

STEVE SISOLAK
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA



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

Chairman
ROBERT OSTROVSKY

Vice Chairman
ROBERT STOLDAL

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

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

MEETING MINUTES
Monday, September 19, 2022,
2:00pm

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

Location:

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

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

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

Passcode: 954137

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

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

669-900-6833 or

253-215-8782 or

346-248-7799 or

929-436-2866 or

301-715-8592 or

312-626-6799

Webinar ID: 882 4875 6949

Passcode: 954137

Additionally, public comment or testimony can be submitted via email to ccloud@shpo.nv.gov or leaving a voice message at: (775) 684-3448. Voice messages received during the meeting will be transcribed and read to the Commissioners during the meeting. The Commission will make reasonable efforts to include all comments received by email and voicemail into the record. Please try to provide email or voicemail comments by 9:00am September 19, 2022. Comments are limited to 3 minutes per person.

**Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm**

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

1. Call to order by Chairman Robert Ostrovsky (The Chair)
2. Roll call of Commissioners and determination of quorum.

Commissioners:

Robert Ostrovsky, Chairman (Board of Museums and History, Governor's Appointee) **Present**
Robert Stoldal, *Vice Chair* (Board of Museums and History) **Present**
Antoinette Cavanaugh **Not Present**
Patricia Olmstead (At-Large, Governor's Appointee) **Present**
Yale Yeandel Present
David Ortlipp **Present**
E'sha Hoferer (Native American Representative) **Not Present**

Chair determined a quorum was present.

3. Public comment.

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

There was no public comment.

4. Approval of minutes from previous meetings **(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**.
 - 4a) February 1, 2022
 - 4b) June 14, 2022

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

Motion Passed Unanimously.

5. Summary of the status of the Commission grants for the FY19-20 cycle that were extended to Jan 1, 2023.

Rebecca Palmer reported on the status of the Commission grants, beginning with 19-01, the White Pine County Community Choir Association. Rebecca Palmer noted that the issues with the proposed elevator have delayed this project and that the costs of supplies and contractor's costs have doubled since the time of the original request. Rebecca Palmer indicated that at this

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

time, the contractors are working with the architect to determine how much of the original 19 request can be completed in a timely fashion. Rebecca Palmer explained that the grantee has been notified of the need for a project change request in order to allocate grant funds to a different category than originally proposed in the scope of work. Rebecca Palmer further indicated that this project request has not yet been received and the hope is that the project will be completed by the end of the grant cycle in January of 2023.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the money needs to be spent by the end of the grant period, and if there is a hard deadline by which the grant need to be spent and/or if it will otherwise be lost and unable to be allocated to another grant from the same cycle.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that the first choice is to delete the elevator entirely from the '19 grant and reallocate the grant funds to other parts of the scope of work. The second choice, Rebecca Palmer explained, is to reduce the price on the elevator to something more manageable.

Kristen Brown discussed the options for different elevators and confirmed that there have not yet been any updates about the project or process of research for the project.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that the final date in the funding agreement is January of 2023 per the Commission's decision to extend the grants needing extension. Rebecca Palmer explained that because these bonds were sold in November, there may be additional time but not later than July of 2023 should the Commission agree to further extend the funding agreement.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the July 2023 date would allow money to be expended upon another grantee should the funds not be able to be reallocated to this project.

Rebecca Palmer explained that the Commission won't lose the funding but will need to pay arbitrage fees. Rebecca Palmer further indicated that the Commission has never had to pay arbitrage fees to date. Rebecca Palmer stated her recommendation that the Commission continue to work with the grantee to clarify and finalize the elevator change.

The Chair reminded the Commission that this is not an action item and as such, an agenda item would need to be created for the next meeting.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the Commission needed to even get involved if an alternative plan to the elevator was determined to be the best course of action.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that if the proposal stays consistent with the original request reviewed and granted by the Commission, this could then be a staff administrative decision. Rebecca Palmer further indicated that if the plan does not stay within the original request, the Commission will then need to review those requests.

Rebecca Palmer next discussed CCCHP-19-10, Friends of the Dangberg Home Ranch, indicating that this project is anticipated to be completed by September 30, 2022.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that CCCHP-19-12, St. Mary's Art Center, anticipates completing

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

their project by September 30, 2022. Rebecca Palmer explained that there is only one coat of paint that needs to be added to the porch, and that this task is being coordinated with property bookings in order to avoid wet paint.

Vice Chair Stoldal informed the Commission that he has had a chance to visit St. Mary's and complimented the work that has been done on the porch.

Rebecca Palmer explained that the Nevada Northern Railway Foundation Transportation Building and Vault upgrades, CCCHP 19-17, indicated that the utility work will be complete by the end of September, and then the rest of the work will be complete by the end of 2022.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that CCCHP-19-19, the City of Ely, anticipates completing their grant by September 30, 2022 and that the grant came in \$6,000 under budget.

Rebecca Palmer informed the Commission that grantee 19-20, the Goldfield Historical Society, has been working continuously to find a contractor willing to work in a remote environment, and that this issue will appear under agenda item 8 at today's meeting.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that CCCHP-19-22, Carlin Historical Society, should have completed their project by September 1 and the Commission has no reason to believe that this has not occurred and indicated that the status of extended grants is based on the August progress report.

Rebecca Palmer explained that CCCHP-19-24, the Thunderbird Lodge Preservation Society has experienced continuing contractor and material delays and the project is anticipated to be completed by October 31 with an upcoming progress report in November.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the Commission could be notified on whether or not grantees have met their deadlines for September, October, or November.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that staff would be happy to inform the Commission when grantees meet their target dates, and can do so by sending out an email.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the Commission could be updated monthly.

The Chair asked if staff's regular reporting is monthly or quarterly.

Carla Cloud indicated that grantees are asked to report quarterly.

The Chair requested a follow-up email to see all the reports.

Carla Cloud concurred and indicated that the next report is due November 1.

Rebecca Palmer reiterated that information that comes from the progress reports will be submitted to the Commission.

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

Rebeca Palmer next discussed grantee CCCHP-19-25, Western Missionary Museum Corporation, indicating that there was some misunderstanding on the part of the grantee as to when documentation would be submitted. Rebecca Palmer reminded the Commission that this grant was modified from a construction grant to a documentation grant in a previous meeting and explained that the grantee now understands that SHPO staff needs time to review documentation. As such, the submission date has been slightly modified in order to allow SHPO staff time to review those documents before the close of the funding agreement.

6. Review and discussion of the additional documentation requested by the Commission at the June 14, 2022 meeting. **(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION).**

The Chair reminded the Commission that in the last grant cycle, appropriate funding was set aside for a number of grants but not approved as the Commission wished to see additional information or documentation prior to approval.

- 6a) CCCHP-21-02 - Comstock Cemetery Foundation

Rebecca Palmer reminded the Commission that items requested were the memorandum of agreement between Storey County and the Comstock Cemetery Foundation. Rebecca Palmer indicated that the items received were as follows: a statement of ownership confirmation and clarification; a letter dated July 14, 2022 from Hugh Roy Marshall; and a letter dated August 13, 2014 from Storey County Commissioner's Office. Rebeca Palmer explained that the document memorandum of agreement between Storey County and CCF requested by the Commission was not received.

The Chair opened the floor to Commissioners for questions.

Candace Wheeler, Comstock Cemetery Foundation, reminded the Commission that because the cemetery is running out of space, approximately four years ago, a request for donation of land from the County and/or Huber and Marshall Consolidated Virginia Mining was made. As a result, Candace Wheeler explained that Mr. Marshall wanted an MOU between the Cemetery Foundation and the County to ensure that we were given the ability to completely manage the land, and then the County wanted the land, the additional land for modern burials to be conveyed to them, and everybody is on the same page, but everybody wants to do it correctly. And so that is taking time, not so much from the MOU standpoint, but the lease between Consolidated Virginia Mining and the County, because in there Mr. Marshall wanted a family plot, and they're trying to do this with legal descriptions and trying to avoid doing a full survey, which could cost about \$12,000. And it's just taking them time to get it organized. But as Mr. Marshall's letter explains, no land ownership has changed at all. We are still in possession of a 99-year lease to all the property and we still own the visitor center. So at the moment, it's status quo until those issues are ironed out by them.

Vice Chair Stoldal stated that this helps clarify a cloudy situation and that this satisfies the Commission.

The Chair indicated that \$55,400 is still outstanding.

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

Carla Cloud confirmed that this was correct.

Motion to approve the grant in the amount of \$55,400: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments.

Motion Passed Unanimously.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the Commission could get a status report on the funding.

The Chair indicated that this would be done under item 11 and reminded the Commission that all of the grants are within the budget approved at the prior meeting.

6b) CCCHP-21-10 - White Pine Community Choir Association

Rebecca Palmer reminded the Commission that in the previous grant hearing, this particular grantee had some missing items from their application. I would like to report that all of the missing items with one exception have been provided per the Commission's request. That was photographs of the exterior elevations, photographs of the major rooms, the mission statement, the detailed report on grant status, resumes for principal professionals, current board members, copy of the organization's long range plans, activities for the past fiscal year, a copy of the latest audit or in this case why the audit is not available, a printout of the County Assessor's web website, and, a question from the Commission about the seismic proposal. The Commission requested that this project not piecemeal the seismic proposal. We have received information based on quotes, and a building assessment done in 2018 that the Southwest Corner has the settlement issues and does require repair, and they are going to face the seismic reinforcement for the benefit of the building. The one remaining item that was not provided was an itemized list or contractor quotes. We have the list, but there are no quotes attached to the documents received.

Mary Eldridge, White Pine Community Choir Association secretary and grants director explained that the figures used for this budget came directly from the contractors.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that the submission contained no actual quotes from those contractors.

Kristen Brown explained that we do have the dollar amounts from the contractor, but what we don't have is simply the photocopy of the contractor quote on the contractor letterhead, with an itemized list and their name and address.

Carla Cloud confirmed that this was correct.

The Chair asked the applicant if they have this information available.

Mary Eldridge indicated that she does from the design firm and the engineering firm, but not from construction as the numbers were sent in an email from the contractor.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if there is a total dollar figure of how much the Commission has allocated over they years to this project, including potentially this grant.

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

Carla Cloud indicated that the amounts total \$313,000, not including the potential of another \$83,000.

The Chair indicated the importance of staff and the Commission to have quotes for the work rather than just a generic dollar figure and expressed concern with moving forward without those actual quotes, and would take a recommendation from staff that whether we hold this grant up until we get those actual quotes and grant and the staff can sign off on it and then move forward. And then secondly, there's a detailed, what are called safeguards and how the money is spent, but it's not an audit, and we are now looking at \$400,000. And as we get later on in our Board agenda, we're going to talk about that and I would suggest that one of the requirements would be if the grants were five or seven or \$8,000, maybe there's not the necessity of a particular audit, but when we start getting 75, a hundred, 200, 300, \$400,000 to a particular grant application, some form may be required. So, my point now is I think we need the quotes, the contractor quotes, before we can move forward.

Motion to approve the grant in the amount of \$83,200 following the receipt of the actual quote from the appropriate contractor: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead.

Commissioner Ortlipp raised the idea that an email mentioning the quote would not be sufficient.

The Chair indicated that something on letterhead with a firm, solid bid would suffice.

Motion Passed Unanimously.

6c) CCCHP-21-14 - Old Glory Theater Co.

Rebecca Palmer reminded the Commission that the requested amount was for \$227,237.50 and that the documentation requested has been provided by the applicant.

The Chair reiterated the idea that the Commission will need to make some sort of decision on a dollar amount that will require an audit.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked how the Commission can understand and ensure that the money granted is being spent properly.

Rebecca Palmer explained that traditionally, the Commission and its predecessor, the CCA, set these grants as reimbursable grants. In other words, the expenditures would already have occurred to pay for the items identified in the grant, and then the grantees would come to the office for reimbursement of those expenditures, so we would request at that time both the completion of the reimbursement request paperwork and proof of payment to the contractor. And the proof of payment can be a canceled check, canceled by the contractor and deposited in their account, or it can be in the case of state agencies of the wireless transmission of funds to the contractor. In some circumstances, that requirement to be a reimbursable grant has been waived and we do pay on invoice. However, there is no such request in this case so the grantee would have to pay their

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

contractors and then seek reimbursement for those expenses from my office.

The Chair raised the issue of the neon sign that had been discussed at the previous meeting.

Kansas Bowling indicated that the name of the theater will be changed. As such, no parts of the sign are being removed, so this means simply adding new neon on top of the iron that's there.

The Chair asked the original name of the facility.

Kansas Bowling indicated that it was the Cactus, then the Cinadome, and will now be Old Glory to go with the patriotic theme of Hawthorne.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked for an explanation of the Quonset hut structure's invention in Yerington for the war.

Kansas Bowling explained that the building is a Quonset hut and noted that it had been invented nearby, thus making it a notable structure in the area.

Vice Chair Stoldal clarified that the Quonset hut was built in Yerington, but not invented there.

Kansas Bowling apologized for any possible inaccuracies.

The Chair indicated the importance of accurately stating the history of this structure in the grants.

Vice Chair Stoldal concurred.

The Chair asked how the building will be used following its completion.

Kansas Bowling indicated that the heads of the nonprofit will be the programmers at first. Beyond that has not yet been decided, but everything will be on 35 millimeter on the original projectors inside the theater.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if in addition to returning to a movie theater, if there will be options for live entertainment.

Kansas Bowling indicated that it will primarily be a movie theater and at this time, there are no plans for live events, but that live events have not been completely ruled out.

Motion to approve the request for the Old Glory Theatre in the amount of \$227,238: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Ortlipp.

Yale Yeandel asked if the projectors are period or modern movie.

Kansas Bowling indicated that the particular projectors in the theater right now date from the 1960s and that the theater intends to get a second projector to do a dual projector system.

Yale Yeandel asked if the \$200 was mostly to sustain the building and asked how many audiences can be housed.

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

Kansas Bowling explained that there are 190 seats and one screen.

The Chair asked for a general explanation of the project that the Commission is funding.

Kansas Bowling explained that the biggest costs will include installing a new HVAC system, new plumbing, and the restoration of the neon sign.

Motion passed unanimously.

