecca?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I
believe that to be correct. I can check the grant manual real quick, but, but yeah, that's, that's --

OSTROVSKY: Clearly, 99 years would, would, would cover our covenant responsibilities, so, if you want to make this grant contingent upon them receiving the appropriate MOU, that's fine. My concern is, and I'll ask the applicant, what's the construction schedule for this project? You know, I, I’m understanding Virginia City can be very tough in the winter.

WHEELER: It, it's largely dependent on, on when we get the funding, but we have, 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. I mean, for once, we were kind of lucky.

OSTROVSKY: Other commissioners have questions? Bob, you want to make a motion? I think we know where we were going.

STOLDAL: Well, I'd like to, to make a motion, 21-02 Comstock Cemetery Foundation Visitor Center Water Waste System, pending the approval of the MOU between Storey County and the Comstock Cemetery Foundation, awarding a grant of
$55,400.

OMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second that motion.

OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second. Commissioners have any further comments? Any member of the public like to make a comment? Seeing and hearing none, all those in favor of approving 21-02 in the amount of $55,400 with the requirement of a signed MOU, please say.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Anyone opposed? Chairman votes in favor. Motion is carried. Thank you very much, and we'll look forward to seeing the MOU and perhaps the county, knowing that funding is out there, might help you get that done sooner.

Thank you very much.

WHEELER: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: One minute. We'll move on to 21-03. 21-03 is Douglas County Historical Society, Carson Valley Museum and Cultural Center exterior rehabilitation. Is there someone here from Douglas County Historical Society to speak?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I have Janice Beerwinkle. I'll bring her on.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, Janice. (Inaudible).

OSTROVSKY: Can't hear you yet, Janice. We still trying to bring her on?
HITCHCOCK: Yeah. I just got a message in the chat that Dennis Little is on. If you're on the computer with Janice, you guys will need to unmute yourself. It says there's no unmute. If you go down to the bottom of your screen, there should be a whole line of options there and one of them is to mute or unmute. Just move your cursor over the bottom of your screen.

STOLDAL: It’s on the left side?

HITCHCOCK: Yeah, on the left-hand side.

OSTROVSKY: You can also press the space bar to speak. Not sure.

HITCHCOCK: Try the space bar?

STOLDAL: (Inaudible).

HITCHCOCK: I am not able to do the unmuting. All it says is ask them to unmute, so I am not able to unmute them.

STOLDAL: Well, there was -- it was unmuted for a second, whatever they did.

HITCHCOCK: Let's see.

STOLDAL: Are we able to contact them?

HITCHCOCK: One moment. Now, they've -- maybe they're trying again. I don't even see Janice on any longer, so they must have dropped off.

OSTROVSKY: Well, I'll tell you what, we'll move on to number four --

STOLDAL: Right.
OSTROVSKY: -- and we'll come back to number three as soon as we finish number four. Maybe that will give them an opportunity to get, get it sorted out, but one way or the other, we -- we'll get the -- so --

HITCHCOCK: Okay. It says Dennis is still here. I'm just not -- hold on. Douglas -- Dennis?

LITTLE: Okay. Found it this time.

OSTROVSKY: Great. There you are. Thank you.

LITTLE: Thank you, commissioners. Each morning before I start my computer, I write 'I love high tech' ten times in cursive. Again, we'd like to thank the Commission for entertaining our proposal. I like sharing with you and the public that the Carson Valley Museum and Cultural Center is far more than just a museum. We're pleased to be 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, I'm very pleased to say, we host a youth education program, highlighting the history, the culture, our DCHS young Chautauqua program, all the things which I view of great support to the community. Our proposal on the restoration of the exterior fascia and painting, the one thing I wanted to stress, it's 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, very interesting problems with the 
deteriorating fascia where we've had a bat infestation, which 
was a very, very interesting program to mitigate, and we also 
have had a nice colony of bees who decided to live in our 
attic. I won't say belfry, but bats into belfry, bees in the 
attic, so we're far more than just cosmetic. I know most of 
you are very familiar with our building and operations and 
rather than belabor the aspects of it, the only thing I'd 

close is 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, and I'd be 
inclined just to take questions from this point.

OSTROVSKY: Yes, Dennis, I don't know if staff had a 

chance -- we, we seem to have some minor discrepancies in, in 

how the budget was prepared. Do staff want to comment or do 
you want to comment on if the request of $21,075 is correct or 

whether it needs to be modified in any way?

LITTLE: Yes. The $21,000-some odd dollars is the 
correct request. We are always terrified that contractors 
always find a way of adding 10% to the cost, so our request of 

SHPO is the $21,075.

OSTROVSKY: And you -- did they give you an itemized 

breakdown? None, none was included.
LITTLE: (Inaudible). Oh.

UNIDENTIFIED: What's on the (Inaudible).

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I think that -- Stoldal for the record. I think that there's -- the, the, the discrepancy is not the $21,075 actual, it's the -- whether or not there's a, an $1850 non-state share. The, the math doesn't seem to add up. Is that, is that correct, staff?

UNIDENTIFIED: That's our contribution.

LITTLE: Yeah. We're contributing $1850 towards the project is -- which is what we have left in our building maintenance fund as of the moment.

STOLDAL: So do we subtract the $1850 from the $21?

LITTLE: No, that's what we're adding in addition to, that we are able to put in, in that much money.

OSTROVSKY: Staff, does that answer your question or, or do we need more?

PALMER: This is Rebecca Palmer for the, for the record. I believe that answers the question.

STOLDAL: Chair, I had two or three other smaller questions.

OSTROVSKY: Yes, absolutely. Go ahead, Mr. Stoldal.

STOLDAL: Stoldal for the record. It says Douglas County as far as your name. That's a great name, Mr. -- Douglas Museum. I didn't get your full name.

LITTLE: Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner. I'm Dennis
Little and I'm the Operational Director of the Douglas County Historical Society, which operates the Carson Valley Museum and Cultural Center.

STOLDAL: Great, and, and a great facility it, it, it, it is as I'm a member of it. Let me ask you a question. The photographs you sent, has a seismic study been produced recently for this building and, and I'm talking also about the column?

LITTLE: 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.

STOLDAL: All right. What's the overall condition of the six columns?

LITTLE: 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 facia material and the columns put back together as quick as possible.

STOLDAL: So, so, so part of this grant is, is going to specifically go to repair the columns and, and the, and the leaking issue.

LITTLE: Yes. Yes.

STOLDAL: And, and are -- will you manage this
project? Who's going to overall manage this project?

LITTLE: Basically, I am going to be the one out there asking the -- or calling the contractor why they didn't show up to work today. So basically, I will be the ramrod on it and Janice Beerwinkle will be the financial aspect in monitoring the project.

STOLDAL: Dennis, thank you very much. Mr. Chair, thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioners have questions?

Now, this is one where, just so the applicant knows, we, 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. Any commissioner like to make a motion?

STOLDAL: I'll make a motion then, 21-03, Douglas County Historical Society, the Carson Valley Museum and Cultural Center Exterior Rehabilitation grant request of $21,075, I move to approve the grant request.

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I’ll second.

OSTROVSKY: All right, thank you, commissioner. Any further comments from the commission? Any comments from the public? Hearing none, all those in favor of approving 21-03 in the amount of $21,075, please say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.
OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Motion carried with the Chairman voting in favor. Thank you very much.

LITTLE: Thank you, commissioners.

OSTROVSKY: The next item is a Fourth Ward School with the requested amount of $504,648, I believe. A substantial sum of money, substantial project. Is there someone here from the Fourth Ward School available to speak to the commission?

UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir. One moment. I'll bring her on.

STEFU: Hello. Can you hear me?

OSTROVSKY: Yes. We can hear you clearly.

STEFU: Hello, my name's Nora Stefu and I'm the Executive Director of the Fourth Ward School Museum for the record. So good morning, commissioners and thank you for giving me this opportunity to be here with all of you and discuss the continuous rehabilitation of the Fourth Ward School Museum. 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 and provided -- I'm sorry, that it was innovation of its time and it was -- that accommodated students and teachers, and this would, an 1876 structural building, is the last of its kind in the State of Nevada and the United States. The community for many decades have been an advocate to save
and rehabilitate the Fourth Ward building. Throughout the years, success -- successfully, they have rehabilitated the original structure of 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, 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, and travelers who come and visit Virginia City. It is one of the most popular attraction. We continue to have programs for preservation inviting and, 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 program -- the -- programs that are produced at the premises, and most important is archival center that holds the historical artifacts and historical information of our -- of, of the Comstock community. The rehabilitation project is essential to secure the building exterior wall -- walls. If the wood walls fall, the building -- and the
building is not sealed and secured, we’ll not have the safe interior environment for the staff and the, and the public to continue the programming of preserving the Comstock history.

At this president state, the Fourth Ward School, we were fortunate to preserve and rehabilitate the building as last year, we rehabilitated the west front elevation of the building.

UNIDENTIFIED: Three minutes (Inaudible).

STEFU: 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 -- if we believe the funds are available, we can do all three sites by next spring. Our contractors have been proven and they can finish the project, and last year, we accomplished the entire west (Inaudible) and the bell tower of the building in time. 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 where -- and
the funds are available, we can finish the project with the
secretary interior standards. Thank you so much.

OSTROVSKY: Thank, thank you. Just to comment, then
I'll go on to the commissioners. This, this, this facility
has received grants from, from this Commission and it's prior
Cultural Commission for a long time, but it still didn't
excuse the applicant from not providing us a printout of the
assessors 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?

STEFU: From my understanding, Commissioner, we
were not required for an audit, a professional audit, because
our -- we don't meet the threshold to provide a professional
audit. However, though, every quarterly, our, our board --
the board pretty much sees our financial statements and we
hire professional -- I'm sorry, a professional --

OSTROVSKY: Accounting firm? Is that what --

STEFU: Accounting. Thank you. Accounting firm
for our IRS tax and for our IRS taxes.

OSTROVSKY: All right, thank you. Commissioners,
questions at this point.

STOLDAL: Oh, I appreciate the, the -- Stoldal for
the record. I appreciate the response, but this is not -- we're not the IRS. We're the Commission on Cultural Centers and Historic Places, and we require, and it's clear within the application in the grant manual, that we require an audit, and, and I will tell you, quite frankly, surprises me that, that there, there hasn't been an audit on any nonprofit that has this kind of, of importance and, and this building and, and what it stands for is very important. The money that this Commission has invested in it has been substantial, so, this is not a re -- re -- requirement of the IRS, but it's clear in the -- in, in the grand application for the Commission on Cultural Affairs and Historic Places that, that we require an audit. Now, the, 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, it's spent properly. The other question was who actually owns the building and the land?

STEFU: Storey County, sir.

STOLDAL: Okay. And so you would be able to provide, as the Chair asked, that, that list of the, of the AP number and, and, and so they would -- Rebecca, would Storey County sign the covenants?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
Yes. The answer is yes. The property owner signs the covenants.

STOLDAL: Great. Thank you.

PALMER: And in this case, Storey County would be the, the signatory there. I -- it -- if I could beg the Chair's indulgence for just one moment, 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 or the -- yeah, the grant application should reflect that money has come in for that south elevation and therefore the award may need to be reduced.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Is the applicant -- can you tell us what the county contributed?

STEFU: Well, I mean, we -- I know the Storey County has passed in their budget to give -- to give us the money for the southeast. I mean, I'm sorry for the south side of the building, however, we haven't had the meeting to go in -- we don't know exactly the process yet, so this is all in, in the future tense that we will know all the requirements that we need for -- to go and our request also, it doesn't include the south side. Our request was for the east and north side of the building on our grand report. E

STOLDAL: Chair, I'm, I'm, I'm, I'm still a bit
confused. It was my 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.

STEFU: Correct.
STOLDAL: Is, is for the south side.
STEFU: Correct.
OSTROVSKY: And I'll note that the letter of submission to the Commission says, ‘rehabilitation and restoration of the exterior south, east and north elevations’.
So I'm a little confused.

STEFU: Well, we, we explain what are the needs in our grant proposal. However, we believe that we explained that we want -- we requested the east and the north from, from SHPO grant money, but we wanted to explain how -- what we requested for the Storey County as well. So just to see our, you know, what was the -- what are requesting for -- to -- what we need to -- for the building to be fixed. So --

STOLDAL: Well, let me jump in. Stoldal for the record. So if I read the, the figures correctly, you're asking for the east side $305,870, and for the north side, $198,778. Are, are those the figures we should be looking at?
STEFU: Absolutely.
STOLDAL: Then I'd like to ask you couple of quick,
Chair, questions. The Chair mentioned earlier that -- and, and this Commission and this predecessor has given several hundred thousand dollars, recognized the importance of the Fourth Ward School. One of the last applications was -- and grants was for $228,633 for the -- that included the roof. Can you -- I'm, I'm a bit confused because there are different elements in the, in the phrase, 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?

STEFU: The mansard re -- all the wood sh -- links are deteriorated. So what we did, for example, from -- for the west front that had pretty much the same similarity problems, so we have the same problems on the south and east. They're so -- some parts are deteriorating that they need to be pulled out and sealed and repaint them.

STOLDAL: Mm-hmm. I, I guess what -- the, the -- where I was going at, it doesn't make sense to me, but then I, I, I am not an architect or, or a contractor of construction. We fixed one side of the roof. To me, we should have fixed the whole roof. Why wasn't the roof itself not a major project and we took care of that? What's the benefit of fixing one side, then later, a couple years later, the, the, the, the other side? How was that decision arrived at?

STEFU: Probably, from my understanding, because I
wasn't in all the restoration of the building, and from what I've read, it's just money was the issue and years ago, I know they restructured the main level of the roof, but the, the (Inaudible) due to time weather, it needs all, you know, it needs pretty much a lot of attention through years to seal the, the shingles. The major part, for example, like, five years, estimated if it's five years ago. I know they fixed the west-north side of the building roof because they had some, some major deteriorating elements, so they focused on that side. On our end, because that also, a part of the roof, for example, on the south side is -- we included on our, on our grant estimate is because it needs -- the shingles were not all finished back in that -- back five years ago. So they need to be refreshed, painted, and sealed, but the major construction of rehabilitating the south, the north-south side of the roof was, was completed, but not all the shingles, from my understanding, what I've read at the report.

STOLDAL: Well, my last question then is taking consideration the mansard roof, the condition, if you had the choice, and this is going to be asked to, to many of our applicants, the choice between the east elevation or the north elevation, which is the one that, that needs the attention right now, the east or the north elevation?

STEFU: Did you say the roof, sir, or the whole side of the building?
STOLDAL: Well, the, the mansard is, is, is not a separate. It's, it's part of, it's part of each of the, the, the east elevation or the north elevation. There's two numbers in there, one for the east elevation and one for the north elevation, and each of those numbers has the details of what will be taken care of. For example, the east elevation is at $305,870. The north is at $198,778. So forgetting the dollar figure, which one needs the attention right now?

STEFU: The attention right now is the east. The ma -- it needs a ma -- it needs a lot of work.

STOLDAL: Okay.

STEFU: So it is a prominent whether -- yeah. I mean, at this point, we would really hope we can fix the east side of the building.

STOLDAL: So you'd work on, on the east side and then the south side, and then potentially later on ask for a grant for the north side?

STEFU: Correct. We asked for Storey grant -- for Storey County for the south side. So if we can, if -- and I believe we granted the south side from Storey County. So if we can continue fixing the east, it will be a great deal because those two sites are very deteriorated.

STOLDAL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Applicant.

OSTROVSKY: Mr. Kavanaugh?
KAVANAUGH: My, my question has to do with previous grant awards, when, 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, 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, and maybe that's a question for the staff.

OSTROVSKY: Well, just from the --

KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. From the Chairman's point of view, we've always accepted their proposal based on, you know, their accounting firm and their board, but I, I think 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 that -- of this size, which we've invested more than hundreds of thousands, I think, more -- and over a million dollars in this building, that we should encourage their board of directors to spend the money, and it's not cheap, but 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, 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, in order to, to, to achieve that. I don't know if the staff has any further comments, Rebecca, on, on the audits.

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Audits have always been required by the Commission. The Commission can choose to, you know, 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, has, has noted and will continue to note where required elements are missing.

OSTROVSKY: Excuse me. Any further comments?

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I, I -- yes. I, I'm sorry. I said no, but I meant yes. And, and to me, the audit is, is not something that should be -- it's just really clear throughout the application and this is an application to the State of Nevada, not an application to the IRS, and, and to just completely not acknowledge that by saying -- and I think the applicant explained what every quarter there's a, an auditing firm that comes in and, and makes sure one and one is two. That should have been included in, in the application, and, and I want to make sure, Rebecca, 'cause I don't think that you can make it any clearer that -- staff could make it
any clear that audits are an important element of the
application, but maybe we just need to put it all in capital
letters, all in, in, in red ink and put it at the top or
something that -- to make sure that this is, this is, is, is
important. And I think the Chair also is, is correct.
Spending the money properly, whether it's $10,000 or, or a
million dollars is, is important. This is taxpayer's money
and -- but, but the spotlight, the magnifying glass, gets a
little more focused when the, the, the money is a quarter
million dollars or more rather than $10,000, so thank you, Mr.
Chair.

OSTROVSKY: Well, and 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 of -- 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. So
I, I think we will add that to our agenda to make sure we, we
have that full discussion.

STOLDAL: I'd like to make a motion then.

OSTROVSKY: Mr. Stoldal, please.

STOLDAL: I'd like to make a motion for 21-04, the
Historic Fourth Ward School Foundation for the exterior
restoration of the east elevation at a grant fee of $305,870.

OSTROVSKY: Is there a second to that motion?
OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second that motion.

OSTROVSKY: Any discussion? Any discussion from the public? Rebecca, do you have a comment? Public, public -- member of the public have a comment? I see a, a hand raised. That's the only reason why --

STEFU: It's me, sir. I'm so sorry. I just --

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

STEFU: Yes.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Go ahead.