6d) CCCHP-21-19 - City of Carlin

Rebecca Palmer indicated that this applicant did receive an award, and the Commission requested 3 items: a seismic study; an engineering study with a focus on key structural elements such as the foundation; and estimates for funds needed to initiate whatever the immediate needs of the building were. The items that we received were proof of insurance and a description of research done to date. Staff advised the grantee that if the documents requested by the Commission were not available, that they explain the research they have done to date, and that was included.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if any of the original \$30,000 has been expended.

Kristen Brown explained that it has not yet, but the applicant does have a quote from an architect for the \$30,000 in order to expend the money as quickly as possible and that the applicant needs the grant money in order to complete the studies. So, in an effort to try to expend that 30,000 as quickly as possible, the architect split the quote into two pieces, and we have it explained in the bulleted section of the staff notes. Quote one was for that 30,000 and the architect determined how much could occur for 30,000 and that with that money, the architect can begin immediately. If necessary, they could do site visits, they could do full documentation, start doing the seismic study, running the structural calculations and numbers. They could start working on evaluating the whole building, making some recommendations, that kind of thing. That's always the first step in this type of study. And that's the part that can begin now to expend that 30,000. Then the second quote is really just the second half of it, which is the drawings themselves. And that was the last update that we had received from the applicant. It's possible that there has been more work done since that time.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked for confirmation that the Commission has already approved the 30,000, but to move forward quicker, the applicant is asking for an additional \$44,000 and then another \$44,000 for the roof.

Kristen Brown confirmed that this is correct.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if making a motion to approve the \$84,115 would be a reasonable approach.

Rebecca Palmer confirmed that it would.

The Chair indicated his belief that there was some issue about an appropriate roof to meet the

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

standard and asked if that had yet been determined.

Kristen Brown indicated that staff needs to work with the applicant to discuss the most appropriate type of roof.

Yale Yeandel asked if the bid for the roof is still good.

Madison Aviles indicated that the quote would no longer be valid, but that the contractor would be contacted for an updated quote.

Rebecca Palmer asked that because the Commission is awarding based on an older quote, is it the Commission's desire to ensure the completion of the roof project.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated his belief that the Commission has the authority to increase that amount and would amend his motion to include this.

Motion to approve the additional \$40,000 for the study and \$53,000, which includes a 20 percent increase, for the roof: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Yeandel.

Commissioner Yeandel indicated concern that the 20 percent increase may not be enough.

The Chair indicated that the applicant has the opportunity to come back to the Commission for additional funding should the bid turn out to be higher than the awarded amount.

Motion Passed Unanimously.

6e) CCCHP-21-23 - Carlin Historical Society

Rebecca Palmer explained that the Commission requested estimates for roof replacement, estimates for the reconstruction of the widow's walk and the bell tower, and seismic stabilization, if needed, and reinforcement of the roof structure. The Commission also requested a seismic study, an engineering study with a focus on the key structural elements such as the foundation, and drawings and specifications for construction. The items we received, again staff provided guidance to the grantee that if this information was not available, that they provide us with a status report for the estimates for those activities. We received an estimate for the preparation of drawings, we received an estimate for the preparation of the architectural study, and an estimate for construction costs for reconstruction of the widows walk and the bell tower.

The Chair asked what the Commission had set aside at the last hearing for funding this project.

Rebecca Palmer explained that the grantee did receive an award of \$45,000 for the architectural study. The grantee received a quote, the first quote is for the architectural design services, and it came in at 65,000. So, 20,000 above the awarded amount totaling an additional requested amount of \$190,002.64.

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

Kristen Brown noted that these two quotes are basically the same as the previous Carlin grant award with the only difference being that they are listed in a different order. So for this particular grant, the 21-23 that we're discussing now, quote 2 is actually the one that would occur first. Quote 2 is the \$45,000 that the Commission previously granted, and that is to do the study and analysis for seismic, for architecture, for recommendations, evaluating the building condition and all of that, all the calculations that are required to make the building stable. The next step is to prepare the drawings themselves to be able to actually then take those drawings and get the permits at the County and take the drawings out to bid and get bids from contractors to actually do the work. So those two go hand in hand. The 45 occurs first with the money that has already been granted and the 65 would be the next step. And then I just also want to point out that in the supporting documentation for agenda item 7-E that is on our website, if you look at page 15, that is where the dollar amounts for the actual brick and mortar construction work are listed. You will note that those are not quotes from contractors. That is just a list of best guesses, educated of course, educated guess dollar amounts from another architect in town, in Elko. So the architect is using construction estimating skills to come up with these dollar amounts, but because we don't have the drawings yet, they can't shop out those drawings for bids from contractors. So those dollar amounts may change once actual contractors have a chance to submit bids.

Vice Chair Stoldal suggested that the Commission allocate \$109,003, and that includes the 45 we've already allocated. And then an additional 65, additional 68 and additional 11,006 for 145, plus the 45 we've already given. And while those construction costs are in fact estimates, the asterisk that would go with my motion would be the construction costs that staff would have to have actual quotes from the contractors before that money would be spent. If we don't get the quotes, then staff doesn't move forward with that. I'm only suggesting we allocate 109,000 to move this project forward as fast as we can, knowing that we've got some significant studies to do beforehand, before the contractors' quotes can be actually requested. But I think this is a very important project and Carlin really needs to be supported for all the effort it is moving forward in the last couple, three years to really bring in historic preservation and provide these cultural centers. So I think it would be important that we don't have direct quotes, we have estimates, but we will not fund it until we get the exact quotes. So, my motion would be for 190,000 when you're ready for one, if following further discussion.

Motion to approve an additional \$145,000 to fund the studies and the initial cost for construction following an actual securing of bids: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments.

Motion passed unanimously.

7. Review of Storey County's request for additional funding in the amount of \$18, 721 to their grant (CCCHP-21-01) to cover the costs of material and labor increases from the original application (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Rebecca Palmer indicated that the documentation was provided to the Commissioners and that the balance remaining for the grant fund is \$216,104.50 before any awards to grantees requesting additional

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

funding.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated I'm just not sure if I understand in looking at the bid from the United Electric Service, as well as the updated proposal. On one of them, from the bid included, it lists everything excluded, it lists what is not included, and then the budget numbers individually. So, excluded number 2 is drywall, carpet and other surface repair, but yet in the actual budget numbers there's money for drywall and carpet repair for \$7,500. So one says the drywall and the carpet is excluded, but then the budget includes \$7,500 for drywall and carpet repair.

Honey Menefee, Storey County, explained that this is a format that they use. And because we knew that the electrical project for the court was going to involve carpet from areas of carpet, a lot of the outlets are in the flooring. And then a lot of the outlets and devices are also in the drywall. Because I noticed that the drywall, carpet and other surface repair was excluded, I asked them to include a price that could involve that work. So, when they came back with the July 6 estimate, they put a contingency because at the time, they don't know the extent of what is going to be involved until they get in there to see the amount of work that's going to be done with the carpet and the drywall. So that's why in the second one they have included this \$7,500 contingency. If you've noticed that for the budget numbers, they don't have the hours that is estimated because it's sort of an unknown at this point. But because I asked them to provide some sort of estimate for the cost that could be involved with that drywall and carpet, that is what they came up with.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if the amount for this goes beyond that \$7,500, if Storey County would then pick up the additional cost.

Honey Menefee confirmed that it would.

Motion to approve Storey County 21-01 for the additional \$18,721: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by unidentified Commissioner. No Commissioner comments.

Motion passed unanimously.

8. Review of the Fallon Community Theatre's request for additional funding in the amount of \$15,000 to their grant (CCCHP-21-05) to cover the increased cost of metal and roofing from the original application.
(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Rebecca Palmer explained that when this meeting was rescheduled to September the 19th, 2022, staff sent out a notification to the grantees consistent with the request of the Commission in their June hearing that if any party had additional costs that they've discovered since their original application due to economic issues or increasing supply costs or contractor costs, that they were to notify staff and provide an estimate as to what those additional costs might be. The Fallon Community Theatre's original request is now grant number 21-05 and is now \$15,000 below the required funding.

Motion to approve the additional \$15,000 for Storey County: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments.

Motion passed unanimously.

**Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm**

9. Review of the Historic Fourth Ward (CCCHP-21-04) request to seek reimbursement for the installation of the scaffolding prior to receiving a fully executed agreement and recording of covenants. **(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Rebecca Palmer noted for the Commission's benefit and the benefit of the public and the grantees that happen to be on this Zoom call, the CCCHP grant manual very clearly states on page 7 that a grantee cannot begin the grant-funded portion of their project until the covenants are officially recorded, and the proof of recording and the original covenants are received by SHPO. On August the 29, 2022, SHPO staff had a phone conversation with the grantee's representative, where the grantee informed SHPO staff that the scaffolding had already been in place and the grantee was going to seek reimbursement for the scaffolding construction. There are some dates to be aware of. The funding agreement project commencement date was August 15, 2022. This date was set in consultation with the grantee because they felt that they could begin work quickly. However, there were delays in the execution of the funding agreement and the funding agreement was not executed until August 24, 2022. The recorded covenants were received by SHPO staff on August 30, 2022, two weeks after the initiation of the project. At this point the Commission must decide whether to reimburse the requested funding for the scaffolding construction or not.

The Chair asked for the total amount.

Carla Cloud confirmed that the amount that the Historic Fourth Ward paid to the Raymond Brothers for the scaffolding was \$69,600 on September 6, 2022.

The Chair asked for confirmation that this is a request for an approval of an expenditure outside the normal funding process but is not asking for additional money beyond their grant.

Rebecca Palmer confirmed that this was correct. I would like to note also for the record that the commencement date of the activities was August the 15th. The scaffolding was put in place on August the 17th. So, it does appear that the work was conducted within the commencement and termination dates identified in the funding agreement, but the funding agreement was not executed until August the 24th, 2022.

Motion to approve the request: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead.

A Commissioner asked if the scaffolding was rented or purchased.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated his belief that it is leased out.

Motion passed unanimously.

10. Review and decision to award the Goldfield Historical Society (CCCHP-19-20) either with additional remaining administrative funds from FY19-20 cycle or a portion of their FY21-22 grant in the amount of \$85, 469,80 to complete their FY 19-20 project. **(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

Rebecca Palmer explained that Consistent with the Commission's desire to ensure that there was a

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

complete project, and in discussions with the grantee and yourself, we augmented their '19 grant with an additional amount of 85,469.80 so that they would have a complete FY '19 and '20 project. This revenue will allow the FY '19-'20 award to be completed; however, I now seek the Commission's decision as to what the source of the revenue to support the additional \$85,469.80 will be. It can either come from the FY '19-'20 remaining administrative funds, or it can come from a portion of the grantees FY '21-'22 grant, which is for another phase of the roofing project consistent also with the Commission's desire that the project remain similar to that reviewed during a grant hearing. So I ask the Commission for a decision as to what the revenue source might be.

The Chair asked if the money was taken from the remaining administrative funds that are available, it would spill over then to item 11, which would then leave us approximately 13,000 additional dollars yet to be distributed from those administrative funds. Is that correct?

Rebecca Palmer confirmed that this is correct.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that to me is one of the essential projects statewide and I would support taking the \$85,500. I would prefer to allocate it out of the 19 and 20. We're running out of time to spend that, and I'd rather we look for 21-22 for other projects.

Motion to approve the request for \$85,000 for the Goldfield High School out of the CCCHP '19-'20 fiscal funds: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Ortlipp. No Commissioner comments.

Motion passed unanimously.

11. Discussion and decision for the distribution of remaining funds from the FY19-20 grant cycle. (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

Carla Cloud indicated that there is \$13,745 remaining in funds plus an additional \$15,000 in grants not yet expended, for a total of \$28,912.42.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked what could drive that amount either up or down.

Clara Cloud explained that the remaining amount would need to be redistributed by the Commission, and that amount could go up if, for unforeseen reasons, the other grantees were unable to finish their projects by January or if they came in under budget and had remaining funds.

The Chair asked if in addition to that, staff can make some de Minimis changes to the amounts that they go over.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that staff would be happy to do so.

Rebecca Palmer explained that there are several grantees still working on FY 19-20 projects, and they may very well come in under budget, or they may have so many challenges that they may not be able to complete their project and if that were the case, staff recommends that there be a contingency for what to do with the remaining funds, including any interest earned on the proceeds before the entire close of the grant. In addition, we have one grantee, the city of Ely, the Ely Old City Hall, that came in under budget already at approximately \$6,000. Consistent with the Commission's wishes, we have reverted the funding back to the

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

pot, in the amount of around \$6,000. The grantee has requested that they be awarded the additional \$6,000 to augment their FY 21-22 grant in the amount of \$6,000. That is certainly one option. Another alternative for a decision to distribute the remaining FY 19-20 funding would be to distribute the funds to all or a portion of the FY 21 grantees who were also FY 19 and 20 grantees. That 13,000 will actually end up probably being more in the range of \$28,912.42, and could not go to a 21 grantee who was not also a 19 grantee.

Vice chair Stoldal indicated that there are different motions to distribute the remaining finds and asked the DAG if that should be one motion that includes several items or several different motions.

The DAG indicated that either way is acceptable.

Motion to approve Ely's request for their coming under budget of \$6,000 for the 19-20 grant that they received and move that to their 20-21 grant: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments.

Motion passed unanimously.

The Chair asked for the remaining balance.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that the remaining balance would be \$28,912.43 of FY '19 funding.

Vice Chair Stoldal suggested that this could be distributed in one of two ways: either everybody gets the same piece or there's some mathematical formula that they get some ratio to what their grant is in 20-21. One way is less complicated, the other way would be some math that I'm not capable of doing. But that would be one suggestion. And the other suggestion would be to simply let staff make those decisions on the neediest that are coming up in the 21-20 cycle.

The Chair indicated his concern regarding the creeping cost of construction. As we know, in rural areas in particular, getting contractors to work in some remote areas becomes very difficult and very expensive. Just the transportation costs, which have increased significantly in the last 12 months, makes it more difficult. I was thinking that I think your way of allowing staff to augment the various grantees as needed for inflationary costs for the grants that we've already approved. Some of those grantees have completed their funding. We had one that saved money, the 6,000 we just talked about. I would support allowing staff to distribute it as needed, obviously reporting back to us on where those funds are expended to help offset the cost of inflation.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked for confirmation that the matrix is that the remaining funds can only go to those grantees that received money in 19-20 and 20-21.