STEFU: I do apologize that the oversight of not explaining about the audit on the grant cycle, but I guess it was because of the previous years that I didn't see that it was as important as I found out today, how important it is and, and I can take it to our board in our July meeting and put that in action for the next time to have a professional audit for the Fourth Word School Museum.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

STEFU: Today this was en -- en -- enlightening for me and thank you so much for all that education that you gave me.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Any other comments? Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion?

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The motion carries with the
Chairman voting in favor. Thank you very much. I would, at
the discretion of the Chair, I'd like to take about a very
short break, about seven minutes. I've got it as -- we'd like
to come back in about seven minutes. That would be -- look at
my watch -- about 10:50, just a little restroom break, please.

STOLDAL: (Inaudible).

OSTROVSKY: We'll be right back. Is Commissioner
Olmstead back yet? Oh, there you are. Okay. Rebecca, are
you on the line? Is, is staff back? Carla, have you
returned?

HITCHCOCK: I am back, sir.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Well, then we're going to proceed.
Is Rebecca -- Oh, there she is. All right. Very good. I
will call the meeting back to order from our short break, so
we can move on 21-05 Fallon Community Theater. Is someone
available to speak to us from the theater?

HITCHCOCK: One moment. Stu Richardson is on. Go
ahead.

RICHARDSON: Can you hear us okay?

OSTROVSKY: Yes, I can. Okay. Mike Berney will be
speaking for Fallon Community Theater, Inc., today and he's
ready.

BERNEY: Good morning. First, we'd like to thank
you guys through that last grant phase for the new roof. Wow.
I don't even know how to express how happy we are to have a
roof, so thank you very, very much. As you know, the Fallon Theater just turning 102 this year and, and the Fallon Theater is pretty much, I would say that it's not a cornerstone in the way it sits, but it is, it is the draw of the 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, as recommended by Mel Green and Associates. So - - and I've -- we've put that all out in there. If, if you need me to go over that, I'd be more than happy to. 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 -- I, I think if you've seen the pictures, it's just a huge unit that's probably, what do you think, Stu, from 19 --

RICHARDSON: Thirty?

BERNEY: -- 30s? Which basically is falling apart and is probably more expensive to, to try to repair it as, what the HVAC contractors have told us, than to just put in a new, 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, on this was an electrical upgrade, which would be for our stage.
have -- we've had 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, so that covers what basically we were asking for in our grant. If you have any questions, we'd be glad to answer them.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mike. I, I'll turn it over to the Commission in a moment to ask questions. I just -- please take note that from prior discussions, how important the audit or at least an explanation of a lack thereof is, is so, I mean, you should follow up on with your board to make sure that in future cycles, because it was not included in this application. So just -- you're on notice from the prior applicant that these are important to us, you know. Commissioners have questions.

STOLDAL: Well, I'd, I'd like to hear from the applicant as far as how they balance their books or who, who sees and, 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, can you help, help us with that?

BERNEY: So probably the main problem for us with
an audit and, and I don't disagree with, with your asking for
an audit certainly. The, the problem for us has been, is it's
like $10,000 to $15,000 of money that really we haven't had as
a, as an organization to, to spend. Basically, what we do, we
have a treasurer who handles those -- our bills and, and, 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. I -- and again, I
know it's -- and I understand your guys' concern. I -- we are
a group of people that have known each other for many, many
years, so, I mean, it's -- we're pretty comfortable with
everybody doing what they need to do, but I don't disagree
with an audit. It's just been something that really has been
kind of just a little bit out of our reach to spend that kind
of money.

STOLDAL: And I think we all understand the
challenge of, of -- 'cause they, they, they generally will
run, as you say, somewhere between $9000, $12,000, no matter
how big the group is. It's just sort of a standard kind of
challenge for the small groups. But I think your, your
explanation, although I probably would leave out 'we all know
each other' as part of the --

BERNEY: That could be good or bad.

STOLDAL: Right. But I think the fact that you have
some process, I think that that should, that should be
included. A couple, couple of quick questions. Is, is this -
- it sounds like this one, if you get the approval and, and
the money flow is available, that you could start this right
away.

BERNEY: Actually I could, I could tell you that I
can probably start part of it right away. The rest of it's
going to be -- 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 a D
and D Roofing out of Reno, so it, it just depends how they can
fit us in. But, but, yeah, all of that, I don't think is a
problem. They just got to be told that we're ready to roll
once we have those funds available, so --

STOLDAL: Right. One, one last question. It really
doesn't have to do specifically with your application, but is
there any organization of, of you, the Fallon? I know that
there's a, a movie theater in Pioche, the, the, the gym. We
have the Huntridge in, in Las Vegas, and I'm sure around the
state, there are others all facing a lot of the same
challenges. Do you have -- is there any sort of communication
between the various historic theaters around the state?

BERNEY: You know, I don't think I've heard from
anybody. I don't think you have, Stu, have you?

RICHARDSON: We've heard from other, other people that
-- doing some restoration work with, with the Commission on
maybe -- and I think Goldstill might have been one of them
that asked us maybe if a contractor that might be willing to
go down there, but, but, no, not, not between the theaters.
Probably be a good idea though.

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, thank you. Your mic?

OSTROVSKY: I, I asked were there any other comments?
I hear none. Therefore, I would accept the motion.

STOLDAL: Well, Mr. Chair, then I'd like to make a
motion to approve 21-05, Fallon Community Theater,
Incorporated, the renovation of the Historic Fallon Theater
for the amount of $22 -- 233,120.

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second. Any
further comment from commissioners? Any public comment?

BERNEY: Can I say something as the public?

OSTROVSKY: You may.

BERNEY: I just -- in case we got cut off, we just
want to tell you thank you and thank you guys for all you do.
So thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Seeing no other comment, we have a motion
and a second. All those in favor of the motion of approving
21-05 in the amount of $233,120, please say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Motion carries with the
Chairman voting in favor. Thank you very much. Good luck,
and it's a very active theater. I hope it stays that way for many years.

BERNEY: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: The next applicant is Galena Creek Schoolhouse. This is the Washoe County Park Department. Is there someone from the department or from the schoolhouse who would like to make a presentation?

HITCHCOCK: If there is someone on the line, could you please raise your hand so I can identify you? Excellent.

Joanne? Go ahead, Joanne.

LOWDEN: Okay, perfect. Can you guys hear me?

OSTROVSKY: Yes, I can.

LOWDEN: Great. So good morning. I'm Joanne Lowden. I'm the Natural Resource Planner with Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Space. So our project today is the Galena Creek Schoolhouse. If you're not familiar with it, the schoolhouse is located in Washoe County. It's immediately adjacent to our Phillip and Annie Callahan Park. It's also near the Callahan Family Cemetery, which is known as Whispering Pines. So our schoolhouse building has a really interesting history. Excuse me. 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. So a little history on this. 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. So that kind of brings us to our project goals. We'd really like to stabilize and restore the schoolhouse basically 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 entertainment
programming similar to, to what we do with many of our other
sites like Bartley Ranch and Bowers Mansion, 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, and have another amenity available.
So that's what I have. We're pretty much starting from square
one with this restoration, and if you guys have any questions,
please let me know.

OSTROVSKY: Yes, thank you. This would be the
appropriate time for questions. Mr. Stoldal first.
STOLDAL: First of all, this doesn't sound like this is a shovel-ready project. Is that correct?

LOWDEN: That's correct. All right, we wanted to bring in a consultant to actually put together the construction plans.

STOLDAL: Gotcha.

LOWDEN: And --

STOLDAL: So I, I, I, I, I look at that. One of the concerns I have, and, and despite that fact, I enjoy reading them in the (Inaudible) report and the documents that are used as, as backup, the master plans and so forth, they're more than a decade old. They're back in 2011, and I'm sure things have changed between now and, and -- between then and, and, and now, so I have, I have -- I'm a little concerned about that, so I'm, I'm a little more excited about getting a fresh, a fresh report in funding, a, a, a, a fresh report. What some of it does say is you're going to take out all of that interior, all those modern things, and, and get rid of all the, the stove and, and, and it, it, 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? 'Cause 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?

LOWDEN: Yes, that's correct. And 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.

STOLDAL: All right. Mr. Chair, those are my
questions.

OSTROVSKY: All right. Any other members have
questions? There was a question regarding permitting fees.
Would the -- does the city have to pay -- excuse me -- the
county have to pay those permitting fees?

LOWDEN: Yes, we, we do, both to ourselves and also
typically to city of Reno or whoever has jurisdiction in that
area.

STOLDAL: But I don't think you need to pay the one
to state lands, I'm -- if I'm not mistaken.

LOWDEN: I believe we do, yes.

STOLDAL: Is that --

OSTROVSKY: Any comment? Rebecca?

PALMER: Yes. For the record, this is Rebecca
Palmer. I inquired, with State Lands who share the floor with
me here in the Bryan Building. They indicated to me that, no,
State Lands would not need to issue a permit and therefore,
the, the $5000 permit identified as Nevada Division of State
Lands would not be necessary in this case.

OSTROVSKY: Well, we'll take a $5000 savings where we
can get it. That would bring the grant request to $345,050.
STOLDAL: This is -- I'm -- I -- Stoldal for the record. I, I -- we, we need an updated plan and, and I, I'm ready to make a, a motion to approve Phase 1 for a $110,607 to, to really get an updated plan for construction and understanding what this building is like now. E -- even with that, though, it sounds like, according to the, the document, we wouldn't get that plan until, if I read it right, until early next year at the, at the earliest that we would get the results of that. So, I, I, I think the best thing to do would be to support a detail plan on, on how to move forward with this project e -- even though that plan won't be ready until, I think, June of next year, if I'm not -- if I read the, the process that the, the county has to go through in order to get -- put it out for bid, so to speak, and, and review all the applications, so I'm ready to make a motion if you're ready for, for that.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Go ahead and make your motion. I'll raise it.

LOWDEN: Could I make one quick comment? Would that be okay?

STOLDAL: Sure.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah, go ahead, please.

LOWDEN: Okay. Yeah. So I just wanted to make the comment that, you know, the building was assessed back in 2011, again, part -- as part of that master planning process,
and they did make some recommendations. And as part of that, you know, they really did. 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, you know, 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 such as Bowers Mansion, so I, I just want to make sure that, 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 'cause 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.

STOLDAL: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I'm reading from the narration supplied by the, the applicant and on page 1, it says, 'Phase 1 will focus on assessment and design work, structural retrofitting, and stabilization and initial demolition work to remove modern additions and abate any hazardous material or conditions encountered'. And for that, I used their numbers and I added that up and it came to $110,607. So my, my motion would be that we approve 21-06,
Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Space for the schoolhouse restoration for the sum of $110,607.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Is there a second to that motion? Well, I hear no second. Let me, let me ask staff, if we were to approve the $110,000 and change, would, would there be time in this grant cycle, if we set aside the remaining portion, for them to come back to the Commission for us to con -- if they had a better cost estimate based on the new study, would there be time for this Commission to act under this grant cycle?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. 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, 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, the applications. The Commission can either say that when the information available for, for clearly identifying the requests is a -- is -- 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, it is sufficient
for the needs of the, of the building and for this agreed
funding. This is very confusing. 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. Does that
make sense? I'm, I'm really struggling here. My apologies.

OSTROVSKY: Yes. Yeah. The alternative here is to,
is to authorize the full amount with, 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.

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, that's -- I really didn't
explain.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

STOLDAL: This is an important building, so there's
just no question about that. The challenge that I have is
the, the, the assessment and the documentation is, is 10 years
old. What the county is asking for is $110,000 now to get a
fresh plan. Let's, let's, let's get something that we can
really be an, an actionable item.

OSTROVSKY: Right.

STOLDAL: So, so I think we need to approve that.
My concern then is the lateness of when this applic --
when this -- if the county's able to go through their normal
process, fund the, the consultant report. The consultant has
time to, 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, 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, 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 CCHP for another $125,000 to do this. I
suggest we get this study done and Storey County figures out a
way to, to jack the speed up and, and get that work done as
quickly as, as possible and, and then come back with as much
time as still is available for, 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 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.

OSTROVSKY: Well, let me ask a question of staff.

Remaining, it will have a balance of funds at the completion of this meeting, I'm assuming. So this Commission will have to allocate that balance or return it to this treasurer's office at some future date, so what, what, what the Commissioner Stoldal is proposing is that they come back to us when the plan is done and tell us what they can actually achieve and the cost of that within the timeframe allocated. Is that something we can do?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Yes, that's one of the available alternatives is to, is to fund a portion of the, of the application at this point with the provision that the grantee would return to the Commission to seek the additional funding for whatever phase they, they felt was feasible in the remaining time.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

PALMER: My advice would be that the meeting be held sometime in -- following the, the close of the legislative session in 2023 for two reasons. The Commission will have to establish a new grant cycle if there is funding in the executive budget -- lege-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.

OSTROVSKY: I understand. Does, does that explanation bring any comfort to members of this Commission? Mr. Kavanaugh, your hand up?

KAVANAUGH: Yes. Thank you. Thank you for that explanation, Rebecca. I, I have a desire to go ahead and approve the grant amount for $345,000 or $4 -- 340,050 minus the $500 or the $5000 for the permitting For this reason. The grant application itself meets the requirements of the application process. I understand my fellow commissioner’s concern about not having the exact scope of work lined out in each phase. However, I believe that it is helpful to any organization to know that if they get an estimate of probable cost based on a phased-plan document, they know the scope of which they can get that work done in a given time. I think we have a very capable staff and I think they can oversee this project. That's, that's my comment regarding this application. I am, I respect -- with all due respect, I think it's smart to go ahead and just fund the master plan development, but I also think this gives them an opportunity to move forward with maybe Phase 2, Phase 3 of their project and I think our staff is fully capable of oversight without us having to come back and, and approving the phase -- next phase
or the, or the subsequent phase of this project.

STOLDAL: Chair, I, I -- Stoldal for the record. I don't, I don't, disagree a hundred percent with that and, and I, and I think I'm suggesting almost the same thing with the one exception is when I did the math, I, I'm left over with a considerable amount of change, and, and for me, this project - - I had put money aside for, for Phase 2 and Phase 3, so I've got two lists. One is -- will be what I call the first round that we're all sort of working on, and that's going to be left over with, with some money, and there may be some projects that, that the, the commissioners will likely give more or less money as, as we, as we go through. But in either case, it's likely we're going to wind up with a, with a considerable amount of change, and, and part of my concern is, is getting this report back from the consultants for the county. The way the -- the process outlined in detail in, in, in, in, in this report, which is many pages long, says that that's not like -- 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. They just won't have enough time to, to, to, to get that, assuming that they're going to have somebody ready to go out. 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, I, 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, and, 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, to, to fund it. It's an important project. I just -- I, I want to make sure that we, we don't -- that, you know, we've got several projects that are not getting done on time and, and these are all good people and, and, and Washoe County clearly knows what they're doing. And, and, and I'm not saying I wouldn't vote in favor of the whole thing, but I'd just like to get a, a, a planning document and see if they can speed that process up and get it done. June of next year? That's a year to get this whole -- to get a report back. It's a whole year that. That, that's a long time. Seems to me we could -- they could speed that process up if they want to come back and ask us for a quarter million dollars. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

OSTROVSKY: Mr. Kavanaugh, would you -- could you accept some kind of a motion that allotted the $110,000 and set aside of reserve of $234,000 for this project to be, to be made available on, on the completion of the study?

KAVANAUGH: I absolutely would. And I, I think we can lead that to our staff to send us a notice stating that they've met the, the project plan. They've done phase, you know, that first phase and, and they're ready to move forward. If we set, if we set that money, I know that we'll have
additional funds available based on the current applications we have on the, on doc or on deck. I think we can certainly consider perhaps a set-aside, so if we did the $110,000 right now as an approval and set aside the balance, I think, of, say, of $335,050 or whatever the difference is, that would motivate them to get this project done within the timeframe. And I, and I think it helps organizations when they're planning forward and they know that they have a funding set aside to get their projects done. They're in a better position to move those projects faster. If it's contingent upon us getting back together, I think we -- I think that could cause some delays and, and, and in my business, I'm a business owner, and we're doing some construction renovation right now. If there's a two-week delay, that could cost me $20,000. We don't want these projects to cost more. We want them to be able to get out there, get them done, get their plan reviews approved, get the construction, have them go out to bid as quickly as possible, and get the projects completed in align -- in, in, in compliance with what our office requires. So --

OSTROVSKY: So you --

KAVANAUGH: -- I'm of the mind that, I'm of the mind that we go ahead and, and keep that at the forefront of our minds as we go forward with these grant awards because we have had this problem in the last year with some of our applicants
not being able to complete their projects because of the impact of COVID and supply-chain issues.

OSTROVSKY: So I'm -- what I'm hearing, you would support a motion of $110,607 with a set-aside of $234,443 that -- subject to the approval of staff and the notification to this Commission.

KAVANAUGH: That's what I would -- that's, that's what I would support.

OSTROVSKY: Would you make that, would you make that in a form of a motion?

KAVANAUGH: So moved.

OSTROVSKY: Is there a second for that motion?

OLMSTEAD: Commission Olmstead. I second.

OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second.

Commissioners comments on that motion. Any public comment --

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I'm just -- I'm, I'm a little bit nervous about shifting this Commission's responsibility of a quarter million dollars to a maybe. This Commission is able to meet if, if the county said we've got the report back. We know what we're going to ask. This Commission can be set up within a week, so this Commission is not a delaying factor, and I'm a little bit nervous about -- hesitant about shifting our responsibility over to somebody else. That's what we're charged with is, is looking at -- if this was $5000 or $10,000, okay. But a quarter million dollars, I'm a little
bit nervous about, about that. That's my comment. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Well, let, let me ask the, the -- with the understanding you'd have a snap meeting or very quick meeting, would, would the maker of the motion agree to change her motion to preclude -- to include Commission approval?

KAVANAUGH: I will amend by motion to include the conven -- convening a Commission meeting to make approval for the rest of the funding on this particular grant.

OSTROVSKY: And does the seconder accept that change?

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I accept.

OSTROVSKY: And does the Attorney General's office believe that's -- that the motion would be appropriate now that both the maker and the seconder have approved that change?

WALSH: Yeah, sure. I agree with that.

OSTROVSKY: All right. Any further discussion? Any comments from the public? Everyone's good? All right. All those in favor of the motion to approve 21-06 in the amount of $110,607 with a set-aside of an additional -- if I find my numbers again here. Had them a second ago. We did set-aside of $234,443 subject to Commission -- to future Commission approval. All those in favor, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The motion carries with the affirmative vote of the Chair. Thank you very much. And that
discussion is important because it may come back. I mean, we, we may face this again. Thank you very much. That was 06. I'm looking for 07. Hang on. 07 is a Tonopah Mining Park in the amount of $348,773. Is the applicant available?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. One moment.

CARPENTER: Hi. Can you all hear me? It's Ann Carpenter.

OSTROVSKY: Yes, Ann, I hear you clearly.

CARPENTER: All right. Thank you very much. Very much appreciate this opportunity to come before you. I also have Joe Westerlund with the town, Jeff, Jeff Martin who's -- heads up the park and, I believe, Nathan Robeson (phonetic) is also on. He's the engineer who's been helping us for probably a good decade out at the park. So if, if they raise their hand to want to offer additional information, that'd be great. Thank you for the opportunity to present in front of you.

We've been making great advancements. I am the Chair of the Tonopah Historic Mining Park Foundation. The Foundation is -- works in partnership with the, with the town. We raise 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 this -- our efforts up at the park, and we have been laser focused lately on the head frame restoration. So we've been able to
advance a number of great projects with SHPO’s help for which we are greatly appreciative. It is an outdoor -- the, the park is an outdoor museum open to the public. The Foundation, again, working closely with the town of Pono -- 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 -- a grant award will -- this grant award will open -- 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. These are the -- these all create long-term access to and by the public. Historic significance of the Silver Top Grizzly, one of the only complete historic mine complexes in the State of Nevada. It has a head frame which SHPO helped us with restoring that, which was a major feature because it was
beginning to fall over. It -- again, so it has a head frame, a hoist house, an ore house, which is called a grizzly and the Tonopah Goldfield Railroad Bed that goes underneath.

Currently, it's lim -- there's limited access due to animal infestation and some additional stabilization work that needs to be completed. Can only be cleaned -- the town lacks personnel and funds to, to clean and restore consistently, so the Grizzly must remain closed to the public until we complete the restoration and the, the, the work that we are proposing.

The Silver Top Complex, exor -- again, the significance.

It's, it's one of the only complete historic mine complexes in the State of Nevada. Head frame, hoist house, ore house, grizzly, and the Tonopah Goldfield Road Bed. So we are rehabil -- we want to rehabilitate -- well, we rehabilitated and save from collapse the head frame a couple of years back and then we, we additionally built trestles last year that we were able to complete so that we could re-illustrate to the public what that mind complex looked like. 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, inst -- 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. The Town of Tonopah has
initiated some of the stabilization work while we focused our attention on -- in the years past focused our attention on the Silver Top. It is part of the original claims on the, on the historic Tonopah -- historic mining park property. It was used as a rescue shaft during the Belmont fire of 1911.

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. Full completion of the -- final completion of the full Desert Queen area will allow public access and from that, a better learning experience from the, the historic mine projects. I want to emphasize that we have an incredible team that keeps coming back to do this work, and that includes Nathan Robison and Robison Engineering and Simerson Construction. When we were awarded the, the last grant for the rebuilding of the trestles and the stabilization of the existing tre -- trestles, we had to -- Simonson came to me and said, Now that we have the money, the price of, of lumber has gone through the roof, and he went out under his own initiative and, and, and developed his own sawmill so that he could keep the price of lumber down and bring it back into check so that we could complete what we had started. The, you know, the grant process was at least a year delay and the, and the price of lumber had gone through the roof. So I want to emphasize that this team, between Nathan Robison and the Simson Group, they really act very
nimbly and create great fixes for the park to, to last a long
time. I thank you for your consideration, and I'm, I'm open
to questions.

OSTROVSKY: Two, two things from the Chair and one,
again, it lacks an audit. Could you tell us about your money?
How you handle your books?

CARPENTER: Absolutely. We are a board structured of
nine of us now. Unfortunately, we lost one of our members.
he passed away recently and he was a, a wonderful supporter of
the park and, and regional history, and we are structured
through an executive committee. So we have nine members.
There is a Chair. I'm the Chair, a Vice Chair, a Treasurer,
and a Secretary. We meet quarterly and we review our
financials through our Executive Assistant and Treasurer. We
utilize Dan MacArthur (phonetic). We've been using him for
decades as the town has. That's the town's a -- accountant
and is our accountant and most importantly, 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, 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.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Last question that I had,
what, what was the year that the park originally opened? Do
you recall?
CARPENTER: You know, I'm going to punt that one over to, to Jeff, if -- Jeff and Joe. I'm, I'm not sure. I've been serving on the board with pleasure for at least 12 years and I, I'm going to say it's been open for 20 years, but if, if Jeff or Joe have raised their hand, it would, it would be coming from the town of Tonopah office.

OSTROVSKY: Well, it's really a personal --

MARTIN: Yeah, we're on. My name is Jeff Martin and I'm the Park Host of Tonopah Historic Mining Park. The park was started in '92 as a, as a gift from Echo Bay, the mining company out of Canada. It was several years in the making, probably a good 10 years and officially opened in 2000 and started with just weekend tours, went to five days a week, and now we are seven days a week, only closed on state and federal holidays, and we provide self-guided and guided walking tours.

OSTROVSKY: I appreciate the --

MARTIN: I believe the --

OSTROVSKY: It was a kind of --

MARTIN: Yeah.

OSTROVSKY: -- self-interest question. I, I, I was there the day the park opened. I just couldn't remember when it was. Quite a big -- a long time ago. Twenty-two years.

MARTIN: Yes, it was. Yup.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Go ahead. Commissioners,
questions please. I don't see any. Would someone like to
make a motion?

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'll make
a motion for the Tonopah Historic Mining Park Foundation to
award the $263,380 as requested.

OSTROVSKY: No, I, I think --

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry. I wasn't plugged
in. I did have a couple of questions.

OSTROVSKY: Oh, I'm sorry. Go -- we'll come back --

STOLDAL: No --

OSTROVSKY: -- to your motion. I'm sorry.

STOLDAL: No, no, it was, it was -- I was, I was not
plugged in. I, I, I think that they’ve satisfactorily -- my
biggest question was on the audit. I think they
satisfactorily answered that question. On all these projects,
I look at roof, walls, and foundation as sort of the
stabilization and to begin with. On the Silver Top project,
there's, there's a question in there, if I understand
correctly, that you plan to open it with a, with a spread mat
while the proposal from the Desert Queen, you're talking about
a, a piers that, that are going to be the, the stabilization
point. What are the safety issues between having a spread
stabilization and, and, and sort of a piers, if I'm, if I'm
asking that engineering correctly?

CARPENTER: if, if Nathan's on the call, let him -- he
can raise his hand. I, I thought I saw him a little bit earlier. I'll take a whack at it. 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, so it's, it's easier to -- I think that's where the piers may come in, and whereas the, the, the grizzly of the Silver Top is, is, is up on very high stilts, if you will, big thick timber that probably came out of the Sierras and that, that allowed the trains to come under (Inaudible). But if Nathan's on the phone, he might be able to provide a bit more detail.

STOLDAL: And kind of my question is really, is, is this a safety issue? One, one is safer than the other, and are we funding the safest or is it -- it's just a geology issue?

CARPENTER: I think it's an engineering issue and it's -- they're both safe. One has to do with the structure of one sort of building and its dynamics, and the other is very particular to that building, but it is -- all the engineering that we've done with -- is with safety first in mind.

STOLDAL: Great. Okay. Chair, I have -- that was, that was my question other than the traditional question. If you have to choose between the Silver Top and the, and the other one, which would you do?

CARPENTER: If, if -- I think I'm, I'm still on.
Yeah, thanks. We would s -- I'm -- would lean towards finishing the Silver Top and focusing on that if we had to choose between the two and then delay the work on the Desert Queen.

STOLDAL: Okay. I'm not suggesting you have to do that, but that's just a, a (Inaudible). Mr. Chair, thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Commissioner Kavanaugh, would you like to make your motion again? And the proper amount is $348,773.

KAVANAUGH: I'm sorry. I -- my, my audio went out for a second.

OSTROVSKY: That's okay. I'm saying I'm prepared for your motion. You're still on mute. There you are.

KAVANAUGH: Okay. So we are on, on 20 -- 21-07, Tonopah Historic Mining Foundation, Desert Queen head frame, grizzly, and Silver Top rehabilitation for the amount of $263,380.

OSTROVSKY: I have $348 (Inaudible).

KAVANAUGH: $348?

OSTROVSKY: I show $348,773.50. Is that?

CARPENTER: That's correct.

UNIDENTIFIED: That is correct.

KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible). I’m sorry. I have the wrong amount on my, on my --

OSTROVSKY: That's okay.
KAVANAUGH: -- document.

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Commissioner Kavanaugh, that was staff's mistake. We put the incorrect amount on staff notes. The correct amount is on the table identified as Appendix 7.

KAVANAUGH: Okay. I have it here. So I'm recommending that we approve the Tonopah Historic Mining Park, Desert Queen frame, grizzly rehabilitation and Silver Top Complex grizzly rehabilitation in the amount of $348,773.50.

OSTROVSKY: Is there a second to that motion?

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

OSTROVSKY: Olmstead second. Any commissioners have any further comments? Any member of the public have any comments? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The motion carries with the Chair's affirmative vote. It's unanimous. Thank you very much of those in attendance. Thank you very much.

CARPENTER: Thank you so much.

OSTROVSKY: I will make it a point to get out there again 22 years later to have a look. I, I -- just for everyone's information, if we could get through the first 10 applications and then take a lunch break, that would give us 10 more, about approximately 10 more to do after lunch. So
we're looking at 08, which is the Reno First Methodist Church. They have a request of amount of $54,267. Is there someone from the group?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I'll bring on Ron Applegate.
OSTROVSKY: Okay.
HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, Ron. You'll have to unmute.
APPLEGATE: Okay. Thank you. I'm Ron Applegate here with Reno First United Methodist Church and along with me here is Jim Gerbel (phonetic) and John Helmrick (phonetic) and Jennifer Smith, who does work with us. So anyway, first of all, what I wanted say is I want to thank the Commission and the staff, you know, the staff with Rebecca, Carla, and Kristen for all the support they've given us, that you folks have given us over the last couple cycles and fortunately or in good nature is the fact is that we got the roof on before that big deluge of rain. We got come in. Got that just in time as we was trying to protect the building and so that brings us to the other point, how do we continue to protect the building -- building more and that is with the rain gutter systems that, you know, we have here. They're pretty well rotten out. They're corroded out and they need to be rebuilt, saved where we can, and rebuild what we can't and so with the scuffers and the downspouts and the gutters and that, so that's one phase of it there. And then the other, the other phase that we're looking at is the -- on the electrical
switch. Over the years, you know, actually here in a couple years, it'll be a hundred years since this church was built, this building and the way to turn the lights on in the sanctuary was -- has always been to open up the breaker box and start flipping breakers and that's not very safe. That's something we can't be doing. So we've approached some contractors about bringing out control switches outside the breaker box so people aren't opening up that breaker box, you know, in an unsafe deal there to get that done. And then the final one is these doors we have here, the, the trifold doors between the parlor and the sanctuary pretty well wearing out. The tracks are wearing out and need to be rebuilt, and so that's, that's what we're asking for help on that. You know, you've been talking about audits, you know. Our last audit was done in 2019. It had been prepared to start, but then COVID hit us and that shut us down for a while. And about two months ago, we started with another audit, so that is coming up on the, on the line here pretty quick. You know, I'm, I'm going to be right up front. Everybody has never said much about this, but, you know, we, we're asking for $54,267 to cover a total project number of $62,105. These numbers we got, you know, we're trying to hold true with our contractors. They're pretty iffy right now and I'm thinking that, you know, the prices have probably went up for materials probably 15% up to 20%. And so, that's what we're doing. We're just going on
faith that we can make this happen. So, I don't know what
else to do, but say -- ask you for your comments, your
questions, and see what we can do. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Any questions of the members of the
Commission?

STOLDAL: Well, I think -- Stoldal for the record --
I think that the applicant is, is correct for every one of
these applications. The price fluctuation, the ability, for
example, in Goldfield weather, to get a contractor, all kinds
of issues, but I don't think we should start adding 10 or 15%
to, to, to these, these grants. We need solid figures. If
there's a real problem, I do understand the applicant’s issue
‘cause we all face that when we drive down the street, so I --
it just -- I, I just want to say we appreciate it, I think,
the, the, the, the challenge, but I think we need to stick
with at least using that phrase that costs have gone up to
change it. I, I don't think we should do that at, at this
point, but I, I, I would be happy just to, to make a motion
to, to approve a 21-08 Reno First United Methodist Church
restoration, repair of gutters, electric panels, inside
trifold, sanctuary doors for $54,262 if I have the math right.
Or is it $61?

APPLEGATE: $67.

OSTROVSKY: $67.

STOLDAL: Well, I think there's a $6 mistake in
there from staff and so I think the figure is $54,261.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

KAVANAUGH: I’ll second.

OSTROVSKY: If you --

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY: I'm sorry. Is there a second?

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'll second the motion.

OSTROVSKY: Any further (Inaudible) --

KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible) Mr. Stoldal.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. And any further comments from the commissioners? Any comments from the public?

APPLEGATE: just to -- we are shovel ready to, to begin. We've talked to contractors. We've -- they're all ready to roll. Probably, you know, by the time we get the paperwork and all the grant work done, we're talking 45 d -- days, at least probably and they're ready to roll.

STOLDAL: Well, I'd call them right now and lock the price in.

APPLEGATE: You know what? We've been, we've been hounding them, believe me. I, I work with developers building homes and we're a -- we know what that situation's like.

Thank you very much though for your support throughout the years.

OSTROVSKY: You've all heard the motion. All those in
favor of approving grant number 21-08, please say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Chair votes in favor. It’s unanimous of those present. Thank you very much. Good luck.

APPLEGATE: Thank that.

OSTROVSKY: That takes us to 21-09, which is Art Center in Carson City. Is someone from Brewery Arts with us today?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, I'll be bringing Mike on. One moment. Mikey, you're on.

WIENCEK: Good morning. This is Mikey Wiencek with the Brewery Arts Center. Can you all hear me?

OSTROVSKY: I certainly can. Go ahead.

WIENCEK: Awesome. Well, good morning, commissioners and staff. And I just want to start off by thanking you for the last round of grant funding we received. As I was putting together the final reporting and going through all the different things that we've done over the past year, it has made a huge impact on our campus, our staff, and our visitors. So thank you for everything that you do and for helping us do what we do. So we're talking about the Carson Brewing Company today, the Brewery Art Center. We are the original home of Carson Brewing Company. The building was built 1860 and it was Nevada's oldest business, not Nevada's oldest profession, that's different, but later, we were the
home of the Nevada Appeal until the early seventies and we're three blocks, blocks west of the capitol dome, so we're right here in the historic district and this is our last major project needed on the campus. We've been operating as an art center here for 47 years and we do hundreds of events a year. We're about ready to start our big concert series. We're the home of multiple nonprofits that call the BAC home. We've got theater, ballet. We had the symphony here Sunday nights. They got winded out of the Capitol. I'm looking out our window right now and there's people showing up for Rotary and we've got a Division of Mining meeting going on. School of Rock is performing across the street and we just had the Snoopy and the Red Baron exhibit here for three months and we've got a local artist exhibit in that space right now. And we're hoping that we're going to have an exhibit from the Rock and Roll Hall of Fame coming up very soon. So the request that we have before you today is to finish the restoration of the brick on our building. About 12, 12 or 13 years ago, Abstract Masonry did the Division Street side, the east side, of the building, and completely restored that brick, but there was no funding available to do the rest and now we want to restore the rest as the brick is in pretty bad shape.

Available for questions.

OSTROVSKY: Well, I just want to point out as we go along that staff has a number of questions relative to the
details of the restoration work, which I'm sure you're used to
working with staff in the past --

WIENCEK: Indeed.

OSTROVSKY: -- (Inaudible) examples and types of
materials and making sure that it all meets the standard.

Just, just to let you know, there are, there are numerous
questions, all of which I think you can work out with staff.

You've always been able to do that in the past, but I will
open it up for commissioner's questions at this time. Mr.

STOLDAL: Couple of questions. First, the double
asterisk note from the contractor, help me understand that.

This proposal is for $537,431 of which $200,000, nearly half,
is for wastewater disposal and you're going to absorb that?

WIENCEK: No, sir. What it is, is 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 --

STOLDAL: Right.

WIENCEK: -- 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.

STOLDAL: And could you clear up a second question that comes from the contract proposal? It, it says that the, the quote includes “repoint 100% of all mortar joints”, but then point 14 says, This proposal specifically includes reappointing.

WIENCEK: Um --

OSTROVSKY: I mean, excludes reappointing is, I think, is what it says.

STOLDAL: Yeah.

WIENCEK: Yeah. Excludes masonry repair. I think they're talking about --

STOLDAL: And appointing.

WIENCEK: Yeah. I th -- I don't know if that's -- I, 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.

STOLDAL: Well, I think you need to clear that, that point up because both of them use the word reappointing and, and there's probably some logical explanation on, on, on that and then just really kind of a minor question. Once these bricks are all done and they're beautiful and, and so forth, is there -- do you have a -- does the board or, or the foundation have a policy of what you can put up on those
wells? Glue signs on? Paint things on? I presume we're

going to leave these walls once they're all fixed, the bricks
are all as pristine as possible without hanging stuff on them
or paint or (Inaudible).