Rebecca Palmer confirmed that this is correct.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if there is a way to see potentially who those grantees are.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that this information is in the summary documents sent for agenda item 5.

The Chair asked for confirmation that these would be the grantees that are with uncompleted projects.

**Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm**

Rebecca Palmer indicated that this is correct and listed the projects: White Pine County Community Choir Association, St. Mary's Art Center, Nevada Northern Railway Foundation, the City of Ely, the Goldfield Historical Society, and the Carlin Historical Society. In addition, Rebecca Palmer indicated that if the decision is to either augment a 19 grant or a 21-22 grant, the pool of possible recipients grows larger.

The Chair noted that this is because there are projects in that grant period that did not receive money in the next cycle, but their projects are still ongoing.

Rebecca Palmer noted that this is correct, and that there are also FY '19 grantees who have completed their project, but who have applied for FY 21-22 grant funds.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked if this decision needs to be made today or if there is time to make that decision.

Rebecca Palmer explained that there is time to make that decision. So if I have the Commission's direction to augment 2019 grants to account for cost increases, the \$28,912 will shrink if we do that. And then in the next Commission meeting, you would receive a report as to what that remaining balance will be.

Motion to use the remaining 19-20 funds now at \$28,900, but could go up, and that would include any increase if projects came in under budget, and to allow staff to allocate those funds to any of the 19-20 applicants whose costs have gone up and then provide a report to the Board at the next meeting: Vice Chair Stoldal; second by Commissioner Olmstead. No Commissioner comments.

Motion passed unanimously.

Carla Cloud noted that the Cemetery Foundation CCCHP-21-02 would like to request another \$8400 for design drawings for handicap toilets to be reviewed/approved by engineers and asked if there is another point in this process where this addition could be requested.

The Chair asked if those types of requests want to be taken now or at a future meeting.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that it is a known applicant and that the Commission would certainly like to make the ADA facilities available at the site.

The Chair noted his preference would be to get it in writing and take a look at it.

An unidentified speaker noted that as a point of order, this would need to be agendaized as a future item.

Carla Cloud noted that there is a note to see the architect's quote, but indicated that she did not know if that is already included in the quote that they provided.

The Chair noted that he would like to discuss this at the next meeting.

12. Discussion and decision on what may be required of a non-profit for an audit. (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

The Chair noted for those Commissioners who weren't present, we've struggled recently with a question

Meeting Notice and Agenda September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

of audits which are required, and we have agencies and small foundations which have not done audits. They've provided us varying information about how they track expenditures, how many signatures are required, bank records, et cetera, but no audit per se. We all know audits can be expensive, but as Mr. Stoldal said earlier, if you're getting \$400,000, an audit would seem like a reasonable request if your total project cost is \$19,000, and we granted it, it's hard to imagine them asking spending four or \$5,000 on an audit. So, I'll open it for discussion about whether we should, one, change our audit procedures and rules to be more specific about who should and who shouldn't, or whether an audit is so important we ought to require one on some cycle, whether that be 2 years or 5 years or whatever.

Vice Chair Stoldal indicated that this discussion involves whether or not we need to change the grant application. And I think we do to some degree. Right now, on the grant application there's a requirement and statutorily, this Commission has the authority to require an audit. The State of Nevada does not require nonprofits to come up with an audit, and I think that that's been confusing to just potentially to some of the applicants that said the NRS does allow this Commission to set the standards for allocating taxpayer funds. And one of the things the Commission decided that we needed an audit. While the state doesn't require nonprofits audit, it clearly references that they exist in one of the NRS. NRS 82-186 talks about the ability to inspect audits of non-profits, and the attorney general of the State of Nevada has a guide for nonprofits and in reading that, it mentions audit several times and that it should be done by an independent accountant to ensure accuracy. So it's not that the State of Nevada prohibits audits, it just really leaves it up to the particular agency and we would need to adjust our application and our grant manual with that. That said, we get back to the fundamental challenge of a nonprofit, how it can fund a \$10,000 annual audit, but I think what we are trying to get at is this Board, this Commission, needs to be assured that there is some financial accounting process of something, and so in doing a limited amount of research, Mr. Chair, there are things called professional audits, professional reviews, and professional complications, and they are some form of review of the accounting process. The review is less extensive than an audit but involves more than a complication. A review engagement consists primarily of an analysis of the procedures of the financial of that particular nonprofit. And the last one, the computation, is simply something that's done by an independent CPA looking at what the process is that they are using. Not saying the math all adds up, but here's what the processes they are using. And so I was thinking in the most broadest terms that we put this into our process rather than just a straight word, the word audit, which has a very specific requirement when you audit something, that we add these other reviews and attach to them something that includes the amount of revenue, the amount of how much the grant is. So, if they're getting a quarter million dollars in grants, we would need potentially an audit. And some of these agencies have gotten more than a million dollars. So, I would certainly look for an audit from one of these nonprofits that received that kind of money. Now, whether it's an annual audit, but I want to use the word recent, because that could be the last one, and that was done in 2010. So I think there's some language that we need to draw up that includes the opportunities for the smaller nonprofits to do an audit or a review or a computation. Secondly, that there's some connection with the amount of revenue that this nonprofit is receiving. And then the third element I was thinking about was some relationship to an audit that needs to be done. Maybe some of them annually, or some of them over 3 or 2-year period.

David Ortlipp indicated his belief that for smaller grants, that would be something that would be perhaps too onerous. So, maybe what we do is we say grants above a certain amount that's been awarded would require

**Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm**

this because you're right, I think if it's a very small project and someone who's getting 15 or \$20,000 to repair some steps or a roof or something, it would seem to be a little too onerous to have the same level of accountability for someone who's receiving a million dollars.

The Chair asked staff if this needs to be specified when the next grant request proposal goes out, and if this needs to be done at this meeting or another one.

Rebecca Palmer explained that assuming that support for the Commission and for the sale of bonds appears in the ledge-approved budget next year, the first opportunity for the Commission to decide the grant cycle would be July of 2023, when the new, executive ledge-approved budget is in place. So the answer to the question is the decision does not need to be made now, but it should be made before the Commission approves the application and forms for any future grant cycles, which would be after July of 2023.

The Chair indicated that the legislative counsel bureau has an audit division, the state has an audit division. Is there any expertise we could go to that you could think of to help us guide on what would be reasonable? I mean, could we ask for assistance just in formulating a policy? Because my thought is I don't think we're prepared to do it today, but perhaps we could get some recommendations from even the board of accountancy over what they might recommend there as a board, for us to follow as a guideline that would be reasonable. Is that possible?

Rebecca Palmer indicated that staff could do some research on what's available, what's a reasonable audit request for a nonprofit because that is essentially the population we're addressing here are the nonprofits because the local governments and the governmental entities already have audit procedures in place, and that staff would be happy to reach out to our sister agencies, the Arts Council, the Humanities, and find out if there are some policies or best practices for nonprofits in those fields that we could provide that information to the Commission at its next meeting.

The Chair asked if this was acceptable to the Commissioners.

Vice Chair Stoldal noted that the Arts council and the Humanities don't give out two or \$300,000 grant; they give out two or \$3,000 grants to artists and authors and put on single events. Mr. Chair, you talked about the Nevada Board of Accountants. I think we need to reach out to that level because again, the Arts Council and Humanities, we should ask them, but I think that the amount of grants, they probably don't ask for audits for some of the smaller grants. But going to the agency you talked about, and I did a little bit of that surface research with them, and there are the different levels of accountants of audits that are not called audits, that I think would give us some feeling of security that there is something in place that the nonprofit uses to -- the one that we received from White Pine, it lists in detail what they do, but the one thing they don't have, and I think is key, is an outside agency. They probably have very good internal checks and balances, but we would be looking for some form of somebody coming in and doing a full audit or one of the lower ones, which would cost less. But going to the State Board, I think would be a perfect place to go.

The Chair directed staff to do research and bring it back to the Committee, and to re-agendize Item 12 to the next meeting.

Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm

13. Update on the revisions to the CCCHP Handbook, Application, and forms.

Rayette Martin indicated that she has been tasked with kind of upgrading everything that we have when it comes to the application, the guidance and the forms. My goal is to make it as easy as possible for not only the applicants, but the grantees and yourselves to know what happens during each step of this granting process, so I broke everything down into when you apply, to when you receive the grant, to what are your responsibilities afterward. I took all of the forms, and I standardized them into interactive PDFs, and they reference the pages within the handbook so people can double check that quite easily. I also worked on the application and forms that are kind of separate, so there's three different documents that work together. So sitting in today's meeting, I have been taking notes to make sure that these issues and things that come up are reflected in that handbook. I've gone through all the old meetings and through conversations with you all, and then also former applicants and people who've come to informational sessions, incorporated their questions and concerns as well. So this has been a long going process to get this information together. So I did want to make a quick comment about the audit and talking about accountability. In the grant manual, which is now going to be in the handbook, there is a request for an adequate accounting system for all applicants, and it has a number of bullet points that it goes through that explains what that looks like and what that needs to be. So when you're ready to have the conversation about what type of audit or substitute for that that's adequate there is some language that's already being used and I'd be more than happy to help with that as well.

The Chair asked that the language be shared with the Commissioners via email.

Rebecca Palmer reminded the Commission that this document will also be the 10-year plan required by statute. Additionally, given the modifications that occur on a regular basis with Commissioner representation, we are also including a section about previous Commission decisions so that if there's a question about when did the Commission decide that audits were required or something other like that, you will be able to look in this 10 year plan document and find when that decision was made and be able to do research, and perhaps even look at the minutes for that particular meeting and the discussion for that particular aspect of the application. I believe that was important. I found the reading of the old minutes from the 90s and early 2000s to be incredibly enlightening, and we felt that the Commissioners would appreciate having that historical information available to them.

Vice Chair Stoldal asked about the deadline for Rayette Martin's project.

Rebecca Palmer indicated that this project would be completed by the beginning of the next grant cycle.

14. Public Comment:

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

Carla Cloud first noted that Commissioner Ortlipp had another commitment and needed to leave the meeting early. To go back to agenda item number 12, I had two comments come in for that, one from an anonymous

**Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm**

attendee. It states: saying could there be an operating budget threshold to trigger more formal audit requirements. Nonprofits starting out and raising funds for capital costs may have little to no revenue for a formal audit if their building has been closed or unavailable in generating revenue. The second comment I had was from Candace with the Comstock Cemetery Foundation. And she says thank you for being sensitive to small income nonprofits, maybe an income related solution. We have a paid bookkeeper, double signatures and a board treasurer. We try to provide security in how we handle our donations and grants, but affording an audit is a hardship. Connection to income would be helpful. And then also as a public comment, I have Susan Wetmore raising her hand.

Susan Wetmore, White Pine Community Choir Association thanked the Commissioners and staff for their willingness to work patiently and supportively to ensure successful projects.

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

The Chair adjourned the September 19, 2022 meeting.

Members of the public who are disabled and require special accommodations or assistance at the meeting are requested to notify the State Historic Preservation Office in writing at 901 South Stewart Street, suite 5004 Carson City, Nevada 89701, or by calling (775) 684-3448 no later than **9:00 am September 19, 2022**.

Supporting documents for agenda items will be available on **September 14, 2022**. Please call Carla Cloud if you wish to obtain copies prior to the meeting at (775) 684-3441 or email her at ccloud@shpo.nv.gov.

This notice will be posted on or before 9:00 am on the third working day before the meeting at:

- <https://notice.nv.gov>; and
- <http://shpo.nv.gov/services/commission-for-cultural-centers-and-historic-preservation-ccchp>; and in the following locations:
 - Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, 901 South Stewart Street, Richard H. Bryan Building, First Floor, Carson City; and
 - State Historic Preservation Office, 901 South Stewart Street, Richard H. Bryan Building, 5th Floor, Carson City; and
 - Carson City Culture & Tourism Authority, DBA Visit Carson City, 716 N. Carson St. Carson City; and
 - Southern Nevada SHPO Office, 4747 W. Vegas Drive, Las Vegas, NV.

**Meeting Notice and Agenda
September 19, 2022, 2:00 pm**

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

STATE OF NEVADA

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

MEETING TRANSCRIPT

MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 2022

OSTROVSKY: This is the -- this is the time that was posted for a meeting. Just a moment -- for the meeting on Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation scheduled for 2 o'clock today. Would staff verify that the meeting was properly posted?

PALMER: It is sir, or it was.

OSTROVSKY: All right. Thank you. And would staff like to call a roll call please?

PALMER: Yes, sir. Commissioner Yeandel?

YEANDEL: Yes, this is Yale Yeandel from Las Vegas.

PALMER: Commissioner Ortlipp? Commissioner Cavanaugh? Commissioner Hoferer? Commissioner Olmstead?

OLMSTEAD: Present.

PALMER: Vice Chair Stoldal?

STOLDAL: Present.

PALMER: Chair Ostrovsky?

OSTROVSKY: Present. We have four members. We have a quorum. Thank you very much. Would -- if staff, if -- if I don't notice it, if any other Commissioners join the meeting, please identify them. Just a -- a couple of announcements. I

1 would hope this meeting would -- would conclude by 4 o'clock
2 or sooner. There are a number of applicants, who are online,
3 I don't believe they were required to be here, but if we have
4 questions of any of the applicants, we'll be able to call on
5 them, and if they're online, we certainly can take their
6 testimony at the appropriate time. If anybody needs a break
7 for any reason, please let me know. We will -- would take a
8 short break as necessary. And welcome to new Commissioners.
9 Thank you for being here. A lot of this business is old
10 business today, but we'll get you all caught up. The next
11 agenda item is item 3, public comment. The Commission
12 welcomes public comment in any form. Are there any members of
13 the public at the hearing room?

14 UNIDENTIFIED: Chair Ostrovsky, I just have a -- a brief
15 interruption. I do see Commissioner Ortlipp is available
16 online. So, it looks like for the record we have, 5
17 Commissioners, I think.

18 OSTROVSKY: Oh, good. Great. Thank you.

19 UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you. We'll record him as present.
20 Are there any members of the -- of the public, either online
21 on Zoom, by phone or video that would like to comment at this
22 time?

23 PALMER: Go ahead.

24 MENEFFEE: Honey Menefee, Storey County.

25 OSTROVSKY: Yes. Go ahead, please.

1 MENEFEE: I am present in the room. I'm sorry. I
2 thought you were asking who was present.

3 OSTROVSKY: No, just public comment. Hearing no
4 public comment, has anybody received any public comment either
5 by email or text or -- that should be entered into the record
6 at this time?

7 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
8 No, we have received no public comment in any format.

9 OSTROVSKY: Has any Commissioner received any public
10 comment? All right. Hearing and seeing none we'll move on.
11 There'll be another opportunity for public comment before we
12 vote on items, and at the close of this hearing. I will call
13 again for public comment. The next item of business is item 4
14 on the agenda, approval of the minutes of previous meetings.
15 You should have received those minutes from staff, they're
16 also posted on the website. The first is 4A, the meeting of
17 February 1, 2022. Does anyone have comments or corrections?

18 STOLDAL: No, but I'd like to make a motion to
19 approve the minutes of February 1, 2022.

20 OLMSTEAD: Patricia Olmstead, I second.

21 OSTROVSKY: We have a -- a motion and a second. Any
22 further comment? Any comment from the public? Hearing none,
23 all those in favors say aye.

24 MEMBERS: Aye.

25 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? It -- they're approved

1 unanimously of the Commissioner's present. The next is item
2 4-B the meeting of the previous meeting of June 14, 2022. Any
3 -- any Commissioner have comments or corrections?

4 STOLDAL: If not, Stoldal for the record, make a
5 motion to approve.

6 OSTROVSKY: I have a motion. Do I have a second?

7 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead, second.

8 OSTROVSKY: I have a motion and a second, any further
9 comments from Commission members? Any comments from the
10 public? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favors say,
11 aye.

12 MEMBERS: Aye.

13 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? None. It's unanimous of the
14 Commissioner's present. Thank you. The next item is a report
15 by staff on the status of the Commission grant cycles for '19
16 and '20. Rebecca, would you like to make that report please?

17 PALMER: Thank you, sir. For the record, this is
18 Rebecca Palmer. I'll go through them individually, because
19 they each -- each have unique issues that we would like to
20 keep the Commission informed of consistent with the
21 Commission's original request. The first one is 19-01, it's
22 White Pine County Community Choir Association. I would like
23 to note in this particular case that the issues with the
24 proposed elevator have delayed this project, and -- and the
25 costs of supplies and contractor's costs have doubled since

1 the original request was put forward. At the time of this
2 report, the contractors are working with the architect to
3 determine how much of the original 19 request can be completed
4 in a timely fashion. We have informed the grantee that a
5 project change request will be needed to allocate the grant
6 funds to a different category than originally proposed in
7 their scope of work. We have yet to receive that project
8 change request, and we're trying to clarify and finalize this
9 project in a timely fashion. We still hope that this project
10 will be completed by the end of this grant cycle in January of
11 2023. CCCHP-19-10, Friends of the Dangberg Home Ranch, they
12 have modified --

13 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, Mr. Chair, I was wondering if
14 we could adjust this, if we -- we wanna hear the entire report
15 or -- or ask questions as we move with each of these
16 individual items?

17 OSTROVSKY: Well, I think this is her general report.
18 We're gonna take items. We're still on item 5. Is -- is that
19 where you're at Rebecca?

20 STOLDAL: 'm -- I'm on -- yeah, but there -- there
21 are 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, there are 10 items within item
22 5. And I was wondering do we want to hear the entire report
23 or the report on -- on each item and then have questions?

24 OSTROVSKY: Oh, I see. Yeah, no, let's take 'em one
25 at a time. So, Rebecca, when you conclude each section, would

1 you ask if the Commissioners have questions, please?

2 PALMER: Certainly. For the record, this is
3 Rebecca Palmer. I concluded the White Pine Community Choir
4 Association report. I would be happy to answer any questions
5 the Commissioners might have.

6 STOLDAL: Stoldal for the record. When you talked
7 about a change request in -- in the paragraph that's within
8 the -- the Commission's packet, it appears that there are
9 three opportunities, one a less costly elevator allocating
10 more money. And I'm not sure how that would be done and then
11 remove the elevator from the scope of -- of the work. So,
12 within those, and you mentioned the end of this grant period
13 is January 2023. First does the -- the money have to be spent
14 by then? What's the hard deadline where a decision has to be
15 made or -- or this pro -- or this particular grant has to be
16 spent, otherwise it's gonna be lost and potentially not be
17 able to allocate it to another grant from the same cycle?

18 OSTROVSKY: There's a couple of questions in there, I
19 think.

20 PALMER: Yeah. For the record, this is Rebecca
21 Palmer. For the convenience of the public and the
22 Commissioners, I'll break it into three items. The first item
23 is alternative choices that the grantee can make if the
24 elevator is -- is too expensive. So, the first choice is to
25 delete the elevator entirely from the 19 grant and reallocate

1 the grant funds to other parts of the scope of work. With
2 such a large building, there are other parts that could
3 receive that funding. The second part of your question, or
4 the second alternative is to reduce the price on the elevator
5 to something that is more manageable. And I would like
6 Kristen Brown to assist me here in describing what that
7 elevator proposal might look like.

8 BROWN: Hello Commissioners. Let me pull up -- so
9 we're talking about -- Rebecca, can you repeat the question,
10 so I make sure that I answer it correctly?

11 PALMER: Well, there --

12 BROWN: Let me pull up their drawings.

13 PALMER: Well, they're -- they're -- they're
14 looking at alternatives to address the expense of the elevator
15 proposed originally in their FY19 grant.

16 BROWN: Right. So, they --

17 PALMER: The first alternative is to delete it
18 entirely and reallocate the original grant to other parts of
19 their project. The second alternative is to make it more cost
20 effective or less expensive. Can you describe what that would
21 look like?

22 BROWN: Sure. The -- there are different options.
23 Right now, the elevator that they were hoping to install is a
24 -- is kind of what you would assume as a regular elevator. It
25 has -- it would have -- you would enter at the ground level

1 into kind of an elevator lobby where there'd be a traditional
2 elevator that would then deliver you upstairs to another
3 pretty good size elevator lobby, an enclosed elevator. There
4 are other options for ADA accessibility to get folks upstairs.
5 There are those smaller, more lift style elevators, which are
6 not fully enclosed, which you would just roll into, and there
7 might be a gate that closes, and it goes up. There are those
8 type of things that take someone up a staircase even, on a --
9 on a diagonal lift. And then those are the only things that I
10 can think of off the top of my head that would be able to get
11 folks up -- up to the upper or lower levels without being a
12 traditional fully enclosed elevator. I assume that that is
13 what the grantee and their architects are talking about
14 researching, but we haven't heard any updates lately about
15 that project or that process of research. So, perhaps if the
16 -- if the grantee is here at some point during this meeting,
17 they can provide an update on the research so far.

18 PALMER: Okay. Thank you, Kristen. Your next
19 question, Vice Chair Stoldal was to deal with the date -- the
20 last date that they can extend the funds and still be
21 consistent with the requirements of the fact that these are
22 general obligation bonds. That final date currently written
23 in their funding agreement is January of 2023. That was the
24 decision the Commission made to extend the grants that needed
25 extension, that was the last date that was set. However,

1 because these bonds were sold in November of -- of the year,
2 we would actually have additional time. I would argue that it
3 should not be or ought not to be more than July of 2023, but
4 it can be extended slightly and still be consistent with the
5 IRS rules for general obligation (inaudible). So, if worse
6 comes to worse and they're still working in January we can, if
7 the Commission were to agree, extend further the funding
8 agreement for FY19 to accommodate a couple more months' worth
9 of work and still be consistent with the IRS rules.

10 STOLDAL: Stoldal for the record and -- and the --
11 the July 23rd -- July of 23, that date is -- is -- is a date
12 that would allow if they're unable to reallocate the funds,
13 come up with a plan that it would still give time for that
14 money to be expended on another grantee before -- does it --
15 is it -- is the -- is the end date where we would lose the
16 money? Is that November of '23?

17 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
18 The Commission won't lose the funding. What will happen is we
19 would have to pay arbitrage fees, because at the entire time
20 we're holding the gov -- general obligation bonds we are
21 earning interest and, we run up against arbitrage issues if we
22 continue to hold onto the bond funds past the three-year mark.

23 STOLDAL: Gotcha.

24 PALMER: And, in -- in fact, the state pays a
25 substantial arbitrage penalty already. This Commission, and

1 you can be very proud of yourself, has never had to pay any
2 penalty. So, we've tried to keep that record as clean as
3 possible. However, we do bump up against the issue of
4 arbitrage if we have those funds still in our possession after
5 November. To assure that the staff has sufficient time to
6 close out this bond cycle, I was suggesting just off the top
7 of my head that perhaps July might be a good date to end
8 things, so that, that gives us several months to ensure that
9 we have closed this correctly, because we will also have not
10 only interest, but we'll have remaining admin funds as well.
11 So, we need a chance to close down this grant cycle. My
12 recommendation at this point is that we continue to work with
13 the grantee to clarify and finalize that elevator change, that
14 will need to happen.

15 OSTROVSKY: I would note, Mr. Stoldal that this is
16 not an action item.

17 STOLDAL: Right.

18 OSTROVSKY: So, if we wanted to take action on
19 anything, we need to have to find another appropriate agenda
20 item for action or hold it for the next meeting.

21 STOLDAL: Thank you. Chair, I was simply gonna
22 thank Rebecca. That was really helpful 'cause it answers some
23 other questions that -- that are coming up a -- a little bit
24 later. The last question regarding this one, if there's a --
25 an alternative plan to -- to like, we can't do the elevator,

1 but we do have this other element of -- of the project,
2 that's something that you and staff can do. The -- the -- the
3 Commission doesn't have to get involved with that. Is that
4 correct?

5 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
6 If the proposal stays consistent with the original request
7 that the Commission reviewed and granted, no, it could be a
8 staff administrative decision; however, consistent with the
9 Commission's policy, if it does not stay within the original
10 request, and veers off into another direction, the Commission
11 has requested that they -- that it review those requests.

12 STOLDAL: Great. Rebecca, thank you. Mr. Chair,
13 thank you very much. That was very helpful.

14 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Any other Commissioners have a
15 question? Seeing none, go ahead with your report, Rebecca.

16 PALMER: Thank you, sir. For the record, this is
17 Rebecca Palmer again. The next grant, 19-10 is Friends of the
18 Dangberg Home Ranch. They anticipate completing their project
19 by the end of September this year. I spoke to the grantee and
20 they're still hopeful that, that September 30, 2022, date is
21 reasonable. I would be happy to answer any questions on 19-
22 10.

23 OSTROVSKY: I see none, so go ahead with the next one,
24 please.

25 PALMER: Okay. Thank you. The next one is 19-12,

1 St. Mary's Art Center. This grantee anticipates completing
2 their project by the end of September 2022. They have only
3 one coat of paint, additionally to add to the porch. They are
4 waiting so that they can organize the paint work along with
5 their property bookings, so people are not walking on wet
6 paint. And so, it should be complete by September of this
7 year. I would be happy to answer any questions that
8 Commissioners might have.

9 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, not a question, but just a -- I
10 had the opportunity this past weekend to visit St Mary's and
11 that porch is -- is -- is fantastic compared to what it was, a
12 couple, 3 or 4 years ago when it was just falling apart. It
13 is -- if there's an earthquake that's the -- where I wanna
14 stand. It -- it is really a solid piece of work. So,
15 congratulations to the Art Center for all the work they put
16 into that.

17 OSTROVSKY: Seeing no other comments, please go ahead,
18 Rebecca.

19 PALMER: Thank you, sir. For the record, this is
20 Rebecca Palmer. The next grantee is -- actually I'll -- I'll
21 do now. Well, I'll do the first one. It's 19-17, the
22 Northern Nevada Northern Railway Foundation Transportation
23 Building, and Vault upgrades. This grantee assures us that
24 the work will be complete by the end of '22. We are still
25 awaiting a --

1 OSTROVSKY: Rebecca, we're -- we're having a little
2 audio -- we're having little audio issues with you.

3 PALMER: Oh-oh. Can you hear me now?

4 OSTROVSKY: Try it again. I can.

5 PALMER: Okay. This grantee is CCCHP19-17, Nevada
6 Northern Railway Foundation Transportation Building, and Vault
7 upgrades. The grantee assures us that the contractors are
8 scheduled to complete the work by the end of this calendar
9 year. I would be happy to answer any questions that you might
10 have.

11 OSTROVSKY: All right. I don't see any, so go ahead
12 to the next one, please, Rebecca.

13 PALMER: Thank you, sir. For the record, this is
14 Rebecca Palmer. The next grantee is 19-18, Nevada Northern
15 Railway Foundation McGill Depot. The utility work for this
16 grantee is supposed to be completed by the end of September,
17 when that is complete, the contractors are planning to
18 complete the rest of the work by the end of the calendar year
19 in conjunction with the transportation building to save on
20 mobilization costs. We have no reason to believe that this
21 will not occur. I would be happy to answer any questions you
22 might have.

23 OSTROVSKY: I see none, Rebecca.

24 PALMER: Okay. For the record, this is Rebecca
25 Palmer. The next grantee is 19-19, the city of Ely. The city

1 anticipates completing their grant by September 30, 2022. I
2 have one note to make for the Commission -- Commissioner's
3 information. This grant came in under budget, a rare event
4 for this cycle. They are \$6,000 under budget and they -- we
5 will -- they have asked that the \$6,000 be reverted to them in
6 their current grant cycle. This is also agenda item number
7 11.

8 OSTROVSKY: So, we -- we will take that up before the
9 end of the day. Thank you.

10 PALMER: The next -- for the record, this is
11 Rebecca Palmer. The next grant -- grantee is 19-20, the
12 Goldfield Historical Society. This grantee has been working
13 continuously to find a contractor willing to work in a remote
14 environment. He has been -- the -- the Historical Society has
15 been successful in finding that contractor, but the costs of
16 the materials have escalated, as well as the cost of
17 contracting. This issue is agenda item 8 for your reference.

18 OSTROVSKY: All right. And we, again, we will take
19 that up before the end of the day -- end of the day. Thank
20 you.