WIENCEK: Oh, indeed. Indeed. We have zero plans
to ever do anything to the brick or mount anything to it.
There's -- yeah. It's -- there's no signage mounted to the
brick. The only thing that's mounted to the brick are
handrails, and then there's some existing hooks from previous
years and seismic things that have been attached and light
fixtures.

STOLDAL: Okay. And my last question then is, is,
as I've asked a couple of other applicants, if this has to be
financially phased in, which set of walls do you recommend?
West and south or west and north walls?

WIENCEK: I would say the west and the north walls
are the most important. The, the south wall is the smallest
section and it seems to be fairly well intact. It only seems
to have just a couple of (Inaudible) on it, and it doesn't
seem -- it doesn't appear to have the same erosion damage that
the other two sides have suffered.

STOLDAL: So you would say the west and north?

WIENCEK: Yes, sir. And the plan for this is, we're
aiming for next spring, but the contractor wouldn't get into
any kind of dates until we had funding secured and then they
would schedule us. But the understanding is, is that we were aiming for spring of 2023.

STOLDAL: And how long would it take to get done?

WIENCEK: They are -- they weren't able to provide me with that information exactly.

STOLDAL: I mean, within a year though?

WIENCEK: Oh, yes, sir. Definitely.

STOLDAL: Okay. All right.

WIENCEK: Yeah. Once, 'cause they're coming from Utah, they would be set up, put up scaffold, do it, and it -- I think it took a little over a month that -- when they did the other side of the building.

STOLDAL: Okay. Again, you're thinking west wall and north wall, and, and if it's between the west and north, which one?

WIENCEK: Personally, the ugliest side to me is the west wall, but the north wall, it has a lot of windows on it and I'm, I'm concerned about the structure of the brick.

STOLDAL: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

WIENCEK: Thank you, sir.

OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioners have questions? Would any commissioner care to make a motion?

STOLDAL: Chair, I'll make the -- make a motion for the 21-09 Brewery Art Center, the Brewery Building brick restoration. I move that we fund the, the, the total amount
of $302,452.

OSTROVSKY: Is there a second?

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'll second.

OSTROVSKY: I have a motion and a second. Are there any other comments or questions from commissioners? Any questions or comments --

KAVANAUGH: I just --

OSTROVSKY: I'm sorry, go ahead.

KAVANAUGH: I just wanted to say -- this is Commissioner Kavanaugh for the record. I just want to say thank you for working to get mitigation of the, of the lead water during the renovation. I think that's really important for our environment. So thank you for finding resources to do that for this project.

OSTROVSKY: Any other comment? Any comments from the public? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Motion carries unanimous of those in attendance with the Chair's affirmative vote. Thank you very much.

WIENCEK: Thank you, all.

OSTROVSKY: We're going to take one more and then take a lunch break. We'll do number 10, which is the White Pine County Community Choir Association. Is there someone
available from the association?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I have Mary Eldridge. I'll bring her on.

OSTROVSKY: All right.

ELDRIDGE: This is Mary Eldridge. Can you hear me?

OSTROVSKY: Oh, yes, we can, Mary. Very clearly.

Thank you.

ELDRIDGE: Thank you. I am the Grants Director for the White Pine Community Choir Association, and we have applied for funding to re-- continue the restoration of the Centennial Fine Arts Center. The building was constructed as a first stake tabernacle for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints in White Pine County. The building erected in 1927 was designed by Brigham Young's grandson, Joseph Van Carlos Young and is an integral part of Ely's downtown landscape. The center is a beautiful example of colonial revival architecture with unique features, including outstanding acoustics in the sanctuary, a performance stage in the activity hall and a Yankee gutter drainage system. Over the years, the center has housed community choir concerts, recitals, art shows, quilt shows, and visiting musicians. The choir has undertaken the restoration to continue and build on those opportunities for events. There are no venues of our -- of this size in our area. Current facilities in Ely are suitable for large events at the convention center or school.
gymnasiums or small events in individual conference rooms. The restoration of the building creates a venue for groups currently having no other options. The choir has community support in planning and completing the projects. Dozens of residents participated in a charette identifying over 200 potential users for the building. The choir board meets monthly and has captured the participation of people interested in preserving this historic site. Funding has also come from the Great Basin Heritage Area, the White Pine Tourism and Recreation Board, local businesses, community residents, and private foundations. The Environmental Protection Agency’s Brownfields program has funded a concurrent project of abating the asbestos shingles and replacing the roof. 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. We hope you'll find this project worthy of funding. I want to close by emphasizing the commitment of many people involved in
restoring the center and our desire to preserve and protect this community to landmark for generations to come. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: I'm sorry. Thank you very much for presentation. Let me, let me start with the first question. I'll turn it over to commissioners. We -- we're a little unclear about how you arrived at the $83,200 and whether or not you have the firm bids and so on. We didn't quite see enough detail. Could you explain to us how you arrived at that number?

ELDRIDGE: We do not have firm bids, but we did talk with the, the structural engineer who was recommended to us that has found -- experience in restoring foundations, and these are the figures that he gave us, the steps in the process and the, the figures that he gave us for the work to be completed.

OSTROVSKY: So they came from an engineer that you worked with before or is someone recommended?

ELDRIDGE: Someone recommended. They were recommended by an architect that we have worked with previously.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank you. Other commissioners, time is appropriate for questions. Mr. Stoldal?

STOLDAL: Rebecca, are you still on the line? I'm sure you are somewhere. I thought my notes here a little
scribbly, but at the beginning of this meeting, you mentioned a building in Ely that was closed?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. The -- no, I was referring to a building in Virginia City.

STOLDAL: Okay. All right. Great. Thank you. So Chairman, my challenge is that there are almost a dozen things missing from this application, and, and there's no firm bid. There's -- the dollar figures are, are, are really a guesstimate. I -- while on the face of it, I think this is, is, is clearly based on working, I think, in past years, this, this building has all the elements of, of -- 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 a, an examination of, of the, the, the foundation, the structure that's on, so we're not just going around and, and patching stuff, stuff up? I -- my, my notes here, and I don't have a specific plan, my notes are to, to delay funding on this and put some reserve money in so this applicant could come back with, with more details and, and again, 11 pieces, critical pieces, are missing from this application, and I, I don't quite understand that, but I think that the project, based on, on previous grant application, has value to both the state and, and, and the community, but I'm not ready to, to, to give money just based on this
OSTROVSKY: Other commissioners have comments?

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I, I echo the same concerns of my colleague, Mr. Stoldal. We have a number of required missing components for the application to receive approval and so in order to meet our requirements of being accountable for state funds, we -- I think we need to have those, those in -- those pieces of -- those elements -- those pieces of the grant application in the application, so that it is -- it meets the threshold of accountability that we have to uphold.

STOLDAL: Chair, I --

KAVANAUGH: I would recommend --

STOLDAL: I'm sorry, go ahead.

KAVANAUGH: That being said, I would recommend that the staff work with the White Pine Community Choir Association to make this grant whole, but only to the extent that they get a list of the things that are required for this application. I would be amenable to setting aside, as suggested by my colleague, Mr. Stoldal, to set aside some funds for them if, if they are compliant -- become compliant with all grant application requirements.

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, a question for the Attorney General's office.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah, go ahead, Bob.
STOLDAL: Anthony, the question -- what I'd like 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 Chair -- this board may meet again? Within 90 days? Before the end of the year?

OSTROVSKY: Well, c -- certainly before the end of the year. I think there are things we need to do. I think you're looking at probably a meeting no later than, than September 1st.

STOLDAL: So that, that's what I'd like include in, in, in the, in the motion, that we hold these funds -- we delay a vote on this matter on until the, the, the next board meeting, no later than September of this year.

WALSH: Thank you, Chair, Vice Chair. I am comfortable with that motion. I don't see any prohibitions on essentially continuing a vote and that doesn't bother me slightly at all.

STOLDAL: Commissioner Kavanaugh, is that kind of what you were saying as well?

KAVANAUGH: Yes.

STOLDAL: Okay. Well, that would be my motion.

WALSH: Fantastic. And to the extent that that is agendized properly, and I think maybe we could note on the record next meeting that it had been continued from the
previous meeting, and that would be the action item that I feel is appropriate.

STOLDAL: Right. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

KAVANAUGH: Second it. This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. And that -- then -- my -- we have a motion and a second. My first comment is, is staff, this is a question for staff. Are you comfortable 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. Whatever items they need, they need to get those into us so we can then take action? Is that something you can do and are willing to do, Rebecca?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. My apologies. The video doesn't seem to want to come on, but, yes, we, we would certainly be willing to work with the applicant to assist them to review the available checklist and ensure that they have a, a quote that's, you know, that that's reliable that the Commission can then review at a subsequent meeting.

STOLDAL: And, and, Rebecca, I would also, if you -- I, I need to understand that, that we're not piecemealing this, and I don't know whether a complete structural
foundation of seismic and if somewhere in the, in the process of working with them, if, if that question can be asked or we can find a way to get that answer. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Well, we have a motion and a second. Any further commissioner comments? Any comments from the public?

ELDRIDGE: This is Mary Eldridge. I, I just wanted -- we, we are more than willing to do whatever requirements are necessary to answer your questions and I, I will say that we are basing this repair off of a 2018 building assessment that identified only the southwest corner where the subsidence had been -- was of a concern.

STOLDAL: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Well, it gives you an opportunity to, to get the rest of it together, and we assure you, we will give it your due consideration at our next meeting. We have a, a motion and a second before us. All those in favor, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair voting in favor, unanimous of the commissioners that are present. Thank you very much. I intend now to take a 30-minute break. It is a quarter after 12:00. If we could get back together at a quarter to 1:00, exactly 30 minutes from now. We've got about 10 more to do, take a couple more hours of work. I appreciate all your time and effort this morning, and we'll try to move
it along.

WALSH: And Chair Ostrovsky, before we do adjourn for lunch, I would like to notice --- have this notice on the record. Ms. Carpenter's statement in the chat, sometimes the chat function does not show up on the record, so, I think it'd be appropriate if one of the commissioners or staff members read Ms. Carpenter's statement into the record. I do feel that that is a kind of a substantive comment, so, if that could just be read off of the chat function, I think that would be completing -- complete for the record.

OSTROVSKY: Rebecca, could you read that into the record, please?

PALMER: I certainly can. From Ann Carpenter, Ann Carpenter here for the Tonopah Historic Mining Park -- 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 that -- this, as I forgot to mention this detail in my presentation, thank you again.

OSTROVSKY: All right, fine. Read into the record. Appreciate that. That was from the chat. And, so now I think it's appropriate to take our break. Thirty minutes. See you back here, quarter to 1:00. Thank you very much.

STOLDAL: And we're going to stop recording? Audio?
KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

WALSH: Yeah, that would be fine in recess.

OSTROVSKY: I can pause it?

(Break)

OSTROVSKY: I'm waiting for Commissioner Olmstead. I don't see her back yet.

STOLDAL: Chair, I'm wondering if maybe staff could, at the end, before we end the meeting or at some point give us a total. I'm, I'm keeping a running total, but then my math is not always the best, but --


STOLDAL: Okay.

OSTROVSKY: We'll have to --

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. I do have a spreadsheet that I'm filling out as we go.

STOLDAL: Okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Me, too.

STOLDAL: Where are you right now by the way? Just so I can double check.

OSTROVSKY: Who's that?

STOLDAL: What's your total right now that we've allocated?

OSTROVSKY: I don't, I don't have a total. I'm just trying keep track of what we didn't spend (Inaudible) what we did.
HITCHCOCK: I can give you a total here in a second and just so you know, we just moved Patricia over, so she's here.

OSTROVSKY: Oh, okay.

OLMSTEAD: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: All right.

HITCHCOCK: And --

OSTROVSKY: This is Chairman of the Commission. I'd like to call the meeting back to order after our lunch break. Glad to see everyone back. I think we maintained the same quorum that we had before.

STOLDAL: Chairman, have we started the recording?

OSTROVSKY: We have.

STOLDAL: Okay.

OSTROVSKY: The meeting is currently being recorded. Just prior to coming onto the break, 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.

WALSH: And, Chair Ostrovsky, if I may interrupt for just a brief moment. While we were on break, it does look like we received a question in the chat as well that may need to be read in the record. This is Candace W.
OSTROVSKY: Okay.

PALMER: Okay. This is Rebecca Palmer, sir. If you'd like me to read that, I would be happy to do that.

OSTROVSKY: Do that, please. Thank you.

PALMER: Oops. Hold on a second. Go back, close that. Okay. It says, I'm not sure about procedure here. Perhaps I should wait until the ending public comment section. 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? Thanks, Candace W.

OSTROVSKY: Staff want to respond to that question at all?

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

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

PALMER: 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.

STOLDAL: 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, 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?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
Our -- my understanding and perhaps Attorney -- Deputy
Attorney General Walsh will, will assist, the covenants are
written on the parcel in question, the land and the property
on top. We have not exe -- the Commission has not executed
covenants on the property, the building alone, in the past.

STOLDAL: Okay. I don't know if that's ever a
situation where somebody just owns the building and somebody
else owns the land.

OSTROVSKY: Well, just to keep things moving, I would
ask staff if there are concerns about that and if you could
make a formal request. I, I think it's very hard for the
Attorney General's office to make an off-the-cuff opinion on a
subject as detailed as that unless they can do that.

WALSH: Well, realistically, Chair, ideally, the
covenants would apply to both, you know, the building and the
land. Sometimes, there is not privity of ownership between a
party that could own, own land and a building. I think we
have seen that before where, I guess, a locality owned the
land and a different individual owned a building, and that
needed to get sorted out. Essentially, the landowner would've
had to acquiesce to those, to those covenants as well, which
sometimes municipalities, if they're the parties, don't
usually want to do that or are prohibited by statute from
doing that. 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.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Well that, that'll have to suffice
for the moment, I think, Bob, if we're going to -- if there
are other issues, we'll let staff work it out with the
Attorney General's office to see (Inaudible) covenants
properly in place.

WALSH: Sure.

STOLDAL: And just for clarification, ownership is,
is -- doesn't mean own. It could also mean lease as in a long-term lease that covers the point of the covenant, I think, the Chair pointed out, so (Inaudible).

WALSH: Correct. A pro -- protected property interest, yes.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. All right. I would like to move on. I’d like to move on to -- get my proper pages here. The next applicant is 0 -- is 21-11, St. Mary's Art Center, requesting looks like a hundred thousand dollars is the request. Is there someone from St Mary's Art Center available?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I'll bring on Arika Perry.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, Arika.

PERRY: Thank you. Can everyone hear me?

OSTROVSKY: Yes, we hear you fine.

PERRY: Great. Thank you, commissioners. On behalf of our board, staff, and visitors, we just want to thank you for the previous grant award. That project has made a tremendous difference in preserving the integrity of the property as well as its functionality and ability to generate revenue. St. Mary's Art Center is located in former 1876 St. Marie Louise's Hospital located in Virginia City, and it was originally operated by the Daughters of Charity and then later as Storey County Hospital until 1942. This property is a
cornerstone of Virginia City's deep history and pioneering mining and inventions as well as art and culture, and our building is -- was one of the first to include indoor plumbing and gas lighting in its interiors and it was well known for offering exceptional medical care and the best chances for recovery. Today, it remains an important hub for the community, now specifically focused on art, culture, history, and serving the community in tourism. We are proudly the longest operating nonprofit in Storey County and have been of service since 1964. Our programming includes six art galleries, three art creation spaces as well as a theater, library, 16 guestrooms, kitchens, and other supportive spaces. We host art and historical exhibitions and tours, receptions, professional artist retreats where the artists will come in for a week at a time often and learn and create together. We also host community adult and children's art classes and workshops and are a venue for special events that showcase art, music, and holidays such as the Holiday Fair Easter Egg Hunt on the lawn, as well as business meetings, weddings, and other private retreats. So the work that was previously -- 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 and -- 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, infiltrate our interior, and it's making it very difficult for our guests to open the windows, which is 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. So with that, I would just say that our property really is a con -- a critical
contributor to the community and it's a hub for creativity and its history as an 1876 property and providing exposure of regional professional artist works and creative spaces to the community and tourists. And with that, I will open it up for questions that you may have of me.

OSTROVSKY: This is the Chair. Question, you mentioned other windows. Do you have an estimate on the cost of a -- of per-window basis or average cost of a window repair?

PERRY: No, we could, 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 that above -- 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, 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.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank you.

PERRY: Mm-hmm. Other commissioners, please.
STOLDAL: Chair, I had -- I went along the same lines and so I did some rough math and, and so I'm going to be making a motion to increase the funding to $127,597 based on this, 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 repaired or less damaged for the other six and the contingency cost, so I've, I've -- the, the really damaged one $5400, the increase in prices and, 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. That was the math that I arrived at, however ludicrous that was.

OSTROVSKY: Is that the form of a motion?

STOLDAL: Well, I, I would be happy to make a motion for 21-11 St. Mary's Art Center, east facade window restoration and other restorations in the application for a total amount of $127,597.

OSTROVSKY: Is there a second?

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Now
would be appropriate time if other commissioners have comments or questions. I don't see any. Is there any public comment? Seeing or hearing none, we have a motion before us. All those in favor, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair votes in favor.

Unanimous of the commissioners present. Thank you very much, and hopefully, that will help with those other windows. It's a beautiful building and needs consistent long-term investment.

PERRY: Thank you so much.

OSTROVSKY: Mm-hmm. The next application is 21-12, City of Boulder City, the water filtration plant. Someone from the city available?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, I have Mr. Michael Mays. One moment. Go ahead, Michael. You can unmute yourself.

MAYS: Good afternoon, everybody. Can you hear me?

OSTROVSKY: I hear you fine. Thank you. Go ahead.

MAYS: All right. Good afternoon, commissioners. Michael Mays, Boulder City Community Development Director for the record. 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 name, Boulder
City, the new government-owned town would require utilities, streets, and a water treatment plant. The completed water filtration plant in 1932 brought treated Colorado River water to the new Boulder City homes. The filtration plant continued to serve the city until its decommission in the early 1980s. Unfortunately, the 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 pointing to allow the building to be more accessible to the public. A detailed cost estimate of the LGA re-recommended improvements is provided on page 267 of your application. (Inaudible) in their report, 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.