21 PALMER: The next grantee is 19-22, Carlin
22 Historical Society. This grantee should have completed their
23 project by September 1st of this year. We have no reason to
24 believe that this has not occurred. So, it should be complete
25 as of the beginning of September. I would be happy to answer

1 any questions the Commissioners might have.

2 STOLDAL: Stoldal for the record. Just -- so I'm
3 assuming that today being September the 19th, that they have
4 not reached out to the SHPO and give us a heads up or heads --
5 thumbs down?

6 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
7 The summary of the status of extended grants is based on the
8 August progress report.

9 STOLDAL: Okay, thank you.

10 PALMER: So, we put this together, based on those
11 progress reports. There is no progress report between August
12 and the date of this meeting, September the 19th.

13 STOLDAL: Okay, great. Thank you.

14 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
15 The next grantee is 19-24, the Thunderbird Lodge Preservation
16 Society. This grantee has experienced continuing contractor
17 and material delays, as have a lot of our grantees. We expect
18 that the project will be complete by October the 31st, 2022.
19 However, there is an upcoming progress report due in October,
20 I believe. Carla?

21 CLOUD: November.

22 PALMER: November. So, by November, we will know
23 whether or not that October 31st date was -- target was met.
24 I would be happy to answer any questions that you might have.

25 OSTROVSKY: Mr. Stoldal?

1 STOLDAL: In the -- my ongoing effort to provide,
2 SHPO with more work, I'm wondering whether or not on a couple
3 of these, if we could be notified if they have in fact met
4 their September, October or November deadlines, if there's
5 some just quick way to just let us know that kind of keep us
6 up to speed on -- on the progress of these grants. Thank you.

7 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
8 We would be happy to inform the Commissioners when the
9 grantees meet their target dates.

10 STOLDAL: Thank you.

11 PALMER: We can do so by sending out an email as
12 long as none of the Commissioners reply to each other. And
13 so, we will do that. Sir, would you like that in one email,
14 or would you like it as the grantees meet their target dates?

15 STOLDAL: Well, I'm trying to think of the -- the --
16 the -- the -- the value to the Commission of getting it as
17 quickly as possible, if there's some or -- or just simply
18 informing us that keeping us up to -- up to speed, because if
19 some of these things are going to be -- the money is gonna be
20 reverted, they couldn't come up with a plan or -- or it's
21 gonna require a special meeting to reallocate the -- the
22 information. Chair, I -- I would -- would just your best
23 judgment. Maybe just a notification once a month or something
24 like that.

25 OSTROVSKY: Well, let me ask staff, it sounds as if

1 you have regular reporting, is it monthly or quarterly that
2 you ask them or is it not?

3 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
4 Carla, could you answer that?

5 CLOUD: Yes, this is Carla Cloud for the record,
6 and it is quarterly that we were having them report. So,
7 August. Yeah. Every three months.

8 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

9 CLOUD: Is what we did.

10 OSTROVSKY: I would think if we could get a follow up
11 email.

12 CLOUD: Absolutely.

13 OSTROVSKY: To see all the reports, that would be
14 helpful to us.

15 CLOUD: Sure. The next report is due on November
16 1st, sir.

17 OSTROVSKY: And it wouldn't require them to get --
18 collect any more information, it's just how that information
19 is distributed once it's received. Thank you.

20 CLOUD: Yes, sir.

21 OSTROVSKY: Rebecca, do you have further items? Go
22 ahead.

23 PALMER: Oh, sorry. For the record, this is
24 Rebecca Palmer. We will ensure that the information that
25 comes from those progress reports will be submitted to the

1 commission per your request.

2 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

3 PALMER: And the final grantee is 19-25, Western
4 Missionary Museum Corporation. There was some -- there was
5 some miscommunication or misunderstanding on the part of the
6 grantee as to when the documentation would be submitted to our
7 office. I would like to remind the Commissioners that this
8 grant was modified from a construction grant to a
9 documentation grant in a previous meeting. The grantee now
10 understands that the SHPO staff needs time to review the
11 documentation. So, they have modified their submission date
12 slightly, so that there is time for SHPO staff to review the -
13 - review those documents before the close of the funding
14 agreement. So, we have been assured that the construction
15 drawings will be submitted by no later than the end of
16 December 2022, so that we may review, we meaning the SHPO
17 staff, will review and approve the design development drawings
18 before the construction drawings can be finalized, and before
19 the conclusion of the funding agreement. We will receive, as
20 previously noted, a progress report in November. If this is
21 not the case, we will inform the Commission, of possible
22 delays. I would be happy to answer any questions that the
23 Commission might have.

24 OSTROVSKY: I see none. So, Rebecca, that concludes
25 item number 5. We will take up some of those questions as

1 individual items on the agenda. Thank you for that report.
2 Moving on to item number 6 on the agenda. Commission will
3 recall when we -- the last grant cycle, there were a number of
4 grants where we set aside the appropriate funding, but we did
5 not approve the grants, because the Commission asked for
6 additional information or documentation from those grant --
7 those who requested the grants. This is our opportunity to
8 review that material that was submitted based on those
9 requests, and it is an action item. So, if we approve the
10 documentation that we received that would then authorize the
11 grant funds to be allocated. The first one is the Comstock
12 Cemetery Foundation, it's grant 21-02. You should have all
13 received and it's posted on the website, the submission from
14 the -- from the Comstock Cemetery Association. Those
15 questions, many of them related to, or not, they had an
16 agreement at MOU between their Association and Foundation and
17 the County who owned the land rights. And so, they provided
18 us a status of that. Rebecca, you wanna give us a quick
19 review of those documents?

20 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I
21 do believe we also have the applicant present.

22 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

23 PALMER: A representative for the applicant is also
24 present. If you wish, sir. The items that were requested in
25 the June meeting by the Commission for Commission review was

1 the memorandum of agreement between Storey County and the --
2 and the Comstock Cemetery Foundation. The items that were
3 received by staff and provided to the Commissioners are a
4 statement of ownership confirmation, and clarification, a
5 letter dated July 14, 2022, from Hugh Roy Marshall, and a
6 letter dated August 13, 2014, from Storey County
7 Commissioner's Office. The document memorandum of agreement
8 between Storey County and CCF requested by the Commission is
9 not present.

10 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. I'll open it for the
11 Commissioners to ask questions of staff or from the applicant.
12 Could -- is -- is the applicant available now, and could you
13 bring them online?

14 WHEELER: I am available. Go right ahead.

15 OSTROVSKY: Would you introduce yourself, please?

16 WHEELER: I -- this is Candace Wheeler, Comstock
17 Cemetery Foundation, for the record.

18 OSTROVSKY: Thank you.

19 WHEELER: Land issues are so confusing on the
20 Comstock and perhaps I should not have even mentioned the MOU
21 because we've been talking about the MOU now for 2 to 3 years.
22 We currently own the visitor center, and we currently have the
23 rights and a 99-year lease on all the land in the cemetery.
24 Because the cemetery's running out of space, we suggested
25 about 4 years ago that the County please, or that Huber and

1 Marshall Consolidated Virginia Mining would consider donating
2 some additional land to the County to accommodate their modern
3 burials. And in all of those discussions, what we came up
4 with was Mr. Marshall wanted an MOU between the Cemetery
5 Foundation and the County to ensure that we were given the
6 ability to completely manage the land. And then the County
7 wanted the land, the additional land for modern burials to be
8 conveyed to them. And everybody is on the same page, but
9 everybody wants to do it correctly. And so that is taking
10 time, not so much from the MOU standpoint, but the lease
11 between Consolidated Virginia Mining and the County, because
12 in there Mr. Marshall wanted a family plot, and they're trying
13 to do this with legal descriptions and trying to avoid doing a
14 full survey, which could cost about \$12,000. And it's just
15 taking them time to get it organized. But as Mr. Marshall's
16 letter explains, no land ownership has changed at all. We are
17 still in possession of a 99-year lease to all the property and
18 we still own the visitor center. So, at the moment it's
19 status quo until those issues are ironed out by them.

20 OSTROVSKY: Do any Commissioners have questions of
21 Candace?

22 STOLDAL: Yeah. Stoldal for record. I -- I -- I
23 think this really helps clarify a cloudy situation.

24 WHEELER: Yeah.

25 STOLDAL: And -- and even though it hasn't been

1 resolved, I think this is the best that we're going to get,
2 and would be excited to hear when it's finalized. It's been
3 going on for several years, but -- so, I'm -- I'm satisfied.
4 Thank you.

5 OSTROVSKY: Any other Commissioners have questions?
6 Rebecca, would you remind us of what the dollar value of this
7 grant is outstanding for us to grant?

8 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. We
9 have prepared a spreadsheet that shows the dollar amount
10 requested. Carla, can you share your screen? You are muted
11 still.

12 CLOUD: Carla Cloud for the record. Yes. One
13 moment, let pull that right for you. Can you see the
14 spreadsheet?

15 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

16 CLOUD: Okay.

17 OSTROVSKY: The amount I see is \$80,418. Is that
18 correct?

19 CLOUD: No.

20 OSTROVSKY: No, I'm sorry. I'm looking at the wrong
21 place. You're right. \$5,400.

22 STOLDAL: 55,000.

23 OSTROVSKY: Oh, pending. Okay. \$55,400. Is that the
24 correct amount, staff?

25 CLOUD: Yes. Yes.

1 PALMER: Carla, highlight that one, please. Take
2 your cursor and go to that line. Thank you. It's easier to
3 read if you -- there you go.

4 OSTROVSKY: There -- there it is. So, I would
5 entertain a motion to approve the grant in that amount.

6 STOLDAL: So, moved. This is Stoldal for the
7 record. I'll move the approval of the Comstock Cemetery
8 Foundation request for \$55,400.

9 OSTROVSKY: Do I hear a second from any Commissioner?

10 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead I second.

11 OSTROVSKY: I have a second. Thank you. Any further
12 comment from Commissioners. Any member of the public like to
13 comment? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor of the
14 motion say aye.

15 MEMBERS: Aye.

16 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Hearing none, it's unanimous
17 among the Commissioners in attendance. Candace, thank you
18 very much. Mr. Stoldal, comment?

19 WHEELER: Thank you.

20 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, would there be a point
21 somewhere that we could get a review, a status report on how
22 much money -- I was wondering what -- when you moved that over
23 to the 55, to the last column that changed the -- the bottom
24 line, if we could just get -- get before we start reallocating
25 or allocating funds, if we could get a starting -- a starting

1 point a review just to bring us all on the same page.

2 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Bob, we -- we intend to one, do
3 that under item 11, but also understand that if we grant all
4 of these requests, they're all within the budget that we
5 approved at the prior meeting subject to their submission.
6 So, I don't know if you'd wanna review this now or you wanna
7 wait to item 11? If we approve all of these, we're still
8 within our budget.

9 STOLDAL: Eleven's fine. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

10 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank you.

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

12 It is the green column that shows the awards plus the amount
13 left and reserved for one of the grantees. So, Carla if you
14 could perhaps highlight that green column, please, that's the
15 one that is a running total. And that's the one that also
16 shows up on -- below there in green.

17 OSTROVSKY: Great, thanks.

18 PALMER: And it will change as you award, so you
19 can continue to watch that spreadsheet if you would like, sir,
20 we can keep this up and that way you can see what remains to
21 be awarded.

22 STOLDAL: Okay. Thank you.

23 OSTROVSKY: I'd like to move on to item 6-B, White
24 Pine Community Choir Association. This is a request for an
25 audit update. Rebecca, could you talk about their response to

1 our request?

2 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
3 Carla, could you take Candace off and I believe there is a
4 grantee representative for the White Pine County Community
5 Choir Association. I was -- would like to remind -- we still
6 need to see your screen, Carla.

7 CLOUD: Yes, I -- I -- this is Carla Cloud for the
8 record. I have to unshare the screen in order to control
9 anything on the panel.

10 OSTROVSKY: It's okay (inaudible). Just before we
11 vote, that would be fine.

12 CLOUD: Okay. Thank you, sir.

13 PALMER: Thank you. My apologies, the technology
14 sometimes is more than my little brain can handle. I'd like
15 to remind the Commissioners that in the previous grant hearing
16 this particular grantee had some missing items from their
17 application. I would like to report that all of the missing
18 items with one exception have been provided per the
19 Commission's request. That was photographs of the exterior
20 elevations, photographs of the major rooms, the mission
21 statement, the detailed report on grant status, resumes for
22 principal professionals, current board members, copy of the
23 organization's long range plans, activities for the past
24 fiscal year, a copy of the latest audit or in this case why
25 the audit is not available, a printout of the County

1 Assessor's web website, and, a question from the Commission
2 about the seismic proposal. The Commission requested that
3 this project not piecemeal the seismic proposal. We have
4 received information based on quotes and, a building
5 assessment done in 2018 that the Southwest Corner has this -
6 the settlement issues and does require repair, and they are
7 going to face the seismic reinforcement for the benefit of the
8 building. And so, we have provided that information to the
9 Commission. The one remaining item that was not provided was
10 an itemized list or contractor quotes. We have the list, but
11 it -- there are no quotes attached to the documents received.
12 And with that, I conclude my summary of the documents provided
13 by the grantee for 21-10.

14 OSTROVSKY: You say someone is available from White
15 Pine Community Choir Association?

16 CLOUD: Carla Could for the record. Yes, sir I
17 have Mary Eldridge and Susan Wetmore joining us today.

18 OSTROVSKY: Fine. Would -- would one of them like to
19 address the Commission?

20 CLOUD: I've brought Mary on.

21 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Welcome Mary.

22 ELDRIDGE: Thank you.

23 OSTROVSKY: Please introduce yourself, and any
24 comments please.

25 ELDRIDGE: My name is Mary Eldridge, and I am member

1 of the White Pine Community Choir Association. I am the
2 secretary and the grants director.

3 OSTROVSKY: Any comment on -- staff raised the issue
4 of -- of the lack of -- of information in the contractors bid?

5 ELDRIDGE: Those figures that we used for this budget
6 came directly from the contractors we are proposing to work
7 with.

8 OSTROVSKY: Well, I'll ask Rebecca you -- what is the
9 missing piece, Rebecca, do you think we --

10 PALMER: For, for the record, this is Rebecca
11 Palmer. The submission that we received contained no actual
12 quotes from those contractors.