Commission consideration of contributing to this project augments the city council's prior financial commitments to preserving this important part of Nevada's history and the city appreciates the Commission's consideration.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Michael. Questions of the commissioners, please.

STOLDAL: Yeah. Quick -- Stoldal for the record. Mr. Mays, the -- you mentioned a page number, 200 and something. Was, was that in the LGA report?

MAYS: It was, yes, 267 of the packet. It was at the very end of their structural assessment report, which included the cost estimates for the proposal.

STOLDAL: So that would -- that was Section 2 of structural report and at the end of that?

MAYS: Correct.

STOLDAL: Okay. Yeah, each report is, is numbered
separately, not as the -- so -- all right, so my -- the, the, the -- put that off for, for a second. Let, let me, let me sort of jump to the end. This building has been in -- under consideration by the city. At one point, there was an effort to make it go private and turn it into a saloon, a saloon, I mean, in the most contemporary terms and what do you see the end state for the public usage? When all said is done, what is -- what's going to be the cultural function of this building?

MAYS: Part of what we have been engaging with the council, and the priority has been with preservation first and building upon the existing activities that have occurred there. So for example, each year, the Historic Preservation Committee has a tour of the facility. It is limited because of the condition and accessibility of the building. It is utilized in the past for plays that have occurred outside. It's adjacent to a sculpture park and the community garden. The ultimate use, we believe, for this building will be 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.

STOLDAL: I, I hope you understand the question. It, it, it -- the question is based on the title of this organization, which is the Commission on Cultural Centers and Historic Places, and, and its function is to not just restore
buildings, historic buildings, but bring life back into them and extend, and extend their life, so as, as we move forward, that, that's going to be a key question for how is this building going to be used? What, what sort of -- and 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, and by the way, you, you clearly have employed some of the, the, the, the top organizations, whether it's LGA or, or, or North Wind, which gives me confidence in reading these reports, so thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you.

KAVANAUGH: Michael, this is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I have a question for you. Do you have a, an estimate of probable cost from a contractor or is this your estimate of probable cost based on the additional funds that you'll receive for mitigation of, of assistance for mitigation of the asbestos?

MAYS: Thank you for the question. Again, Michael Mays for the record. 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.
KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

STOLDAL: Chair, I'd like to make a motion.

OSTROVSKY: Yes, go ahead, Bob.

STOLDAL: I'd like to make a motion for 21-12, City of Boulder City, the Boulder City Water Filtration Plant. The applicant is requesting $199,880. I move to approve that amount.

OSTROVSKY: Do we have a second?

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I’ll second.

OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioner have any questions or comments? Is there any public comment? I see none. We have a motion in front of us. All those in favor of approving 21-12, the amount of $199,880, please say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair votes in favor. It's unanimous of those present. Thank you very much.

MAYS: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: The next project is City of Ely, Ely City Hall. Is there someone from the City of Ely available?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I have Nathan Robertson. One moment.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, sir.

ROBERTSON: Good afternoon, commissioners. Can you
hear me okay?

OSTROVSKY: Can hear you just fine. Go ahead, Nathan. Thank you.

ROBERTSON: Wonderful. Thank you. I appreciate this opportunity to talk a little bit about the project. Ely City Hall was built in 1929. As I brought up to this, to this board before, there's only two city halls left in the State of Nevada built before -- in the early part of the 20th Century that are still in use by their communities. That’d be us and Fallon. That being the case, it makes the Ely City Hall kind of a rare creature. In our, in our last, almost a hundred years now, the city -- Ely City Hall's been used for a number of things in addition to being the center of city government. It's been used as the public library. It's been used for educational purposes, office space for community nonprofits. It's been used to display art. It's really been a center for a lot of things in our community and, and the, the city of Ely is committed to making sure that it continues as that for the next hundred years, and, and over the last 10 years, we've addressed a number of the issues facing the building, including weatherization projects, maintenance, of course, 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, and, of course, it's still in use, is, 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. It, it generally takes, and, and the, the, 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, and like I said, we'll make sure that the project meets the highest possible standards and, and hopefully keep our city hall around for another hundred years at least. With
that, I'll open up for questions.

OSTROVSKY: This is the Chair. Nathan, I guess that
you, you, you've begun to address one of my issues, which is
how we arrived at the $300,000. This, this is your best
estimate based on prior history for engineering and, and
project design?

ROBERTSON: Industry standards for project design,
like I said, is, is between 10 and 15. I, 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,
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. Hopefully, we can get it done for less.
Like I said, there's other contributing entities and grants
into this factor. If, 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 project -- if, if this phase starts to go a
little bit more expensive than that, but it's, it's, it's,
it's the best industry standard that we could use coming up
with that cost.
OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Go ahead, commissioners.

Questions, please.

STOLDAL: Chair, my question really along the same lines. I just -- it, it was just a series of, 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 -- I'm not sure what the proper adjective is, but 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, and then the board is able to -- this Commission is able to say, okay, yes or no, or we don't -- 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, we don't know, but -- and I, I -- clearly everything that the applicant just said is correct. I mean, it, it's, it's, it's a challenge these days on any number of levels. Plus, this Commission has already funded elements of the, of the city hall and we know how important it is and, and we know the, the, the type of, of work that the applicant and the city does and, and, and how much Ely, the city of Ely and, and White Pine is, is doing to preserve its history and, and, and promote it. I mean, so I lean towards granting this, but I'm just worried about setting some sort of a precedent or just putting money into a, into a pot. We don't know exactly what
the deliverable is.

MAYS: Well, Mr. -- Commissioner Stoldal, if I might address that. Nathan Robertson for the record. So, like I said, this -- one of the things that the Commission funded previously was a historic structures report. As part of that report, the, the engineers involved came up with an engineer's estimate of what it might take to address the issues with the building and, 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. 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, some cost estimates. Like I said, that, 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, and if I, if I might add, I'm, I have a degree in construction management and probably 15 years now in project management. The industry standard for these kind of projects, like I said, is, is right between 10 and 15% of your project cost for engineering and architecture. That being the case, that, that's how we arrived at that number and I, 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, that's why we asked what we asked. The, 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.

STOLDAL: Nathan, what if, what if we said, okay, fine, but we're, we're going to hold $300,000 or $400,000 in reserve, but please come back with a specific piece of the action that, 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 re-- take care of the roof or the, or, 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?

ROBERTSON: Well, Commissioner Stoldal, this, this application is specifically for hiring the architecture and engineers and, and getting this planning portion done. None of it is, 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. With -- without a comprehensive plan, without, like, has been talked about earlier in this meeting, the seismic -- 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, this planning phase first, and, and that will present us
with -- the, the deliverable at the end of this is a set of construction drawings.

STOLDAL:    Well, I, I, I -- yeah.

ROBERTSON:  We can --

STOLDAL:    I, I think, I think that the work done and the, and the, and the credibility that's your, your organization, the city, has, has done with the past projects, I'm leaning towards supporting the funding, but I'd, I'd like to hear from the other commissioners.

KAVANAUGH:  This is Commissioner Kavanaugh for the record. Mr. Robertson, 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.

ROBERTSON:  No, what, 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.

KAVANAUGH:  Of, of the engineer and architect amount for this project, correct?

ROBERTSON:  Yeah. That is correct.

KAVANAUGH:  Okay. I just wanted to get clarification on that.

ROBERTSON:  Right.

KAVANAUGH:  And I, I un -- for the record, I'm sorry.
I forgot to say that earlier. This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.
I understand the need for your draw -- your plans to be drawn up, be able to go through plan review, and must have architectural approval by the engineer in that process of project design and, and all of that. So thank you for the clarification, Mr. Robertson.

ROBERTSON: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: This is Chair Ostrovsky. I, I could also support it, but I -- with the understanding that we, we do not throw $300,000 in a pot. We will, we will reimburse you actual costs from contracts from the qualified engineers and architects and so on that you submit for reimbursement. So --

ROBERTSON: I understand.

OSTROVSKY: It, it, it, it -- we will reimburse you for actual costs, which have to be submitted to the office with the appropriate contracts and documents, and I'm assuming that would be acceptable to you.

ROBERTSON: It, it would. We, we have experience working with the Commission before and, and we have no problem with that.

STOLDAL: All right, Chair. I'd like to make a motion --

KAVANAUGH: Mr. Chairman --

STOLDAL: Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible). Go ahead.
KAVANAUGH: Mr. Chair, this is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I would like to make a motion.

OSTROVSKY: All right.

KAVANAUGH: I would like to move that we approve the Project Number 21-13, City of Ely, Ely City Hall Project Design architecture and engineering costs for up to $300,000 reimbursement once those costs have been submitted to us and when I mean us, to our office staff, and then for presentation of action by the commissioners at their next meeting.

OSTROVSKY: Well, this is just a comment on the motion. We can do -- that's not normal. Nor -- normally staff would, would match the, the approved amount to the actual billings that they receive and would not come back to this Commission unless you really think you want them to. It's up to you. It's your motion.

KAVANAUGH: Well, I -- so this is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I say that with the understanding that they're requesting $300,000, but the project is an estimate of $4, $4 million. And typically, engineering and architect costs can go anywhere from between 10 to 20% on any given project, so given that they've requested $300,000, I'm, I'm of the mind to respect that request. If this project in the future requires more, more funding for project development or anything of that nature, I think it's an opportunity to apply for additional funding by Ely's, for Ely's city hall. So, if it, if it is
only supposed to go to the staff, then I can make a motion. I can amend my motion. I don't even have to amend it at this point. I can just restate it, but, I'm open for further discussion before I give it a second go.

OSTROVSKY: That's why I think you're on the right track.

STOLDAL: Listen, Chair. I think, I think that -- I, I think I understand. What, what we're looking at here is, is that if we approve this and, and it's spent, the cost may be more than the $300,000, and that potentially this applicant could come back and ask for more money to, to finish out the construction costs. So I would ask Rebecca, if we approve the, the $300,000 right now, would they be -- would the City of Ely be able to come back? 'Cause it's likely we're going to have a pot of money left, left over. Would they be able to come back and ask for an additional dip into the bucket?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. And again, my apologies. My camera is doesn't appear to be working. The answer is yes. The Commission -- there's no prohibition on the Commission awarding more than was requested by the applicant and they can do so at any point in the life of the grant cycle.

STOLDAL: So Commissioner Kavanaugh's motion that we go the $300,000 does not prohibit them from coming back again?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
That is correct.

STOLDAL:    Okay.

OSTROVSKY:   So Commissioner Kavanaugh, would you like to try again?

KAVANAUGH:    I, I sure would. So in review of -- or in -- with respect to the additional information provided by staff, I would like to offer a motion to approve pro -- the funded request of $300,000 to the City of Ely, Grant Number 21-13 for the Ely City Hall project design architectural and engineering costs with the understanding that they may come back during this funding round for additional funding requests.

OSTROVSKY:    Fine.

STOLDAL:    I'll second that.

OSTROVSKY:   (Inaudible). You seconded the motion?

STOLDAL:    Yes.

OSTROVSKY:   Any further discussion? Any public comment? We have a motion and a second. All those in favor of granting to 21-13, $300,000, City of Ely say aye.

MULTIPLE:    Aye.


Okay. Thank you very much. Good luck. It's a big project, a lot, lot to do.

ROBERTSON:   Thank you. Thank you for your assistance.
OSTROVSKY: The next one is Old Glory Theater Company requesting an amount of $227,237.50. I would like to open this discussion by asking staff to advise us on the, on the applicant’s eligibility for grant as a, as a nonprofit. Rebecca, any comment? We don't hear you, Rebecca.

PALMER: Oh, my sincere apologies.

OSTROVSKY: Here you are. Okay.

PALMER: We have no, we have no additional information since the staff notes were prepared. We have not received the articles of incorporation.

OSTROVSKY: So staff had a question of, of the eligibility whether they were properly organized under the IRS code. Is that correct?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Yes, that is correct, and we requested, as we note in our, in our staff notes, articles of incorporation at -- and we have not received those to date.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Is there someone from Old Glory Theater Company available?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I have Kansas Bowling. I'll bring her on.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

HITCHCOCK: Kansas, go ahead. You'll have to unmute.

BOWLING: Hello?

OSTROVSKY: Kansas, we hear you.

OSTROVSKY: Tell us about your project and about our question.

BOWLING: yeah, so it, it has been properly amended. I have the document. I, 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.

OSTROVSKY: All right, fine. Thank you. That would comfort us that whatever action we take, it will obviously be on contingent -- contingent upon us receiving the appropriate documents to make sure you're eligible. With that --

STOLDAL: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chair, I, I, I -- there, there was a deadline, a couple of deadlines, to get this done, and as those deadlines were not met, I -- and until the Attorney General's office rules at this application is -- covers all the bases that we have, I, I'm not sure that I would be comfortable in, in even taking any action on, on, on this other than delaying it without prejudice to, to, to a later date. This -- there was a deadline, I think, of May 22nd. That deadline was passed. Now, I know things take time, but, but having it before this Commission without the AG’s office getting a, a stamp of approval, I'm, I'm, I, I -- again, I don't want to say this is not a good project, but I, I, I'm not ready -- I wouldn't be ready to vote on it at this point without a, a firm stamp of approval from the AG’s
office. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Well, what I'm hearing from you, Bob, 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?

STOLDAL: That, that's correct.

BOWLING: And when would the next meeting be?

OSTROVSKY: Well, probably before September 1st.

BOWLING: Okay. I do have everything together now. I really apologize for the delay. I had to send it in a few times and then their system was down last week, so it actually randomly got to me this morning. Everything is in order currently. 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.

STOLDAL: Chair, I would suggest that also taking a, a, a look at the needed other elements of the application from the audit to, to the insurance forms. There are other pieces of the application that were not up to -- all the things were checked off, so I would just recommend that, 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, we can look at this application. Attorney General, is that all right?

WALSH: Thank you, Vice Chair. Yes, I completely agree with that. Again, my legal advice is limited toward the Commission and I cannot provide Old, Old Glory any legal advice. However, reviewing that document to see if it's compliant with the guidelines as well as NRS is appropriate. I can do that. So, and based on the previous work that we've done on it, that should be a rather quick review.

OSTROVSKY: Well then would you like to make a motion, Bob?

STOLDAL: I'd like to make a motion that we hold 21-14, Old Glory Theater, Old Glory Theater request for funding of up to $227,237.50, delay this without prejudice until the next meeting of the Commission of Cultural Affairs and Historic Places, so that the application, the status -- nonprofit status can be verified by the Attorney General, as well as the applicant completing the proper application of areas that are -- haven't been filled out, including insurance and audit and so forth. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Is there a to that motion?

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second. Any further comment or questions from the Commission? Any comments from the public? Hearing none, all those in favor of
the motion, say aye.

   MULTIPLE:     Aye.

   OSTROVSKY:    Any opposed? The Chair votes in favor.

It’s unanimous of those commissioners present. Thank you very much. We look forward to seeing your application in the near future.

   BOWLING:      All right. Thank you so much for working with me. This is a brand-new nonprofit, so, you know, kind of working things out. I very much appreciate it and thank you, Kristen, for letting me know about this grant.

   OSTROVSKY:    Okay. Thank you.

   BROWN::       This is Kristen. You're most welcome.

   OSTROVSKY:    The next application is 21-16, White Pine County for the New Ruth Club Museum. Someone from White Pine that want to address this for Commission.

   HITCHCOCK:    I have Taba -- Tabatha Hamilton. One moment. Go ahead, Tabatha.

   HAMILTON:     Can you guys hear me okay?

   OSTROVSKY:    I certainly can.

   HAMILTON:     Okay, perfect. My name is Tabatha Hamilton. I'm with White Pine County, and I'll be presenting the New Ruth Club project. $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 regulations.
health and safety standards. The end goal of the New Ruth 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. Old Ruth began as a settlement for workers of the White Pine County Copper Company. Ruth ceased to be a company town in 1955. Around this time, the community was moved two miles north to make way for the expansion of the Deep Ruth Mine. This new location is now known as New Ruth. The Ruth Club was originally built in Old Ruth in 1920. It was one of the three saloons that were known to operate within the town. Those saloons were not permitted. It is believed that the company knew about these saloons, but simply just ignored them. Around 1953, the Old Ruth Club was split and moved to New Ruth. These two now separate buildings were set on foundations and the exterior was bricked in New Ruth. 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 an -- 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 economic -- 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 is -- 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, in relation to local mine. And finally, I want to thank you guys for your consideration of our project.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Tabatha. I’ll open it to the commissioners for questions. INAUDIBLE off the bat --

STOLDAL: (Inaudible).
KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner --

OSTROVSKY: Oh, I’m sorry. Go ahead. Commissioner Kavanaugh.

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. This is -- Tabatha, questions for Tabatha. With regard to your budget, can you tell me how you came up with your estimate of $80,000?

BOWLING: This 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.

KAVANAUGH: Was -- this is Commissioner Kavanaugh again. Was your estimate of probable cost rendered from professional engineering groups?

BOWLING: Yes. I apologize. These would've been the bid prices for some of our recent preliminary engineering estimates and the individual tasks with them.

KAVANAUGH: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

STOLDAL: Chair? Stoldal for the record. The couple, three questions. The -- fir -- first of all, just a, a statement. Very happy to see work being done on New Ruth. Ruth is, is such an important historical piece of our state's history and it's nice to see that significant dollars are being spent on the park. I think significant dollars as, as well as just the energy to create the, the, the record of, of,
of Ruth, so the photograph that you included in the building, my question is the building was, was divided and part of it is a commercial. Is the other saloon down -- is that -- down the street. Which part of the sign or which part of the building says New Ruth Club? Was the -- is from the original. On one -- on the left side of the photograph, that was a clothing store and on the right side, it was a barber shop. Which, which part of what is now the New Ruth Club, which part of the building is that, do you know?

BOWLING: I don't. I actually was not aware that, that that was the uses of the Old Ruth Club and I definitely have not dove into that much of the history, so I'm not positive which portion of the Old Ruth Club that this b -- this building is specifically.

STOLDAL: Yeah, the old -- the, the, the original New Ruth Club is a very long building with the center being the Ruth Club and then on, on the left side is the -- near the hotel is the, I believe, the sort of haberdashery clothing on the right side. It would just be nice as, as we, as we move forward. The other part of it is you reference in the, in the narrative about a potential of connecting -- reconnecting Ruth with the Northern Nevada Railway. Are you -- do you have a sense of, of what tracks are still available between -- looking at Google Earth, it looks like there are some tracks, but then there's some others that are missing. Is there any
study done on, on the tracks between New Ruth and Ely?

    BOWLING: It's my understanding that the -- that there is a set of tracks that still operates between Ely and Ruth, and it's my understanding that they do, like, the Halloween Ghost Train and they follow those tracks up to the Ruth Depot and then back into Ely.

    STOLDAL: So there's a, there's a train? The Northern Nevada runs a, a train up to New Ruth? Where, where is the depot? I couldn't find that on the, on the Google Earth.

    BOWLING: I'm not positive. I apologize. I don't know a whole lot about that portion of the Nevada Northern Railway, but I, I've just seen, like, local advertisements and such, so I'm not exactly sure where the Ruth Depot would be.

    STOLDAL: Well, we've -- I think the gentleman from the Northern Nevada Railway will be here later, so maybe we, we, we can ask him. Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a motion to, to approve this 21-16, White Pine County New Ruth Club Museum for $80,000.

    OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

    OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Commissioners, have any further questions, comments? Any comments from the public?

    BOWLING: I just would like to make a comment. I know that Nathan Robertson was on the call earlier, and he might be able to answer your question about the railroad, as I
know that he's pretty involved. I don't know for sure that he could answer it, but it's possible.

OSTROVSKY: Well, it -- yeah, just without belaboring that, Tabatha, I think there, there's a lot going on in Ruth, McGill, and in the Northern Nevada Railroad and other projects. I think what Bob is getting at is, is how do you tie this all together and how do you create to tell the real story of the railroad of Ruth, of McGill, all, all that played out, so I would encourage you at the county to dig into the history, 'cause we're very interested in that. Researchers are, and, and we hope to attract tourism, which will also be educating them on, on how this Central Nevada developed and, and, and why it became so important to, to the state. Thank you. Any other comments? Hearing none --

STOLDAL: Other, other, other than it's New Ruth, because there was an Old Ruth and, and the Old Ruth got, got gobbled up by the, by the pit, so to speak --

OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

STOLDAL: -- and, and I -- it's just an exciting history of, of, of, of White Pine County.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. We have a motion before us. All those in favor?

MULTIPLE Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any oppose? Chairman votes in favor and it's unanimous of those commissioners present. Thank you.
And again, I encourage you to work on the history because it all ties together with a real story to be told. Thank you.

BOWLING: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Next project is the City of Wells, the El Rancho Revitalization. Someone with the City of Wells with us today?

HITCHCOCK: Yes. I have Jordan Tilley. I'll bring him on.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, Jordan.

TILLEY: Thank you. So we're here talking about the El Rancho Hotel and Casino. Some quick history. It was constructed in 19 -- began in 1948. Prior to receiving significant damage from an earthquake in 2008, the El Rancho was a cornerstone of activity throughout in the downtown area of Wells. There was gaming, fine dining, bar, brought sportsmen and cowboys into its doors. I heard once Dennis Quaid played the piano there, so that was a big deal. He broke down somewhere here near outside of town. Murals, vintage, front and back bar, knotty pine dining area. It serves as a reminder of those days gone by, but as we re -- revitalize this building, it also provide not only that glimpse into the past, but a modern up-to-date community center. 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. I touched on this briefly, the building will continue to utilized in town by -- and, 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. You know, as a city here, our, 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, 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. Plans, hopefully, in the next few months to get those back and restore that little area back to its original glow. 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 those -- 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 a hundred thousand dollars 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. By 4:00 today, it might go up, you know, a hundred dollar -- a hundred bucks,
but -- so we have some money set aside to cover any additional there, and I know a lot of questions have been asked about the audit. As we were putting this application together, we had a lot of turnover here at the city, and I think we missed adding that in, but we complete an audit every year through Eide Bailey, and if necessary, we can supply that. And, and that's where we're at.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you very much, Jordan. I'll open it to the Commission for questions.

STOLDAL: Just a question on the -- 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 the -- all the electrical work done. Is that an appropriate number?

TILLEY: Yeah, yeah. Excuse me. Now I'm losing my voice. Based on the electrical that we have had back, you know, one of the rough quotes was around $40,000, but that's not the complete. I think it would be a little bit more accurate to finish out the whole project in that $75 range.

STOLDAL: Well, it's just exciting to see all the work done that's being done in Wells and, and a lot of the community could just have folded up after that earthquake and, and just, and just sort of moved on, but that wasn't the decision. The decision was to bring life back into Wells, so
-- and this is a particularly important building, so thank you for your work. Thanks, Chair.

TILLEY: Thank you.

KAVANAUGH: Mr. Tilley, this is Antoinette Kavanaugh, Commissioner Kavanaugh. I keep forgetting to say Commissioner. I keep wanting to say my first name, so just have to bear with me, my fellow commissioners. I am really thankful for the work that you are doing to restore the El Rancho. I saw that building the day -- the afternoon of that earthquake, and that was hard to see. I'm, I'm appreciative of the fact that you guys are taking -- 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 I -- if, if my co-chair, Mr. Stoldal, puts forth that motion to increase the amount, I, I would, I would support that. So good luck on your project.

TILLEY: Thank you so much.

KAVANAUGH: And, oh, one other comment. One other comment, I would recommend 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, that we are supposed to follow. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Mr. Stoldal, would you like to make a motion now?

STOLDAL: Yes. I'd like to make a motion for 21-17,
City of Wells EL Rancho Revitalization for the amount of $75,000.

OSTROVSKY: Any other --

KAVANAUGH: And I --

OSTROVSKY: -- comments or questions from the Commission?

KAVANAUGH: Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'd like to --

Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'd like to second that motion.

OSTROVSKY: I have motion second. Thank you. Any other comments from commissioners? Is there any public comment? Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion to approve 21-17, City of Wells for $75,000, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair votes in favor, unanimous of those commissioners present. Thank you very much. Good luck.

TILLEY: Thank you so much. And we'll get that audit sent over today.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you.

WALSH: At this moment, I'd like to interrupt briefly with another item from the chats for, for the record.

OSTROVSKY: In keeping with past standards, can staff read that chat to us, please?

WALSH: This is --

PALMER: For the record, this --
For the record -- okay. For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. This is from Honey Menefee, Storey County. Due to the availability of excess funding, would it be possible to ask the Commission for an increased amount -- 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? Thank you.

This is Bob Ostrovsky. Thanks for entering that into the record. The Commission later in this meeting will talk about how to move forward from here. 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, to be prepared to make that application when we decide they should become available.

Chairman, if, if there's a dollar figure, I don't -- didn't see a dollar figure in there. It would help with -- looks like they're potentially a dollar or they could
come up with one, but thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Well, I hate, I hate to do them just off
the fly, so 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.

WALSH: Thank you, Chair.

OSTROVSKY: That leads us to project number -- we're
up to 18, I believe.

STOLDAL: Yup.

KAVANAUGH: Mr. Chair, I have a --

OSTROVSKY: Yes.

KAVANAUGH: -- question. This is Commissioner
Kavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

KAVANAUGH: Did we do 21-15?

OSTROVSKY: No. 21-15 was deleted.

KAVANAUGH: Okay. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Not under consideration. And, and --

KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: -- (Inaudible) that were deleted, they
were deleted conversation between staff and I, because it --
they didn't qualify for the grant pro -- they didn't meet the
minimum qualification. For example, they were not a nonprofit
or they were not a governmental agency, so if it's privately
owned property, we can't put bond money in there, so we advise
them at what, what -- to the extent we could to seek out and
develop a nonprofit so that they would become eligible in
future cycles.

KAVANAUGH: Okay. I just -- this is Commissioner
Kavanaugh. I just wanted to get clarification for the record
that they did submit an application, but it was not
entertained for that reason.

OSTROVSKY: That's correct.

KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Next one is 18, 21-18. This would be the
City of Carlin, Old Church on Main. Someone from the City of
Carlin available?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. Go ahead, Madison.

MAHON: Thank you, and thank you, commissioners.

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 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. Again, the church is probably
the most recognizable historical building in our community, and it's going to help, you know, further develop tourism in our area. It'll be the starting point for preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration of 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 our -- through community help and through help of our local co-op, Wells Rural Electric Company. If you open, open it up to any question, I'm happy to answer any questions that the Commission or the public has.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Madison. Any questions from the commissioners?

STOLDAL: Chair, first of all, thank you for the -- including the brand-new master and it is brand new. I think it's March of this year, master plan for the, for the City of Carlin, and, and I read the note in there that says there was not a vision, objectives, or action steps on historic, or cultural resources in the master plan, but there is one in, in, in this, and that's great to see with, with such an important community like Carlin. I also wrote down here, is there any way to get this study done in 30 days? And I think
you just answered that, that, that it's possible to, to get that. I'm, I'm nervous about the roof and, and, and the structure. Are, are, are you going to be able to get all of the, all of the necessary seismic and structural stuff done? 'Cause I wrote down an additional figure of, of $10,000 as a potential change from the, from the $20,000 that you're asking to, to, 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?

MAHON: Yes. I believe we would be able to -- I would hope that we could come back before our, our -- the September meeting. If not, we would have to wait until the next cycle.

STOLDAL: Oh, that makes me nervous 'cause that's going to be two -- probably the next cycle after September is going to be two years. I'm not sure that that building, the way it's described here, could take another two years with a tarp. So I -- those are my thoughts. Thank you, Chair.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah. The question that the tarp was installed by the city?

MAHON: Correct. With the help of the public works department, Wells Rural Electric, and volunteers, we had tarp, tarping measures and then the, 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, you know, 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.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah, I guess what, as Mr. Stoldal pointed out, the word tarp kind of scares me with winter and water and snow and, and all kinds of wind, but I, I don't know if there's much, you know, adding a new roof will cost a lot of money and a lot of engineering. You really have to know what it would cost more before we could move forward. Bob, you were indicating you wanted add money. You think that $20,000 is inadequate for, for a study? It's a little low compared to what other studies cost.

STOLDAL: Ex -- exactly, and, and especially throwing in a, a seismic study, arch -- architectural, and engineering study. With the focus on, on the key structures, the foundation, there's no sense in putting a roof if the foundation needs to be repaired. So -- and, 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, that something comes back to Carlin come -- 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, is the essential next step. Thank you. So I was going to make a motion to -- for 21-18, City of Carlin, Old Church on the Main for an engineering study, full study, architectural, engineering is for $30,000.

OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioner want to second that motion?

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I will second the motion.

OSTROVSKY: Does the Commission have any other questions or comments? Questions, or comments --

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY: Oh, I’m sorry, Commissioner Kavanaugh.

KAVANAUGH: I have a, I have a comment. My comment is that I would recommend 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, that would be my only, my only addition or comment.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah, goes without saying, but we can add it to that if it's okay with you, Mr. Stoldal.

STOLDAL: Yes. And that's a, that's a (Inaudible).

OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible) bring forward their plan to us, and I'm assuming that's all right with the seconder? Ms.
Olmstead? Yes, it is. Right. We have a motion. Any, any further comments? Any comments from the public? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor of approving City of Carlin's request, project number 21-18 for $30,000 say, aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair votes in favor. It’s unanimous of those commissioners present. Thank you very much, and we look forward to seeing you back very soon.

MAHON: Thank you, commissioners. I will engage today and hopefully have a, a favorable report next meeting. Thank you so much.

OSTROVSKY: We've got a couple more and we're done with this portion of the agenda. Northern Nevada Railroad.

This is for the engine house/machine shop building. Is someone with us from the railroad?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. Mr. Mark Bassett. One moment.

Go ahead, Mark.

BASSETT: Good afternoon, commissioners.

OSTROVSKY: Welcome, Mark.

BASSETT: Thank you for this opportunity to present today. 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 of the (Inaudible). For the past hundred and 15 years, it has
served as the heart of the railroad in the heart of our national historic landmark. It's very popular with our visitors. 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 of 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. If that wasn't bad enough, the leaks also followed -- caused a few exciting electric shows. 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 issuing hap -- 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 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 drain -- 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 -- 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. And if there are any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mark. Commissioners, questions, please. Bob, do you have a question? Commissioner Stoldal, he’s got a problem with his mic. Hang on just a minute.

STOLDAL: How about now?

OSTROVSKY: I can hear you fine.

STOLDAL: All right. Mark, if I could just deviate and, and, and, and for the, the Commission, just 10 seconds, if you can answer this. Previously, we had an applicant from Ruth, Nevada. Are the tracks between the Northern Nevada,
between Ely and Ruth, and is there a depot at the other end at Ruth?

BASSETT: For the record, Mark Bassett.

Unfortunately, the tracks no longer go to New Ruth, and the depot in Ruth was in Old Ruth, and when New Ruth became created, the depot went away. Passenger service ended in 1941, so the -- there was no reason to build the depot when the Town of Ruth was made. We are working with the mine to open up the railroad to the mine. I, I have no prediction on when that would happen.

STOLDAL: Okay.

BASSETT: If that were to happen, our tracks do go right -- Well, actually, at that particular point, the tracks belong to the mine and they do go right past Ruth.

STOLDAL: Okay, great. Thank you. I didn't think there was -- the depot was, was -- it just kept being referred to as the Ruth Depot, but I didn't think it -- so let me, Mark, let me ask you. I'm concerned about why the application page was altered.

BASSETT: The application page was altered?

STOLDAL: Yeah, . The, the port -- the part that says, who owns the, the, the property. That was, that was cut out. The property owner name and address, I mean, right across the top, Mark, and I know you, you've seen this a thousand times. It says this unaltered form must be
submitted, but yet somehow, you or the staff or somebody at
your end took out property owner name and, and address from
the application form.

BASSETT: That would've been me. The -- what I did
is I recreate the, the form be -- to fill it in and that was
an oversight on my part. I thought I checked and double
checked it to make sure that information was identical to the
form submitted from the Commission. In answer to your
question there, that property is owned by the Nevada Northern
Railway Foundation and the City of Ely.

STOLDAL: Yeah, I -- and I found that in, in your
narrative. You, you clearly explained that, so that wasn't,
wasn't -- I'm just wondering why --

BASSETT: Yeah.

STOLDAL: -- it was -- that, that that was taken
from the app -- application page. So the application for work
on the engine house/machine shop building details of
challenges, and you just did that for, for, for the structure.
The weather seals around the -- and there are just hundreds of
large and small windowpanes. The seals are -- you used phrase
-- are substantially nonexistent, causing leaks in the
interior walls. The walls are crumbling. As you pointed out,
there are 14 different roof levels. Where I'm going with all
of that, what's this dollar -- has there been -- is there a
seismic study been done on this building? Has somebody come
in and said, Mark, you need to fix this and here's a construction because where I'm going with this, I think that what needs to be done first is we fund you enough money to do a study on, on what should be done first, second, and third, whether it's the roof fixed, the crumbling walls, fix the windows. What, what, what are you using as, as a basis of, all right, we've got $275,000, now go do this first.

BASSETT: Actually to address your, your comments --

Mark Bassett for the record -- the, the Commission, the previous Commission has actually funded the study that was done, I want to say, 2008, 2009, and we actually implemented the results of that study and had a structural engineer, so we seismically retrofitted the building. It would've been 2008, 2007, thereabouts. I, I can check exactly and let you know when, so --

STOLDAL: Okay.

BASSETT: -- we're in the -- when I say the, the crumbling, it, it's a crumbling parapets on the actual roof itself. We actually have addressed all of the building walls structural deficiencies in previous CCA and CCCHP grants.

STOLDAL: So let me re -- let me state what you just said to me. So the walls right now are not structurally crumbling.

BASSETT: Correct.

STOLDAL: But the windows are still leaking into
those walls.

    BASSETT:    Well, no. The, the windows are actually
    leaking inside the building. These are ver -- these are
    industrial metal windows that open, and so they have a, a
    weather seal that goes around the window openings --
    STOLDAL:    Right.
    BASSETT:    -- and it's these weather seals that have
    failed.
    STOLDAL:    Yeah. I guess where I'm going with that,
    where, where is that, where is the seals failing, leaking
    into, into what? Just on the inside of the building or --
    BASSETT:    Just on -- yes, just on the inside of the
    building. When we get heavy rains being blown by a west or
    south wind, the water comes in and then leaks down the
    interior of the wall.
    STOLDAL:    So the $275,000 is, is specifically -- you
    can delineate between the, the roof, repairing the roof and
    repairing the windows, or are those separate? Like, I wasn't
    able to pull any, any specifics out of here other than just
    the, the number $2 -- $270 --
    BASSETT:    Oh.
    STOLDAL:    -- $247.
    BASSETT:    Okay. I submitted a, 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, sewer at $40,000 --

STOLDAL: Right.

BASSETT: -- and install a new roof at $125,000.

STOLDAL: So in -- in order of those, can any of
that be phased in, 'cause I've got those numbers, the parapet
walls, the smoke jacks, and so forth. I mean, would you do
the roof right away or do you have --

BASSETT: Oh.

STOLDAL: -- or do you have to do them in some
order?

BASSETT: Well, doing -- the, the, the roof would be
-- I would do the, 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 -- that's 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 availability. The, the problem is, you
know, the big doors weigh two tons and it -- 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.

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I just have one, one more
question of Mark.

BASSETT: Yup.