13 OSTROVSKY: It -- the submission did have a requested
14 total value. You're saying it didn't give you a breakdown of
15 the -- how they got there, trying to understand.

16 PALMER: For the -- for the record, this is Rebecca
17 Palmer. Kristen, can you go into detail further about what
18 was missing?

19 BROWN: This is Kristen Brown. I think Carla might be
20 the best person to ask because she's been on the receiving end
21 of all of these items that the grantees submitted over the
22 last few weeks; however, my understanding is that we do have
23 the dollar amounts from the contractor, but we -- what we
24 don't have is simply the photocopy of the contractor quote on
25 the contractor letterhead, with an itemized, you know, list

1 and their name and address and that sort of thing, maybe Carla
2 can confirm.

3 CLOUD: Carla cloud for the record. Correct.
4 They would tell us that the grant, the amounts and the work to
5 go with it, but we don't have any documentation from the
6 contractor directly to back those up. And that's what we
7 would like to see.

8 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. I will ask the applicant; do you
9 have that available?

10 ELDRIDGE: We -- we do from the design firm, the --
11 the engineering firm, we would need to get it from the
12 construction. They just sent us numbers in an email.

13 OSTROVSKY: From the design firm or directly from the
14 contractor, Mary?

15 ELDRIDGE: The contractor just sent us information
16 through an email with those -- the -- the numbers that we use
17 to build the budget.

18 OSTROVSKY: So, it's up to the -- thank you. It's up
19 to the Commission where they want grant this, with the
20 instructions to send the completed document as soon as it's
21 available or as soon as possible or set a deadline to receive
22 it.

23 STOLDAL: Mr. Chairman?

24 OSTROVSKY: Mr. Stoldal?

25 STOLDAL: Two que -- Carla or Rebecca, what's the

1 total, do you have that in front of you or -- or the -- the
2 staff of how much money the Commission has allocated over the
3 years to this project? Do we have a total dollar figure,
4 including -- including potentially this grant?

5 CLOUD: Carla Cloud for the record. Yes, sir. I
6 can pull that up here. One moment.

7 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
8 There has been only one grant awarded, this grantee that was
9 the FY1920 grant cycle. And that was -- and Carla's pulling
10 it up.

11 CLOUD: Yes.

12 PALMER: We just need that amount in total.

13 CLOUD: Yes, \$194,000, according to our
14 spreadsheet, there has been way earlier prior grants back in
15 2000 -- early 2000. Total of \$313,000 I show.

16 OSTROVSKY: And then added to this, the potential of
17 another 83. So, we have about 400,000.

18 CLOUD: Roughly.

19 OSTROVSKY: So, the -- the question to me is -- is as
20 the chair, as we move forward, we have been looking at this
21 past grant cycle. There were some key elements that were
22 missing from many grants, the application, the audit, how --
23 how the money is -- is -- is -- is handled and so forth, just
24 overview in the -- the most generic term of -- of the word
25 audit. Secondly, the ownership of the land, which is just

1 essential for the ownership of the land and -- or -- or -- or
2 -- or the building. And then third is the actual quotes from
3 the contractor, rather than just some generic -- I think it's
4 gonna cost \$50,000 to do X, Y, and Z and 10,000 for this and
5 5,000 for that. I think it's important that staff and
6 therefore the -- the -- the Commission actually have those
7 quotes. So I -- I think this is an important project and I'd
8 like to -- I'd like to move forward, but -- but I have a
9 concern about not having the actual quotes and -- and would
10 take a recommendation from staff that whether we hold this
11 grant up until we get those actual quotes and grant and the
12 staff can sign off on it and then move forward. And then
13 secondly, there's a -- a nice -- under number 11 within the,
14 the -- this -- the -- the updated report -- a really of kind
15 of a detailed, what are called safeguards and how the money is
16 spent, but it's not an audit. And -- and-- and we are now
17 looking at \$400,000. And as we get later on in-- in the -- in
18 our board agenda, we're gonna talk about that. And I would
19 suggest that one of the requirements would be if there's a
20 certain -- if the grants were five or seven or \$8,000, maybe
21 there's -- there's not the necessity of a particular audit,
22 but when we start getting 75, a hundred, 200, 300, \$400,000 to
23 a particular grant application, some form may be required, but
24 that's -- let's talk about -- about that -- about that later.
25 So, my point is now -- is I think we need the quotes, the

1 contractor quotes before we can move forward.

2 OSTROVSKY: Well, Mr. Stoldal, would you -- would you
3 entertain a motion that would authorize the grant upon receipt
4 of the actual quote on -- on, from -- from the appropriate
5 contractor authorized quote?

6 STOLDAL: That was the exact wording of the motion I
7 was gonna make.

8 OSTROVSKY: So, are you making that motion?

9 STOLDAL: Yes.

10 OSTROVSKY: Is there a second? Someone like to second
11 the motion?

12 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead, I'll second.

13 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Let me ask staff -- if -- if
14 we were to vote on this, in this form, could you live with
15 that? I mean, is that an -- can staff take on that
16 responsibility of making sure that we have in our possession,
17 the quote that equals what was stated in the grant application
18 before any funds are distributed, or before we sign a funding
19 agreement?

20 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
21 We would be happy to take on that responsibility. We now have
22 our direction from the Commission. We will look for those
23 actual quotes. We will ensure that those quotes match, the
24 grant award. I -- we just need a grant award amount.

25 OSTROVSKY: So, my --

1 ORTLIPP: This commissioner --

2 OSTROVSKY: I'm sorry, go ahead.

3 ORTLIPP: I was just gonna suggest that would we
4 give -- would an email that they mentioned confirming the
5 quote be sufficient, or I suppose we have to give some staff
6 some directions as whether a copy of that email would be
7 sufficient or whether we need a -- a particular document to --
8 to accompany that, that's probably important.

9 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, that was Commissioner Ortlipp I -- I
10 -- I agree. I think -- I think the email was not acceptable.
11 I think what we're looking for is something on the letterhead
12 signed by the authorized agent of the contractor. And it's a
13 firm solid bid for the amount that they proposed in their
14 email.

15 STOLDAL: And then add to my motion, the specific
16 dollar figure was \$83,200 with part of my motion.

17 OSTROVSKY: So, the grant was in the amount of
18 \$83,200. Is there any further comment from Commissioners?
19 Any comment from the public? All those in favor of the
20 motion, say, aye.

21 MEMBERS: Aye.

22 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? I thank you. Motion carries
23 of -- unanimous among the Commissioners in attendance. Thank
24 you, and I would certainly request that the -- that the Choir
25 Association obtain those documents very quickly and -- and

1 send them to staff so that we can get this project funded and
2 moving as quickly as possible. Thank you for being here with
3 us today. Item 6-C is the Old Glory Theater Company. Staff
4 report, please on this.

5 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
6 This is application 21-14, the Old Glory Theater. The
7 requested amount was \$227,237.50. This application was in the
8 June meeting. The Commissioners asked that this application
9 be completed with additional documentation. I would like to
10 note for the record that this documentation has been provided
11 by the applicant, and I would be happy to answer any questions
12 that the Commission might have.

13 OSTROVSKY: Well, my-- my only comment as chair is
14 that, again, it raises the same audit issue. They had no
15 prior activity, Old Glory Theater, so they didn't have an
16 audit, but I think when we come to the audit question, we're
17 gonna have to make some decisions about where we want to go
18 forward. Does any Commissioner have any other questions? Mr.
19 Stoldal?

20 STOLDAL: Back to the audit and, Rebecca, the -- the
21 expenditure of the funds, just so -- so I can understand, they
22 submit invoices to you, we -- you look at the invoice to see
23 if it's within the grant or within the -- the -- the
24 particular quotes from the -- from the contractor, and then we
25 fund the money, or how -- how does -- how does that work? How

1 do we understand and make sure that the money is actually
2 being spent properly? And I'm not questioning this group only
3 they're a brand-new group, and they have -- they have no
4 tracker, and I'm not suggesting anything inappropriate just to
5 understand the process.

6 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
7 Traditionally this Commission and its predecessor, the CCA set
8 these grants as reimbursable grants. In other words, the
9 expenditures would already have occurred to pay for the items
10 identified in the grant, and then the grantees would come to
11 the -- my office for reimbursement of those expenditures. So,
12 we would request at that time both the completion of the
13 reimbursement request paperwork and proof of payment to the
14 contractor. And the proof of payment can be a canceled check,
15 canceled by the contractor and deposited in their account, or
16 it can be in the case of state agencies of the trans wireless
17 transmission of funds to the contractor. In some
18 circumstances, those, that requirement to be a reimbursable
19 grant has been waived and we do pay on invoice. However,
20 there is no such request in this case. So, they would -- the
21 grantee would have to pay their contractors and then seek
22 reimbursement for those expenses from my office.

23 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. That's helpful. The second
24 point that I had was at our last meeting going through the
25 minutes there was discussion about the sign, which is part of

1 the proposal, the neon sign. Is a member of the organization
2 on board with us today?

3 CLOUD: Carla Cloud for the record. Yes, sir. I
4 do have -- Kansas is on the line. One moment. Kansas, go
5 ahead. You will have to unmute yourself.

6 BOWLING: Hi, can you hear me?

7 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, Kansas thank you. This is Bob
8 Ostrovsky. Thank you for being available today. Commissioner
9 Stoldal has a question for you. Mr. Stoldal.

10 STOLDAL: There was discussion -- welcome Kansas.
11 There was discussion at our last meeting, I believe you were
12 present, regarding the neon sign and what -- what it was going
13 to be restored to. And have you made a decision about whether
14 or not we're gonna -- you are going to restore it to the
15 original name of this facility, or change the name? What's
16 the status of that thought process?

17 BOWLING: We are changing the name of the theater.
18 It's gone through a few different names throughout the years.
19 Currently the sign -- it has both, or it has two old names
20 kind of painted over each other. The sea that comes up like
21 over the -- the metal we're turning into the O for the Old
22 Glory. So, we're not like taking away any parts of the sign.
23 And then the part that reads theater is staying too. So, it's
24 just adding new neon on top of the iron that's there.

25 OSTROVSKY: What was the original name though of the

1 facility?

2 BOWLING: It was the Cactus, and then it turned into
3 the Cinadome.

4 OSTROVSKY: And you wanna change it to Old Glory?

5 BOWLING: Yeah. To go more with the patriotic theme
6 of Hawthorne since, we don't really have cactus around here
7 anyways.

8 STOLDAL: Okay. And then this is really a minor
9 point, in the previous narrative you submitted, and, in this
10 narrative, it says the Quonset Hut structure was invented in
11 Yerington for the war. I don't understand that.

12 BOWLING: I think that's just in the context of the
13 history of it. The building is a Quonset Hut, and the Quonset
14 Hut -- I was just noting it was invented nearby. So, that's
15 why it's a notable structure in the area.

16 STOLDAL: When you say invented, you -- you mean
17 built. I mean, I -- I don't -- the Quonset Hut was not built
18 -- was not invented in Yerington.

19 BOWLING: Oh, that's just what people in town have
20 told me. If that's not true, then, sorry.

21 OSTROVSKY: Well, I think it's important that the
22 history of this structure is accurately stated in the grants.
23 So, I would look forward to you getting with staff and if it
24 was built in Yerington, that's great, but where it was
25 assembled? I'm not sure what Yerrington has to do with this

1 structure.

2 BOWLING: Okay.

3 STOLDAL: 'Cause likely it was -- it was built
4 during the war, and it came in on rail cars and it was
5 assembled in Hawthorne, one would think; however, somehow
6 Yerington is inserted in here. So, if you can just work with
7 the history of this structure, I think it's important if we're
8 gonna be granting a quarter million dollars that we make sure
9 that we have the history of this structure as, as well. So,
10 thank you. Those are my thoughts.

11 OSTROVSKY: And this -- Chairman Ostrovsky. Kansas, I
12 think it's important that grant -- that these historical
13 records and so on are kept as accurate as possible. We know
14 that in future years, when people do research on a city or
15 particular building, they might look to these grant
16 applications for information. And so, they ought to be as
17 accurate as possible.

18 BOWLING: Okay.

19 OSTROVSKY: So, if you have to make a correction,
20 please, please do so in the description. The other question I
21 had offhand, it's -- it's kind of a side question again, is,
22 when this building is done, I can't remember from your
23 original submission how you foresee the use of this building.
24 Will you be administering that or is someone else in the
25 community gonna take over the building for the purposes of

1 programming? Do you have your -- what's your thoughts?

2 BOWLING: Me and the other heads of the nonprofit
3 will be the programmers for at least the first year or two.
4 We'll see where it goes from there, but I'm -- we're going to
5 oversee all the programming at least. It's all going to be on
6 35 millimeter on the original projectors inside the theater.

7 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

8 STOLDAL: So, Mr. Chair, so if I understand
9 correctly -- Stoldal for the record -- that this is gonna be a
10 movie theater, that's the cultural aspect of, I mean, as in
11 our title, we have two responsibilities, the commission and
12 the cultural centers and historic places, and it's to restore
13 historic structures, but not just leave them sit there is to
14 put quote the generic term culture back in, and 35 millimeter
15 film certainly fits within that category. So, you see that
16 primarily as returning to a movie theater or, are there
17 options for any live entertainment or is your initial moving
18 forward going to be a movie theater?

19 BOWLING: Maybe we'll occasionally have some live
20 events, but it's primarily going to be movie theater. Yeah,
21 we don't have anything planned for any sort of live events,
22 but maybe, you know, we can have it rented out for private
23 events, things like that. Maybe in special occasions, like
24 Armed Forces Day here we'll have more special things. We can
25 do like some 24-hour marathons, things like that. Maybe some

1 Q and A with some film guests. But it's primarily movie
2 theater.

3 STOLDAL: All right, thank you.

4 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, we raise that Kansas just to keep in
5 mind that we do fund these construction projects, restoration
6 projects, but we also have that role of being sure that these
7 facilities that we rehabilitate bring value to the community
8 and the community programming is very important to this
9 commission about what happens inside and around those
10 buildings after they're accessible again by the public. So,
11 thank you very much.

12 BOWLING: Thank you.

13 OSTROVSKY: So, we have before us a grant request of
14 \$227,237, is that correct, Rebecca? Is that the right number?

15 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
16 Yes, that is the correct amount. Carla, can you bring up the
17 spreadsheet? You're still muted.

18 CLOUD: Just a moment.

19 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer
20 again. I'd like to note for the Commission's benefit that the
21 pending Commission review grants are in blue. Those pending
22 have not been awarded at all. So, this is the last of the
23 three pending Commission review.

24 OSTROVSKY: So, and let's see where the 227 is. I see
25 Old Glory Theatre is project 14. Would anyone like to make a

1 motion?

2 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, then I'll make a motion -- make
3 a motion to approve the request for the Old Glory Theater in
4 the amount of \$227,237.50.

5 OSTROVSKY: Is there 50 cents in it? Sure is. Okay.

6 STOLDAL: Actually, I'll round it up to \$227,238.

7 OSTROVSKY: OK. Do I have a second?

8 ORTLIPP: David Ortlipp, I second motion.

9 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, David. Any Commissioners have
10 any further comments or questions? Is there any member of the
11 public that has any comments or questions?

12 YEANDEL: Yeah, I have a question. This is Yale
13 Yeandel for the record.

14 OSTROVSKY: All right.

15 YEANDEL: I just -- they mentioned about the
16 projectors, Kansas, are those projectors arc projectors? Are
17 they working projectors? Are they -- are they from the
18 period? Are they -- are they modern movie projectors? What
19 type of projectors are there?

20 BOWLING: Definitely not modern? So, it's a -- this
21 particular projector that's in the theater right now is from
22 the sixties. It's currently on a platter system though, if
23 you're not familiar, that means there's just a single
24 projector and then a giant platter where -- so, one film on 35
25 millimeter. Each reel is about 20 minutes. So, it's usually

1 like five reels per film. So, when you put it on the platter,
2 you splice them all together to make one giant reel and then
3 load that into the projector. Most people don't like lending
4 out their prints, though, if you have a platter system, cause
5 you have to use splicing the prints and stuff. So, we are
6 planning on getting a second projector to do a dual projector
7 system, which is what a lot of other theaters have, where you
8 put one reel on one projector and the other reel on the other,
9 and then you switch and switch until the movie's over. So, we
10 currently have one projector. It's in fairly good condition.
11 We're getting someone to service it soon, but we're also going
12 to install a second projector in the projection booth.

13 YEANDEL: Well, I've been to Hawthorne, I'm familiar
14 with the building itself, but I imagine you could get some
15 pretty good crowds in for some of the parade days. And, I was
16 curious about the number, so that's just to work, to make the
17 building, you know, the \$200, What is that actually? is that
18 just mostly to sustain the building, to make it, you know, for
19 audiences and how big is your house? How many audiences can
20 it in there?

21 BOWLING: It has 190 seats and it's one screen. And
22 sir, you cut out a little bit. You're asking what this money
23 will be going towards?

24 YEANDEL: Yes.

25 OSTROVSKY: If you could explain generally the project

1 and what this -- what we're funding here.

2 BOWLING: So, the biggest cost would be installing a
3 new HVAC system, 'cause right now there's no heating, which it
4 gets, you know, very, very, cold here. And their swamp cooler
5 system is less than desirable. There's you know, some animals
6 living inside of it and stuff. And we need to get all new
7 plumbing as well. We just have like very cheap PCV plumbing
8 that's exploded a few times, so we're getting new plumbing and
9 then the other big project that I'm requesting funds for is to
10 restore the neon sign, which I don't think the actual neon has
11 been going on the sign for maybe half century or something.
12 It's a -- but it's a really beautiful sign. And, when it is
13 restored, it's gonna look really great.

14 YEANDEL: I congratulate on all your work on this
15 project and, you know, I'm very involved with here in Las
16 Vegas and I'd be interested drive up to Hawthorne and see you
17 guys, or the projection film.

18 BOWLING: Well, yeah, please -- please reach out
19 anytime, and I I'll give you a tour of the building, it's
20 really beautiful inside.

21 YEANDEL: Okay.

22 OSTROVSKY: Any other comments?

23 YEANDEL: That answers my question. Thank you.

24 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Any other comments, questions?

25 Hearing none, we have a motion before us to approve an amount

1 of \$227,238. All those in favor, say aye.

2 MEMBERS: Aye.

3 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? It's unanimous amongst the
4 Commissioners in attendance. Thank you very much. Good luck.
5 And we'll all look forward to visiting the site.

6 BOWLING: Okay. Thank you so much.

7 OSTROVSKY: All right. That leads us to item 6-D City
8 of Carlin. Comments from staff.

9 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
10 This is a City of Carlin, application 21-18. Again, as I
11 noted, all of the previous -- all of the previous three
12 applicants that you have just awarded had not received funding
13 at all. This -- this applicant, the City of Carlin, grant 21-
14 18, did receive an award, and the Commission requested 3
15 items, a seismic study, an engineering study with a focus on
16 key structural elements, such as the foundation and estimates
17 for funds needed to initiate whatever the immediate needs of
18 the building were. The items that we received were proof of
19 insurance and a description of research done to date. Staff
20 advised the grantee that if the documents requested by the
21 Commission were not available, that they explain the research
22 they have done to date, and that was included. We would be
23 happy to answer any questions, but I would defer to Kristen
24 Brown for the architectural details for any questions you
25 might have.

1 OSTROVSKY: Any members of the Commission have
2 questions?

3 STOLDAL: Not that it's unusual, but I'm a little
4 confused. The Commission was in favor of this -- of this
5 project in its entirety, but we needed to sort of go back and
6 start with certain plans -- a seismic plan and engineering
7 study. Has any of the -- that the original \$30,000 been
8 expended?

9 BROWN: This is Kristen Brown for the record. No,
10 not at this time. They do -- the applicant does have a quote,
11 from architect for that \$30,000 in an effort to expend the
12 money as quickly as possible. The Commission requested as the
13 staff notes, to explain the Commission requested architectural
14 and engineering studies, but unfortunately that was what the
15 applicant was trying to apply for a grant for. So, they don't
16 have those studies yet. They need our grant money in order to
17 get those studies completed. So, in an effort to try to
18 expend that 30,000 as quickly as possible, the architect split
19 the quote into two pieces, and we have it explained in the
20 bulleted section of the staff notes. Quote one was for that
21 30,000 and the architect determined how much could occur for
22 30,000 and that with that money and the architect can begin
23 immediately. If necessary, they could do side visits, they
24 could do full documentation, start doing the seismic study,
25 running the -- the structural calculations and numbers. They

1 could start working on evaluating the whole building, making
2 some recommendations, that kind of thing. That's always the
3 first step in this type of study. And that's the part that
4 can begin now to expend that 30,000. Then the second quote is
5 really just the second half of it, which is the drawings
6 themselves. And if that -- that was the last update that we
7 had received from the applicant. It's possible that there has
8 been more work done since that time. And I would defer to the
9 applicant to answer that question.

10 STOLDAL: Well, if you could just hang -- hang,
11 right so I don't get too far ahead of myself mentally. We
12 have already approved the 30,000 and to move forward quicker
13 they're asking for an additional 40,000?

14 BROWN: I would have to look at the spreadsheet to
15 remember the original request.

16 OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible) the spreadsheet up please.

17 STOLDAL: Or was it 44,000. No, that's the roof.
18 That's the roof. The roof is separate at 44. So, the numbers
19 I had were we approved the original --

20 OSTROVSKY: We approved 30,000 appears to me, Bob.
21 This is Chairman Ostrovsky.

22 STOLDAL: Okay. So, that's already been approved.
23 Now, in order to -- to move this grant further along there, we
24 could approve an additional 40,000 and additional 44 for the
25 roof. Is that correct?

1 BROWN: This is Kristen Brown for the record.
2 Yes, I believe that is correct. The -- the tricky -- I think
3 the only confusion in this particular grant came from the fact
4 that the Commission requested those studies to be done and
5 they hadn't been done yet.

6 STOLDAL: Okay.

7 BROWN: Because they didn't -- they needed the
8 money. And so, at this point, the 30,000 will indeed get them
9 pretty far along in those -- getting all of those studies
10 done, not the drawings themselves, but the -- all of the
11 analysis can be done. And the Commission preferred that those
12 studies be done before, you know, money was expended on brick
13 and mortar, such as the roof. They do have the quote from the
14 roof as we noted here.

15 STOLDAL: So, if I understand, Chair correctly that
16 if I made a motion to approve the additional 40,000 for the
17 studies, and the 44-14 to follow they would be able to move
18 forward with the studies and fixing the roof in sequence.
19 Certainly, you can't fix the roof before you get the studies
20 done. So, if I made a motion to approve the \$84,115 would
21 that be a viable -- I'm asking kind of staff, does that make
22 sense?

23 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
24 That would certainly be a reasonable approach. We have the
25 screen up, so we can't invite -- Carla, can you invite the

1 grantee while the screen is up?

2 OSTROVSKY: If not, she could take it down. I --
3 while we're doing that staff, I thought there was some issue
4 about whether a metal roof was appropriate to meet the
5 standard. Is that something yet to be determined?

6 BROWN: This is Kristen Brown. Yes, we would need
7 to work with the applicant to discuss the most appropriate
8 type of roof. The roof quote that they currently have was
9 obtained some time ago and since the study had not been
10 completed yet, and we had not had a chance to review the
11 proposed scope, we have not had a -- really that conversation
12 with the applicant yet, but that's certainly something that
13 staff does for every award, for every grantee. We go through
14 the scope of work really carefully and make sure that it meets
15 the standards. And before we execute the funding agreement, we
16 ensure that the scope is correct in that funding agreement.

17 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

18 STOLDAL: Well, with that I'd like to make a motion
19 that we approve the additional \$40,000 for the study, as well
20 as \$44,115 for the roof, realizing that there are -- this is a
21 2019 quote for the -- for the roof and things may change, but
22 I think we need to move forward and have the board approve
23 this now. And if they need to come back at a little later
24 date for additional funding for this. So, that would be my
25 motion for the \$84,115 for CCCHP- 21-18, the City of Carlin.

1 OSTROVSKY: Do we have a second to that motion?

2 YEANDEL: Yeah, this is Yale Yeandel, Las Vegas. I
3 would like to second that motion, please.

4 OSTROVSKY: All right. Thank you. We have a motion
5 and a second. You said someone from the City of Carlin is
6 available?

7 CLOUD: Carla Cloud for the record. Yes, I have
8 Madison from the City of Carlin, one moment. Go ahead
9 Madison.

10 AVILES: Thanks. Madison --

11 OSTROVSKY: Madison, You on board?

12 AVILES: Yes. Can you hear me, okay?

13 YEANDEL: Yes, Madison, I just -- a question on the
14 roof. It's an old bid. Do you have any feelings about
15 whether that bid is still good? Is it a local contractor.
16 What's your -- on this \$44,000 roofing project, that's three
17 years ago. Any comments?

18 AVILES: Yes. This is Madison Aviles for the
19 record. The roofing quote is from a local contractor, given
20 the economic status. We believe that it's likely that quote
21 would be no longer valid, but we will contact the contractor
22 to see if we can get an update on the building materials, we
23 can also work with staff to review the appropriate materials.
24 There's currently a very old cedared shingle roof, I believe.
25 And so, when we were looking for contractors to replace that

1 type of material there were limitations. So, we can begin
2 that process with staff, should the motion move forward, and I
3 can begin updating that quote as well.

4 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank any other questions anyone
5 has for Madison? Thank you for answering my questions.

6 AVILES: Thank you very much.

7 OSTROVSKY: Any other questions from either from staff
8 or from the Commission?

9 PALMER: Yes.

10 OSTROVSKY: Go ahead.

11 PALMER: Oh, I'm sorry. For the record. This is
12 Rebecca Palmer. Given that this was an older quote, and the
13 Commission is awarding based on an older quote, is it -- is it
14 the Commission's desire to ensure that this roof project is
15 completed?

16 STOLDAL: Mr. Chairman, I think that's really a good
17 question. As I'm thinking about that this Commission
18 certainly has the authority to increase the amount that --
19 from the 2019 at 44. You know, we have looked at cost going
20 up sometimes by 25%, in some places it's gone up almost
21 double, but if we were to take the 44,000 and add a 20%
22 increase making it 53, I would certainly amend my motion to
23 increase the amount to adding 20% to that number and changing
24 it from 44 to 53,000.

25 OSTROVSKY: Did the secondary of the motion agree?

1 YEANDEL: Yes. I agree with the 20% increase. I
2 think that's a viable solution.

3 OSTROVSKY: I -- I appreciate that. We'll amend the
4 motion in that way then from the person who made the motion in
5 the secondary. I -- I think it reflects this Commission's
6 effort to try to save these buildings without a roof -- an
7 appropriate roof, the water damage and winter damage that
8 occurs actually increases the cost of trying to bring these
9 buildings back up to occupancy. So, we've always viewed roofs
10 as very important to stabilizing these structures. We know
11 there's a lot more work that needs to be done in this
12 building, but it's a beginning for Carlin to get this done,
13 and therefore any other public comment? Hearing none --

14 YEANDEL: I just have a quick comment. I -- I have
15 -- I have some concerns that, you know, the 20% may not be
16 enough, so has the applicants got additional funds that if the
17 amount ended up being 60 or \$70,000, would they still be able
18 to proceed with the roof? 'Cause it's 20 -- we've made up 20%
19 of the rough guess, but I can tell you at working
20 construction, that could be 30% or 40%.

21 OSTROVSKY: Bob (inaudible). They -- they have the
22 opportunity to come back to us. We have some additional
23 funding still available so the quicker they get a new bid, if
24 it turns out to be higher, they can come back to this
25 Commission, and we could increase it if -- if necessary.

1 YEANDEL: Okay. Thank you.

2 OSTROVSKY: Any other comments, public? All those in
3 favor of the motion say aye.

4 MEMBERS: Aye.

5 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed say nay. Hearing none it's
6 unanimous of the Commissioners present. Thank you very much.
7 And we'll be looking forward to hearing from progress and
8 seeing the final studies as they are made available to us.
9 That leads us to the last item in section 6, which is the
10 Carlin Historical Society, and staff like to bring us up to
11 date.