STOLDAL: This, this is for -- you know better than, than, than anybody the amount of energy, time, and challenges, and almost hourly different challenges that, that you have to deal with. Can -- are, are you able to take on another project? I mean, it seems to me that there's some other projects that are -- still need to be worked on and, and, and may not have been -- get done in time for the funding. Help me understand where, where -- whether if we fund this, we're going to be able to do it.

BASSETT: Okay. On this particular project, 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, buts 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.

STOLDAL: All right. Thank you, Mark. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman. I, I would make a motion unless there's other
questions.

OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioners have questions?

Mr. Bassett? I hear a (Inaudible).

KAVANAUGH: Mr. Bassett?

OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible)? Yes, Commissioner.

KAVANAUGH: Sorry, Chair. Mr. Chair. I -- my
internet, I think, is a little slow, so I apologize. I want
to thank you for the speci -- speci -- specificity of your
grant application on lining out your project.

BASSETT: I Thank you, Commissioner.

OSTROVSKY: Go ahead, Bob, if you want to make a
motion.

STOLDAL: On 20-20 -- 20-20, Nevada Northern Railway
Foundation, Inc., for the urgent building repair of the engine
house/machine shop for $247,000, I make a motion to approve.

OSTROVSKY: We have a second?

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

OSTROVSKY: All right. Any other comments from the
commissioners? Any comments from the public?
KAVANAUGH: Yes. This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY: Yes.

KAVANAUGH: I would like to suggest that we add the City of Elko in the grant application in naming the grant application awardee.

OSTROVSKY: I'm not sure I understand. I'm sorry.

KAVANAUGH: Um --

STOLDAL: As part owner of the building.

KAVANAUGH: -- so we know that the property is -- we know that the property is jointly owned by the Nevada Northern Railway Foundation, Incorporated along with the City of Ely.

OSTROVSKY: Oh, okay. So --

KAVANAUGH: So I --

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

KAVANAUGH: -- I feel like we should include them as part of the grant awardee.

OSTROVSKY: Okay.

BASSETT: Mr. Chairman.

STOLDAL: I accept. I, I accept that.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

BASSETT: Mr. Chairman, I will submit a corrected application cover page. I checked that and double checked it and I -- I'm stunned I missed it, but obviously, I, I will get that to you.

OSTROVSKY: We understand. Thank you, Mark. Does
seconder accept that little change? She does.

OLMSTEAD: Yes.

OSTROVSKY: Any other comments of the commissioners? Any public comment? All those in favor of approving 21-20 in the amount of $247,000, please say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Chairman votes -- any opposed? Chairman votes in favor, unanimous of the commissioners in attendance.

Mark, good luck. I know it's a big project and I've been in that engine house. It's a big building.

BASSETT: Yes, it is, Commissioner. Thank you all very, very much. Appreciate it.

OSTROVSKY: All right.

BASSETT: Bye.

OSTROVSKY: That takes us to the We -- Western Folklife Center. It, it is next to the last. Western Folklife Center, Pioneer Hotel Fire Safety Compliance project. Is someone on board?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, I have Carolyn Trainor. One moment.

Go ahead, Carolyn.

TRAINOR: Hello? Can you hear me?

OSTROVSKY: I hear you just fine. Thank you.

TRAINOR: Okay. I'm Carolyn Flores Trainor, Development Manager for the Western Folklife Center for the record. A little history, the Pioneer Hotel Building was
transformed into a three-story brick building between 1912 and 1913. It quickly became one of the centerpiece of downtown Elko. Barbie Wessel (phonetic) wrote about the Pioneer Hotel for a Northeastern Nevada Historical Society Quarterly published in 1985. Ms. Wessel stated the building's unique architectural style is significant because of its design influences from the American arts and crafts movement. The 109 year old building is the home of the Western Folklife Center and has hosted countless poets, musicians, artists, and fans of cowboy culture, serving as a window to the rural west. The Pioneer Hotel building is an important cultural center for northeast, excuse me, Northeastern Nevada, and is used by an ever-growing year-round community of local and international artists, visitors, and customers. It also increasingly serves as a physical home base that livestream viewers experience virtually every time we go live from the iconic G Three Bar Theater in 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. Many of our local businesses rent our facility for their meetings, community, and special events.
Our convenient downtown location makes it a local favorite for private events, parties, receptions, and celebrations in the G Three Bar Theater and/or the Pioneer Saloon. 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 -- commissioners, excuse me. And I thank you for your consideration in funding this project.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Any questions of the commissioners?

STOLDAL: (Inaudible) a motion --

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. Ms. Trainor, I'd like to thank you for submitting a complete and thorough application and providing all of the documentation necessary on the, on the application. With that, I would like
to make a motion to approve this grant application, number 20-21 to the Western Folklife Center, the Pioneer Hotel Fire Safety Compliance project in the amount of $14,561.

OSTROVSKY: We have --

STOLDAL: I’d like to second that --

OSTROVSKY: -- a second?

STOLDAL: -- as well as the, the comments. It was really an easy one with the photographs and the details and the specifics to understand what the project is, so I second.

TRAINOR: Thank you so much.

OSTROVSKY: Any other comments from commissioners? Any comments from the public? Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion to approve Western Folklife Center, grant number 21-21, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Opposed? Chairman votes in favor, unanimous of all commissioners present. Thank you very much.

TRAINOR: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: That leads us to our, I believe, is our last grant application at Goldfield Historical Society. Someone on the line from Goldfield?

STOLDAL: I have two more.

OSTROVSKY: You have two more? What do you have?

STOLDAL: You left Goldfield and Carlin.

OSTROVSKY: Oh, I'm sorry. You're right. This is
next to the last. I was in a hurry.

STOLDAL: Well, that's --

OSTROVSKY: This is next to the last. Anyway, is someone on from Goldfield?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, we have John Ekman. John, you can unmute yourself. I believe you can try *6 or *9, one of those two.

OSTROVSKY: Still can't hear you, John.

HITCHCOCK: We are unable to unmute you, John. You'll have to unmute yourself and that either you can do by *6 --
oh, there you are.

EKMAN: How about now? I think I'm unmuted.

OSTROVSKY: There you are. Yeah. Thank you, John.

We can hear you fine.

EKMAN: Okay. Again, it's John Ekman, I'm President of the Goldfield Historical Society and 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. I will turn it back over to you.

OSTROVSKY: Questions from the commissioners.

STOLDAL: The -- Stoldal for the record. The -- are -- what, what's your -- well, I don't want to ask a loaded question. What I'd like to be able to, to, to get done is get the roof finished, get it so it's, it's -- we've got the foundation finished. I think we've got the windows finished, and if we can get the roof done, then, then the work on the interior can really, without being damaged. What's it going to -- 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 is -- this, this part of it gets done, how much more needs to be done and at roughly what cost?

EKMAN: Assuming that the current project is adequately funded, we'll find out when the contractors, you know, respond to the, to the bid request and assuming that this current request for $170,000 is adequate considering all the various other costs that are, 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, and -- but as far as actually keeping the water out, they will, they will be
actually superfluous to that point, although they -- they will
-- 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, this
will, this will cover the roof to the point where, where we
can keep the, the water out.

UNIDENTIFIED: Perfect.

OSTROVSKY: That, that answer your question, Bob, or,
you want to know more?

STOLDAL: As, as far as gutters, 'cause we're all
made aware of the gutters. If we see one more commercial
about fixing gutters, how much more is, is the gutter? Any
estimate on that?

EKMAN: That, that is, that -- I'll use a, a, an
ing工程 term. It's indeterminate right now. It's --

STOLDAL: Okay.

EKMAN: I, I don't know. I, I'm really not that
familiar with the, the cost or the skill of fabricating sheet
metal gutters that are more than just gutters, but on the two
sides of the building that face the streets, it's on a corner,
on those two sides, they're very, very, very complex. And on
the other two sides, they're less complex. But the simple
answer to your question is I am just not that sure as to what
the cost will be for those gutters.
STOLDAL: Thank you. That's --

OSTROVSKY: John, this is the Chairman. I think what you're hearing is if we do have another round where we have some leftover funds, I, I think it would be wiser on your part to get some expertise -- experts in and, and get a good handle on what it might cost to, to complete that gutter work, which is, you know, I, I think important in the long run to keeping a roof in good shape. So we would look forward to seeing that soon. Other questions?

EKMAN: I, I will do that.

OSTROVSKY: Any, any other questions from commissioners? Hearing none, accept a motion.

STOLDAL: All right. Stoldal for the record. For 21-22, the Goldfield Historical Society, the Goldfield Historic Building Restoration Project for the sum of $170,000, the motion is for approval.

OSTROVSKY: Do I have a second?

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead.

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner.

OLMSTEAD: (Inaudible).

OSTROVSKY: I accept Commissioner Olmstead’s second.

Any further questions of the Commission? Any comment or questions for the public? Hearing none, you've heard the motion to approve grant application 21-22, Goldfield Historical Society, the amount of $170,000. All those in
favor, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chairman votes in favor.

It's unanimous of the commissioners present. Thank you very much, and we'll look forward hopefully in the next short round, and maybe we'll take a look at your gutters.

EKMAN: Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Now we get to the final application. Is the Carlin Historical Society for the Carlin Schoolhouse Rehabilitation. Again, is someone on from Carlin?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, I'll bring Ella on. Go ahead, Ella.

TRUJILLO: Hi, everyone. My name is Ella Trujillo, and I'm the Treasurer with Carlin Historical Society, and, yes, I'm the last one, so everybody can say yay. We were lucky enough to receive funding from the Commission this last grant cycle to start restoration work on the schoolhouse, and I got great news this morning. It looks like our contractor is going to be able to pour concrete starting tomorrow, and so our -- all of our concrete sidewalk and other elements will hopefully be done by the end of the week, so we are super excited about that. 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 purpose -- the -- 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. And it's also amazing that the building is in the shape that it's in, and I attribute that to the building being used by the community for so many different purposes. It's -- I look at this building and I say -- I, I just think it's amazing. I mean, it has been a schoolhouse. It has been basically city hall. It has been a senior center and now it's a museum, and I think that's why the building is so important, and I think that's why the community thinks it's so important. But it's also given us opportunities that I never thought we would have. On a personal level, I got to visit with both of Carlin's third grade classes this year, and I got to teach them about the heritage of their town, including why their mascot is a railroader. You know, these kids, they grew up in a mining community, not a railroad community, so, it's great, especially to see their fascination, that, that beginning scene at the movie of Frozen, which I don't know if you've seen it or not, but they're harvesting ice and for those kids to learn that that happened in their town, it just -- it's
great. And that wouldn't have happened without this building and the, the community volunteers that have worked tirelessly to make programming happen and to get the building in a place where the public can come and see it and learn about this town's fascinating past, and I learn more every single day. So, I, I think that not only has this building been great for the past, but I think that we all have a vision that it can be -- can make a huge difference for Carlin in the future, especially from a tourism perspective. The heritage of the Chinese railroad workers has completely been a surprise for us as well, and we think it's great that people come all the way from China to see what's in our building, so, I hope the Commission will consider funding the whole project, but, as we laid out in our application that -- we did list everything by priority. So, we will be content with whatever the Commission decides to do for us.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you. I'll start by asking a question. There seems to be some question about what -- how you intend to restore the brick and other masonry.

TRUJILLO: Mm hmm.

OSTROVSKY: Are you familiar with the staff's concerns?

TRUJILLO: No, I wasn't informed of any concerns, but I will do my best to address them.

OSTROVSKY: Well, staff believes you need additional
TRUJILLO: Okay.

OSTROVSKY: Could you -- here, I'm going to need, staff's help just a little bit. Rebecca, can you comment on, on the treatment of the brick?

PALMER: Certainly. For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I'd like to sort of start with, with the application of water repellants to brick is usually not recommended and we would not approve such an application. Those act -- the application of water repellants can significant -- could significantly damage the historic fabric, and it's -- we really need far more information concerning that, but, but perhaps I could beg the indulgence of the Chair and, 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. I think -- 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, if the roof is replaced after or, or all the construction occurs and, and penetrates the roof, it could certainly void the, 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, should be done last. This is in slightly -- that would be our recommended prioritization.

STOLDAL: Mr. Chair.

OSTROVSKY: Yes, Mr. Stoldal.

STOLDAL: Rebecca, clear logic that, that is there, including having a seismic plan, 'cause we're going to put a new roof and put the bell tower back on and I think the applicant a few minutes ago said the building is really older than they thought, and they're surprising that it's standing up, but this is such a, an important structure and, and I will tangent and that is, it's really exciting to see Carlin -- I don't what the word -- come to life with its historic presentation effort, so I really want to support it, but my questions to you, Rebecca, what do you guesstimate that the study that you're suggesting, and I think is, is wise, is how
much would that cost roughly? Estimate, guess, something we
could put in no more than our figure.

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.

My recommendation here, given the, the unusual economic
circumstances that we face, is that perhaps the applicant
could get some estimates on what that seismic study could be.

I, I would hesitate to guess what a possible seismic study
might cost for a building this size.

STOLDAL: Well, then I'm, then I'm going to make a
guess because I think we need to have a figure that, that they
can use to go out and immediately get something against -- get
started to work on this, so, so we have a plan, a presentation
that's going to come back in June, July, August, September in,
in, in the next 90 days so we can look at helping restore the
roof and the -- 'cause all, I -- I think that what you just
suggested, the roof, the bell tower, all those things, the
gutters, need to be done at roughly, roughly the same time.

If, if I said $75,000, do you think that kind of a study can
be done within that figure?

PALMER: For the, for the record, this is Rebecca
Palmer. Why don't -- there, 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.

STOLDAL: So I, I --

PALMER: Does that sound like an --

STOLDAL: -- that sounds like a plan, so -- but I mean, I want to make sure that we, we -- that the Commission is asking for a very -- the very specific report, more than just seismic, but this expanded study would include -- what elements is, is the staff recommending that the new study in -- in -- include? Construction plans? Seismic study? What are the things that we are going to be asking for them to come back for?

BROWN: May I? This is Kristen from SHP -- Kristin Brown from SHPO, if I may add some information? I just want to point out that the application already includes a study and there is a dollar amount attached to that, so I think the question would -- 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 a more -- 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, that, you know, that kind of thing is done. It's not a huge building. I don't think it's going to take a lot, you know, 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 some -- we need enough -- we would ideally 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, to the walls to achieve seismic stabilization, and then, you know, 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 the, 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, I mean, like I say, 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.

STOLDAL: So, so Chair, here's what, here's what R6 Studios is, is saying that 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 engi -- 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. We will assess the entire building, but focus in-depth on the roof, the foundation, and, and original windows. It sounds like we're halfway there with this, but we're, we're not getting all the things necessary to give Carlin, here's what, what, 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 Kristin just said and, and list those as, as things and, and add it to this, and then go out to, to bid again.

OSTROVSKY: You know, I -- this is the Chairman again -- I, you know, Bob, you mentioned $75,000, which sounds a lot compared to the -- what they were asking. I mean, maybe not to exceed $50,000 or $60,000 to include the drawing, so they could go to bid and come back to us with some better numbers and a better priority list of projects to be completed, brick, wall, ADA, et cetera, so I would -- I'd be happy to support some number that -- not to exceed, say, $60,000 and hope they can come back to us with more detail that we could then award in, in our next meeting or as soon as possible.

STOLDAL: Kristen, I, I know I was -- we were putting Rebecca on the spot, so the spot's going to jump over to you. Is, is $50,000 a reasonable number?

BROWN: I would think so based on the original quote, but I would like to point out that Mel Green is present on the call and he might have some insight if the Commission would be interested to hear from him as well.

OSTROVSKY: We're, we're always interested to hear from Mel. So if he would like to come on, give us some advice.

GREEN: I, I'm golfing here. Oh, this is my -- this is a baby picture that's up there, by the way. I, 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, to, to mitigate those
and to restore the structure. So from this conversation,
seems logical to me that, you know, what Kristen has said is
the right path to have the architect-engineer team, you know,
do such a study. They can guide the City of Carlin or the
Carlin Historical Society, and we were, you know, 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, I
would think if you're going to ask for such a study, you need
to increase perhaps $40K 'cause I would bring in more
mechanical engineering. They had civil and structural --
civil engineered survey. There was a lot of players and I
think we want to use them all to the best that we can. I
don't know if I'm rambling or not, so excuse me, but --

OSTROVSKY: Mel, would you add $40,000 or a total of
$40,000?

GREEN: It's -- I don't know. I think $40,000
total and let's -- I think the architect can work with that.

OSTROVSKY: Okay. Well, anybody have any other
questions for Mel? We, we appreciate your, your --

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I have a
question for Mel. Mel, would it require -- would, would it
require having a seismologist come from Reno or Salt Lake to
do an analysis of the building? Is that a completely different person who comes in to do that?

GREEN: 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 putting the -- for evaluating and designing the building. So such a player is not required.

KAVANAUGH: Perfect. Thank you.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mel. Mr. Stoldal, would you like to make a motion?

STOLDAL: I'm working on it and, and, and so the motion would be for 21 -- first of all, to back up, I think that the -- I get the sense that the Commission supports the concept of getting the, the bell tower back and, and identifying that building as, as the, the school, so with that in mind, with 23-23, Carlin Historical Society, Carlin School Rehabilitation, I would support a motion that would fund up to $45,000, a study, a seismic study, and other studies that staff would work with Carlin to include, construction and, and other necessary documents to be able to have the City of -- or the Carlin Historic Society come back to the Commission to be able to say, we need this for the roof, we need this for the, for, for the project, but specific dollar figures. That would be my motion.
OSTROVSKY: Do I have a second?

KAVANAUGH: Seconded by Commissioner Kavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY: Any questions? Any public --

KAVANAUGH: I, I do have a question.

OSTROVSKY: Yes. Go ahead, please.

KAVANAUGH: Commissioner Kavanaugh. I have a question. So, just for a point of clarification, does this then allow them, once they've received all of the plan, once they've done this seismic study and, and have developed a plan for this project, are they -- I'm assuming they're permitted to come back and apply for additional funding to get this project rolling?

OSTROVSKY: That's correct.

KAVANAUGH: That's perfect.

OSTROVSKY: Is there a second?

KAVANAUGH: Yes, I seconded that motion.

OSTROVSKY: Oh, I'm sorry. Any other comment? Any public comment? All those in favor of the motion to grant $45,000 to project 21-23, purpose of study and preparation of documents, all those in favor, say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chairman votes in favor. It's unanimous of those commissioners present. We look forward to seeing you back when all those documents and materials are ready. Thank you very much.
UNIDENTIFIED:  (Inaudible).

OSTROVSKY:  Sorry.

KAVANAUGH:  Chairman?

OSTROVSKY:  Yes. This is Antoinette -- Commissioner Kavanaugh. I would like to thank you, Ms. Trujillo, for continuing to promote the Carlin School's history, which has played a large, large part in the, in the Elko County School District history, so I commend you for doing that and teaching about the harvesting of, of ice and other things that were -- that the railroad was used for in the development and, and economic development of Northeastern Nevada. Congratulations.

TRUJILLO:  Thank you, Commissioner Kavanaugh.

OSTROVSKY:  We've completed item number 7, including approving the various amounts. I -- we use item 8 as discussion of the grant, awarding of grants. Do we know what the total we awarded and what the remaining balance will be that the Commission has available? I don't know if staff's had a chance to -- we just moved some numbers around, so it may take them a minute to come up with that.

HITCHCOCK:  Yes, sir. I have those numbers. So far you have awarded $3,335,895, and the remaining balance here is $454,105.

STOLDAL:  Wow. I'm sure glad you did the math 'cause I came up with $2,800,000, so we're, we're close for only --
HITCHCOCK: I can share my screen if you would like to see the numbers, sir.

STOLDAL: Well, you know, it would help if you could to -- 'cause I, I hate being $500,000 off in my checking account.

HITCHCOCK: Of course. And you can correct me if I'm wrong on any of these numbers. Here we go.

OSTROVSKY: There's $200,000 set aside on top of that, right? For administration.

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir.

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

OSTROVSKY: Okay, Bob, now that -- thank you. Now that you've had a chance to look at these numbers, do you --

STOLDAL: Oh, I'm not that fast.

OSTROVSKY: Oh, okay. I'll let you take a minute and take a look at them.

STOLDAL: No, I, I, I'm just -- I have to go back and, and, and -- 'cause I made the notes on each, on each
sheet, but I'm sure the staff is correct, but I was wondering
why I was $500,000 off, but that's, that's the way it is. I
think it was inflation that hit during the meeting.

HITCHCOCK: I also have my notes put in here for each
one where, if they're pending approval.

STOLDAL: Does this money, does this money include
money we set aside? Or is it just the actual grants or does
it include, for example, the money for Washoe County?

HITCHCOCK: Yeah, for example, Washoe County, I have a
note here that you approved $110,000, the $110,607 approved,
$230,443 set aside for future approval -- future approval. I
just included that whole amount in what you --

STOLDAL: Okay. So, so that's where the $4 -- the
$400,000 that I was off --

HITCHCOCK: You're off. That's probably it. Correct.


HITCHCOCK: And the same -- we have awarded the
$83,200, but we're holding the funding until the next meeting
is held to get more information from White Pine.

STOLDAL: So Mr. Chair, the, the number that, that I
have that we have firmly granted, we have indicated we're
going to hold some money pending, 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 -- we just -- 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, with
staff to drop out all those things other than what we have
done today.

OSTROVSKY: That number added to the reserve, we put
aside added to funds that are not expended yet. We, we've got
a considerable amount of money yet to, to grant in this cycle.

STOLDAL: Right. And I think some of those, for
every example, the Carlin, may, may very well come back with, with a
number that will take a, a piece of that. Washoe County will
likely come back, 'cause some of the -- and again, it's
quickly how, how can -- how fast can they turn around and get
these studies done in time to meet some -- 'cause if we don't
get the information back until June of next year, it's going
to be a challenge to --

OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

STOLDAL: -- to do that and we still have Hawthorne.

Hawthorne could, could come back in, in, in September and say,
We need -- we qualify and here's what we're looking for.

OSTROVSKY: So that is all work we will have to do at
our next meeting --

STOLDAL: Yeah.

OSTROVSKY: -- Bob. I will make sure that staff
double checks this and then sends it out, distributes to the
commissioners, so they, they've got a reference table to look
at and double check their own thinking and, and prepare for a future meeting. Before I move on to the next item, is, is any question staff has about this? You okay? You need any guidance from the Commission in any way?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.

No, I think we have adequate guidance. Thank you, sir. And, again, right now, we have $1,080,000 available in bond proceeds. The rest will have to be -- will be available in November.

OSTROVSKY: If it -- yeah, I understand. I -- with permission of -- or the guidance from the rest of the commissioners, I, I would just delegate that authority to staff. They know how much money they have available and be able to dole that out to the shovel-ready projects that can use that 'cause some of these people can't get too -- we can't get faster than the money comes, so we, we've got to, got to make sure some of these projects don't get into the situation where they have expenditures where we don't, we don't yet have reimbursable funds. It, it -- and I think, Rebecca, you, you got a pretty good idea looking at these which ones are go -- ready to go and which ones are going to require enough time and they have to go to bid and so on that, that we've got to make sure we get the rest of the funds in our bank account.

PALMER: Yes, sir.

STOLDAL: Mr. Chairman?
PALMER: Oh.

OSTROVSKY: Yes, Bob.

STOLDAL: Do we need to do anything with Storey County? Are we telling them, yes, we've got some money, but you have to wait till September?

OSTROVSKY: I have to go back. What did we do with -- I have to go back and look at Storey County.

STOLDAL: I'm not sure that we know how much they're asking for. Is that 01?

STOLDAL: I think it's 01 or 02, yeah.

KAVANAUGH: Yeah, that's 01.

STOLDAL: And what did we, what did we grant them? 72?

KAVANAUGH: Yeah.

OSTROVSKY: $72,711, is that --

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kav -- yeah.

$72,711.40.

STOLDAL: I'm not sure what, what, what the process should -- would you -- 'cause I can't -- I'm reading their notes there. Does it, does it, or does it say?

OSTROVSKY: We had to reduce the award because it exceeded the dollar value. I'm not remembering it. I think we did -- I don't have the chart in front of me. I think we did give them the entire $80,418, as I recall.

KAVANAUGH: Yes. This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.
Yes, that's correct. We've had that discussion and then we did approve for the full amount. According to my notes, we approved for $80,418.

OSTROVSKY: That's what my notes show too.

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

STOLDAL: But I think, aren't they asking for additional funding because something was -- there's a section that was excluded from pricing?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. Yes, sir. You are correct.

STOLDAL: If I obtain the cost of the exclude -- I'm reading the, the, the chat. If I obtain the cost excluded items from it, et cetera, would I be able to present an updated bid estimate to the Commission for the increased amount? Of course, the answer would be yes, but that wouldn't be till September. So I guess we don't -- there's no action we need to take beyond what we already did.

OSTROVSKY: That's correct, in my opinion. Okay. Any other discussion or comments regarding 7 or 8? If no, we'll move on. We'll have an opportunity in a moment to discuss
future grants. So, item 9 of the agenda is to elect a Chair and Vice Chair, which is required by NRS 383.502A. So I would open the floor for nominations for Chair.

STOLDAL: Well, as, as required -- Stoldal for the record -- under NRS 383.500, the Commission on Cultural Affairs and Historic Places is required to elected a Chair from its membership. Today is the appropriate day to do that since I, I'm not sure everybody's going to the polls, but I'll be heading there after this meeting. I would like to nominate Robert Ostrovsky based on him not sending any mailings or robocalls out for his --

OSTROVSKY: Reelection.

STOLDAL: But also -- seriously, but for the great work that, that you have done in keeping this often challenging process, but a very important process with taxpayer dollars and important historic things moving forward in a very professional way. So that's my nomination.

OLMSTEAD: I second the nomination. Commissioner Olmstead.

OSTROVSKY: Do we have a nomination for Vice Chair?

OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I would like to nominate Robert Stoldal for Vice Chair.

OSTROVSKY: Are there any other nominations for either position? Hearing none, as there was only one nomination for each position, I will still take a vote. Those who support
the reelection of Chairman Ostrovsky and the reelection of Veteran Chairman Stoldal, please say aye.

MULTIPLE: Aye.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you very much. I appreciate your support. 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 -- just the folks out in the rural and, and even urban areas that put their heart and soul into these, these projects. So thank you all.

STOLDAL: Mr. Chairman, I, I, I look at, at not only as these being historic, 'cause we have the, as we've talked about before, the two functions, which preserve and restore the history, but bring life back into these buildings. But as we're -- as, 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, the construction that's going on, whether they're the construction teams come in. They're spending their money in town, resources and, and, and it's all taking place in, in, 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, in these communities, so it's really more than just bringing cultural affairs and historic places to life. It is, it is an economic stimulus to the, to these communities and I think that's part of what we need to make sure we tell our legislators.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Bob.

KAVANAUGH: If I -- this is Commissioner Kavanaugh. If I could add to that, I would also like to say that these projects bring back social stimulus of community pride. We've lost 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 that -- so that becomes a, 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.

OSTROVSKY: Well, thank you. Item number 10 for discussion only are ideas for possible modifications to the grant program in future cycles. Multiple properties on a single application, for example, number of grant cycles in the biennium and the application and grant manual. It is discussion item, the purpose of which is to raise these issues
and if they take action, to take them up in a future meeting, probably our next meeting. You know, we've had this multiple, multiple property issue before, Brewery Art Center, which has got multiple buildings on a facility, the, the railroad property in Ely, which has multiple buildings, and whether or not -- it stands now, we require single application. I don't know if you want to consider changing that or not. I don't know if anybody has comment or not. We, 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 to -- give them guidance on how to do that so we don't have confusion out there in, in the community is to what they want to do if they want to add an ancillary building. You know, the Huntridge had more than one building on it. 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.

STOLDAL: Well, the challenge, the challenge is sort of stemmed from, from the, the Northern Nevada Railway Foundation just because it's such a, a massive project that goes from potentially Cobra all the way down to Ely over to Ruth to, to, to McGill, even though it's out of the Nevada, although I, I think that Mark Bassett indicated that they don't own the rail line between Ely and, and Ruth, but it's a
complicated process. So basically we have told Mark, if it's a different location, you, you can submit app -- separate applications, but if it's from the, the, the primary place, the depot area, that's got to be one, one application. Same thing with the brewery in Carson City. They had the brewery building and then they also bought the church and it was a half a block up, but it was still owned. It was still the same, but a different address, so they were allowed to file one application for there and another one for, for the brewery building. There was some feeling that was kind of unfair, that they were sort of cutting and dicing and, and, and slicing, and, and this Commission has left it to where, if it's the main area, that can only -- we can only accept one application from there, but if it's an outlying area like McGill or someplace else, well, we'll accept the second application. I think it's worthy of, of having an additional, additional discussion. The, the second thing is we sure had a lot of non-edit audits and a lot of different explanations and, and quite frankly, most of the explanations were, were, were pretty straightforward and, and really honest. I don't mean dis -- I don't mean there were -- 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, it would've been fine. I looked at both the grant application
and, 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.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah, Bob. You know, audits are expensive, particularly for very small --

STOLDAL: Yeah.

OSTROVSKY: -- groups, you know. If you're the City of Reno or the City of -- for Boulder City, it's easy. You have an auditor anyway, but it's not so easy if, if you're scraping together a few bucks in a, in a small area and you have trouble raising funds for any purpose, so I agree. I would like to see that discussion. I -- we need to have some discussion about how strict we want to be in the future on complete and accurate applications. You know, we've -- there were a lot of unanswered questions, material that wasn't submitted. We advise people to do it, bring us up to date, but I mean, you could get really tough and tell them, we're not going to take your application unless it's complete, or, or do we, do we move the deadlines around and give staff time to say, we're sending it back. It's incomplete. We won't even consider it. You've got 30 days to correct it or, you
know, that's a lot of staff work. So I think we have to talk
to staff and amongst ourselves about how strict we should be
and, and I think we, you know, I personally think the
application is not that difficult to fill out.

STOLDAL: No.

OSTROVSKY: I don't know why you can't give us resumes
of the key players, one or two pages, which we didn't get in
some of the applications. Things like that, which are easy to
do, but -- and we became a checklist and they still didn't do
it. So it was very frustrating this time around and I think
we need to make a firm policy decision about how much latitude
and what procedure -- what will happen if you don't provide
all of the information as required. So I'd like to have that
discussion too.

STOLDAL: Well, we sort of did it a bit with White
Pine. We didn't tell them no, but we said, you're not going
to get a yes until you --

OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

STOLDAL: -- so maybe that's the answer is we tell
them, we just -- well, we should have that discussion and, and
figure out if, if you don't fill out, out the application and
you don't explain why you didn't do it -- I was -- I will tell
you on the record that I was concerned about the application
from, from Mark Bassett, why, why he would take out the
ownership, but I was satisfied with his answer.
OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

STOLDAL: Be -- because he also said in the narrative that this is who the ownership is, but why you would, with the line up there, it clearly says, don't, don't alter this, so all their explanations were straightforward, open about this and that and, and the other challenge is we need to make hardcore at the top. You need an audit or an explanation why, and you need to tell us who the owner is of these buildings or these things. That's got to be -- we -- if we don't have those or an explanation why, we move on.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I was fully prepared today after looking, you know, going through our, our notes, our packet that we have from our, our staff to not approve some of these grants because they were missing components of the grant. I've served on a number of state organizations where we have not only awarded state funds, but also federal funds as a flow through and we have not awarded grants if they were late or incomplete, because we own it. If that organization doesn't come through with those documents, we as a commission, we own it and we have to explain to the taxpayers if something goes awry. So I -- to be quite blunt, I, I was prepared today to say not approved and I was -- I've never been through the process in this commission, so I was follow -- I was being a follower today and, and I think it
makes it cleaner for us if we just say, if you have an
incomplete grant, it will not -- it won't -- 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, then the staff -- if we tell our staff, if they --
if it's an incomplete application, it will not go forward to
the Commission for a review. And if the, 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, how we're going to move forward.

OSTROVSKY:       (Inaudible).

KAVANAUGH:     I would recommend, I would recommend that
we have that conversation and we, 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 have to be, you
know, as, as Bob had stated earlier, we're responsible for
these funds and awarding these funds and I'm, I'm -- I feel
like we're at the mercy of those people to provide that --
those documents now to our staff as we move forward. But with
that said, I, I know too that we were really in a, 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, and I feel and understand that as well. So I'll --

OSTROVSKY: Well, I think --

KAVANAUGH: I think we should really have a conversation about how we're going to proceed.

OSTROVSKY: Yeah, I absolutely agree. I, I don't know where we're land in that discussion, but we need to have that and make a firm decision 'cause I think to be fair to the applicants, they should know, staff should know, and this Commission should know what the rules are and once you have rules, it's easy to live by them. When you don't have rules, it becomes very gray, and gray is not where we want to be. We want to be in the black-and-white category.

OSTROVSKY: And I agree with Commission Kavanaugh. I, I -- but I will also, as we, we talked about at the beginning, these were some of the, I would say, worst, but it's probably not the best word. Some of the worst applications that we have ever had. Nine -- 90% of them are filled out properly and, and everything is -- whatever occurred, we can blame it on COVID or whatever. This time around, they were just not up, up to snuff and, and so I, I hope that what Commissioner Kavanaugh 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. I, I had no, no, no on, on several of these and I heard the explanation and I said, well, okay, this
is a, this is a really important project. We don't want to lose the money and they've been put on notice. They better come up with, with the, the, the document, but that means more work for, for, for the staff. So it's a topic and I think we do need to put, put the, the, the, the foot down on making sure 'cause none of the questions -- they're all relevant questions. They're all important questions as to, as to why, why you should get $250,000, $70,000, $300,000, $400,000. know that's not a lot of money these days, but he says, he says semi-sarcastically, but the, the, but -- and again, these -- we are charged with developing a cultural network around the state. That's the other thing that we are charged with, so, we just need to make sure we do it in the most efficient and, and credible way. Thank you, Chair.

OSTROVSKY: Any other comments from commissioners? If not, thank you very much. Before I go to public comment, I just would like to thank everyone for taking their time out today. We were in the envious position today of not having to make huge cuts and asking people to, to make tough decisions about how to phase in their projects because for the first time in -- that I've been involved in this commission, we actually had funds available, and we didn't, didn't have to shortchange people because we didn't have the money available, so it was, it was a different, a little different process today, but it, it worked out fine. Now's the time for public
comment. Comment will not be restricted based on viewpoint.
No action will be taken on any matters raised during public
comment period not already on the agenda. I would ask that
anyone who wants to make public comment, please identify
themselves for the record. This is now the appropriate time
for comment. So is there any member of the public that would
like to make any comment?

HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. Mark Bassett would like to.

OSTROVSKY: All right. Mark, please.

BASSETT: Again, good afternoon, commissioners and
thank you very, very much. I, I can feel your pain on
incomplete applications. I mean, I had a mistake on mine.
The only thing I'd like to point out is that a lot of these
organizations that have submitted are, are volunteer
organizations and they're, they're doing this because they
want betterment for their community and everything else. One
possible idea might be, is that you 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.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mark. Anyone else have a
comment? Has any commissioner received any email, telephone
calls, text messages, any other public comment that should be
put on the record during the meeting? Haring none, I, again,
thank everyone for their time today and look forward to seeing
you in the near future where maybe we can wrap up the rest of
these -- this grant process for this cycle. So there being no
further agendized items, I would now adjourn this meeting.

Thank you.

STOLDAL: Thank you.

KAVANAUGH: Thank you. Mr. Chair. Thank you for your
leadership.

OSTROVSKY: Thank you.

WALSH: Thank you, Commission and staff. Well
done.

STOLDAL: Good-bye.

[end of meeting]