12 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
13 This last item in agenda item 6 is 21-23, Carlin Historical
14 Society. The Commission requested estimates for roof
15 replacement, estimates for the reconstruction of the widows
16 walk and the bell tower, and seismic stabilization, if needed
17 and reinforcement of the roof structure. The Commission also
18 requested a seismic study, an engineering study with a focus
19 on the key structural elements, such as the foundation and
20 drawings and specifications for construction. The items we
21 received, again we provided guidance staff, provided guidance
22 to the grantee that if this information was not available,
23 that they provide us with a status report for the estimates
24 for those activities. We received an estimate for the
25 preparation of drawings. We received an estimate for the

1 preparation of the architectural study and an estimate for
2 construction costs for reconstruction of the widows walk and
3 the bell tower. That ends the summary.

4 OSTROVSKY: Can I ask what we had set aside at our
5 last hearing, the funding amount?

6 PALMER: For the record, this grantee -- this is
7 Rebecca Palmer. This grantee did receive an original -- an
8 award of \$45,000 for the architectural study. The grantee
9 received an estimate or a quote. Uh, the first quote is for
10 the architectural design services, and it came in at 65,000.
11 So, 20,000 above the awarded amount. So, Carla, can you pull
12 up the spreadsheet, please? If you look in column -- the
13 purple column you will see the -- I'm not seeing it. Why am I
14 not seeing it? My apologies. Oh, it's down below. You'll
15 see the additional requested amount of \$190,002.64.

16 BROWN: This is Kristen Brown from SHPO, may I
17 make a comment?

18 OSTROVSKY: Yes, you may, please.

19 BROWN: Okay. I just want to point out that this
20 -- these two quotes are basically the same as the previous
21 Carlin grant award, and the only difference is that they're
22 listed in a different order. So, for this particular grant,
23 the 21-23 that we're discussing now, quote 2 is actually the
24 one that would occur first. Quote 2 is the \$45,000 that the
25 Commission previously granted, and that is to do the study and

1 analysis for seismic, for architecture, for recommendations,
2 evaluating the building condition and all of that, all the
3 calculations that are required to make the building stable.
4 The first quote is then the next step, is to prepare the
5 drawings themselves to be able to actually then take those
6 drawings and get the permits at the County and take the
7 drawings out to bid and get bids from contractors to actually
8 do the work. So those two go hand in hand. The 45 occurs
9 first with the money that has already been granted and the 65
10 would be the next step. And then I just also wanna point out
11 that in the supporting documentation for agenda item 7-E that
12 is on our website, if you look at page 15, that is where the
13 dollar amounts for the actual brick and mortar construction
14 work are listed. You will note that those are not quotes from
15 contractors. That is just a list of best guesses, educated of
16 course, educated guess dollar amounts from another architect
17 in town, in Elko. So, the architect is using construction
18 estimating skills to come up with these dollar amounts, but
19 because we don't have the drawings, yet they can't shop out
20 those drawings for bids from contractors. So, those dollar
21 amounts may change once actual contractors have a chance to
22 submit bids.

23 OSTROVSKY: Commission questions and comments, before
24 I make mine.

25 STOLDAL: Mr. Chairman, here's one of thinking that

1 I came up with a dollar figure of \$109, 109,002.64 cents of a
2 \$109,003, and that includes the 45 we've already allocated.
3 And then an additional 65, additional 68 and additional 11,006
4 for 145, plus the 45 we've already given. And while those are
5 construction costs are in fact estimates, the asterisk that
6 would go with my motion would be the construction costs that
7 staff would have to have actual quotes from the contractors
8 before that money would be spent. If we don't get the quotes,
9 then we don't -- staff doesn't move forward with that. So, if
10 it's not a -- I'm only suggesting we allocate a 109,000 to
11 move this project forward as fast as we can, knowing that
12 we've got some significant studies to do beforehand, before
13 the contractors' quotes can be actually, requested. But I
14 think this is a very important project and Carlin really needs
15 to be supported for all the effort it is moving forward in the
16 last couple, three years to really bring in historic
17 preservation and provide these cultural centers. So, I think
18 it would be important that we don't have direct quotes, we
19 have estimates, but we will not fund it until we get the exact
20 quotes. So, my motion would be for 190,000 when you're ready
21 for one, if following further discussion.

22 OSTROVSKY: Anyone have further discussion? I'll
23 accept your motion, Bob, if you'd like to make it.

24 STOLDAL: I'd like to approve -- make a motion to
25 approve 190,000, make it 191,000, no \$190,000 even to fund the

1 studies and the initial cost for construction following an
2 actual securing of bids for that, or that's for 21-23.

3 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Clearly understood. This is in
4 addition to the 45,000 that's already been granted. Is that
5 correct?

6 STOLDAL: The 190,000 includes the 45. So let me
7 back that up then.

8 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

9 STOLDAL: So, my request would be for \$145,000 to
10 fund the additional studies and the initial construction.

11 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Because the other money's already
12 been allocated.

13 STOLDAL: Correct.

14 OSTROVSKY: And do I have a second for that motion?

15 OLMSTEAD: Patricia Olmstead, I second.

16 OSTROVSKY: Patricia Olmstead seconds it. Any further
17 discussion of the Commissioners. Any questions from the
18 public? Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion say
19 aye.

20 MEMBERS: Aye.

21 OSTROVSKY: Any oppose? Hearing none it's unanimous
22 amongst the Commissioners in attendance. Thank you very much
23 for the folks in Carlin. We look forward to hearing from you.
24 That brings us to item number 7. This is review of Storey
25 County's request for additional funding in the amount of

1 \$18,721 to cover the cost of material and labor increases from
2 the original application. Any staff comments?

3 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
4 The documentation was provided to the Commissioners. For the
5 Commissioner's information, Carla, can you tell us which color
6 shows the remaining funds in the FY21 grant cycle? Carla,
7 you're muted. Thank you.

8 CLOUD: Carla Cloud for the record. Sorry. It's
9 the very bottom line here that I bolded the balance remaining
10 for the grant fund is 216,104.50.

11 PALMER: So, for the record, this is Rebecca
12 Palmer. Of the remaining FY21, 2022 grant cycle, there is
13 \$216,104.50 cents remaining to be awarded.

14 OSTROVSKY: That's after we approve this or before?

15 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
16 This is before any awards to grantees requesting additional
17 funding.

18 OSTROVSKY: Okay, that's fine. Thank you. Any other
19 questions?

20 STOLDAL: I had a question. Chair, I don't mean to
21 be a nitpicker, but I'm just not sure if I understand in
22 looking at the bid from the United Electric Service, as well
23 as the updated proposal. It says -- on one of them, it says,
24 here's the list -- this is from the bid included it lists
25 everything, excluded it lists what it's not included. And

1 then the budget numbers individually. So, excluded number 2
2 is drywall, carpet and other surface repair, but yet in the
3 actual budget numbers there's money for drywall and carpet
4 repair for \$7,500. So, one says the drywall and the carpet is
5 excluded, but then the budget includes \$7,500 for drywall and
6 carpet repair.

7 OSTROVSKY: Do we have someone from Storey County
8 available?

9 MENEFEE: Yes. This is Honey Menefee with Storey
10 County for the record.

11 OSTROVSKY: Would you like respond to Mr. Stoldal,
12 please?

13 MENEFEE: Pardon?

14 OSTROVSKY: Please respond to the Commissioner's
15 request, information.

16 MENEFEE: The initial bid -- This is like a format
17 that they use. And because we knew that the electrical
18 project for the court was gonna involve carpet from areas of
19 carpet, a lot of the outlets are in the flooring. And then a
20 lot of the outlets and devices are also in the drywall. I
21 asked them -- because I noticed that the drywall, carpet and
22 other surface repair was excluded, I asked them to include a
23 price that could involve that work. So, when they came back
24 with the July 6th estimate, they put a contingency because
25 they, at the time, they don't know, you know, the extent of

1 what is going to be involved until they get in there to see
2 the amount of work that's going be done with the carpet and
3 the drywall. So that -- that's why in the second one they
4 have included this \$7,500 contingency and its -- they don't
5 have an hour amount, if you've noticed that for the budget
6 numbers, they don't have the hours that is estimated because
7 it's -- it's sort of an unknown at this point. But because I
8 asked them to provide some sort of estimate for the cost that
9 could be involved with that drywall and carpet, that is what
10 came up with.

11 STOLDAL: Yeah, it makes sense. Other than the fact
12 that it's still listed as they're not going to -- it's
13 excluded from the bid, but yet they've got it in the 99,000
14 for the 7,500, and they're just suggesting based on your
15 request, that clearly there's going to be some dry wall and
16 there's gonna be some carpet issues as you point out, the
17 electrics in the wall, and the -- what we're saying -- they're
18 saying, so let let's -- let's assume that it's -- it's not 75,
19 it's closer to \$9,000 is Storey County gonna pick up the rest
20 of that?

21 MENEFEE: Yes.

22 STOLDAL: Okay. Thank you. Really helpful.
23 Appreciate it.

24 OSTROVSKY: Any other questions? Did we have a
25 motion? I'm sorry, we don't think we did.

1 STOLDAL: Move to approve Storey County 21-01 for
2 the additional 18,721.

3 OSTROVSKY: Do we have a second?

4 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah. This is (Inaudible) from Las Vegas,
5 I'd like to second the motion.

6 OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and second. Any further
7 discussion amongst Commissioners? Any public comment?
8 Hearing or seeing none, all those in favor of the motion, say
9 aye.

10 MEMBERS: Aye.

11 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? unanimous amongst the
12 commissioners in attendance. Item 8, review of Fallon
13 Community Theatre's request for additional funding of \$15,000
14 in grant 21-05 due to increased cost of the metal roofing from
15 the original application. They apparently got a new bid.
16 Staff any comment?

17 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
18 When this meeting was rescheduled to today, September the
19 19th, 2022, excuse me. The -- we sent out a notification to
20 the grantees that consistent with the request of the
21 Commission in their June hearing that if any party had
22 additional costs, that they've discovered since their original
23 application due to economic issues or increasing supply costs
24 or contractor costs, that they were to notify staff and
25 provide an estimate as to what those additional costs might

1 be. The Fallon Community Theatre's original request is now,
2 grant number 21-05 is now \$15,000 below the required funding.
3 And I have no further information to share.

4 OSTROVSKY: Any questions or comments.

5 STOLDAL: Stoldal for the record. I'd like to make
6 it a motion to approve the additional \$15,000 for the Fallon
7 Community Theatre 21-05.

8 OSTROVSKY: Do I have a second for that motion?

9 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead, I second.

10 OSTROVSKY: Commissioner Olmstead, second. Any
11 comment from Commissioners -- comment or questions? Any
12 comments or questions from the public? Hearing and seeing
13 none, all those in favor of the motion say aye.

14 MEMBERS: Aye.

15 OSTROVSKY: All oppose say nay. It's unanimous
16 amongst the Commissioners in attendance. Thank you. Item
17 number 9 is the Fourth Ward School. It's a little different
18 request. They're seeking reimbursement for an installation of
19 scaffolding prior to receiving a full funding agreement. It's
20 a bit unusual. If staff could give us a quick review of why
21 we're in this situation.

22 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
23 I'll go through the relevant dates, but I will note for the
24 Commission's benefit and the benefit of the public, and the
25 grantees that happen to be on this zoom call the CCHP grant

1 manual very clearly states on page 7 that a grantee cannot
2 begin the grant funded portion of their project until the
3 covenants are officially recorded, and the proof of recording
4 and the original covenants are received by SHPO. On August
5 the 29, 2022, SHPO staff had a phone conversation with the
6 grantee's representative, where the grantee informed SHPO
7 staff that the scaffolding had already been in place. And the
8 grantee was going to seek reimbursement for the scaffolding
9 construction. There are some dates to be aware of. The
10 funding agreement project commencement date was August the
11 15th, 2022. This date was set in consultation with the
12 grantee because they felt that they could begin work quickly.
13 However, there were delays in the execution of the funding
14 agreement and the funding agreement was not executed until
15 August the 24th, 2022. The recorded covenants were not --
16 were received by SHPO staff on August the 30th, 2022, two
17 weeks after the initiation of the project. At this point the
18 Commission must decide whether to reimburse the requested
19 funding for the scaffolding construction or not.

20 OSTROVSKY: What was the total amount?

21 PALMER: The amount of -- of requested -- Carla,
22 can you provide us with that? You're muted.

23 CLOUD: Carla Cloud for the record. Yes, I can
24 locate that amount, I believe with 69,600. The receipt was
25 provided in the backups documentation that was sent to the

1 Commission as well. One moment, please. Yes, I can confirm
2 the amount that the Historic Fourth Ward paid to the Raymond
3 Brothers for the scaffolding was \$69,600. And that check was
4 made out to them on September 6, 2022.

5 PALMER: For the record this is Rebecca Palmer.
6 Sir, I believe the grantees representative is present.

7 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Just so we understand, they're
8 asking us to approve this expenditure outside of what we
9 consider our normal funding process. They're not asking for
10 additional money beyond their grant. This is a portion of
11 what would've been included in the grant had it been executed
12 in a timely fashion. Is that correct staff?

13 PALMER: For the record, that is indeed correct. I
14 would like to note also for the record that the commencement
15 date of the activities was August the 15th. The scaffolding
16 was put in place on August the 17th. So, it does appear that
17 the work was conducted within the commencement and termination
18 dates identified in the funding agreement, but the funding
19 agreement was not executed until August the 24th, 2022.

20 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Commissioners have questions?

21 STOLDAL: I have a question. I think we -- this is
22 really detailed by staff and, you know, we're not talking
23 about weeks or months. We're talking about a period of, it
24 looks like less than, about three week and the nine six when
25 it was paid is within that. I -- I think that the applicant,

1 clearly understands the timing issues as we move forward. So,
2 I'd just like to make a motion to approve this so we can move
3 on with this project.

4 OSTROVSKY: Do we have a second to that motion?

5 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead, I second.

6 OSTROVSKY: Any questions or comments from the
7 Commissioners? Any questions or comments?

8 UNIDENTIFIED: I -- I have -- I have a comment. Yeah, I
9 -- I just was a little bit curious about this. I -- I've been
10 to the site before, it's a beautiful school that needs
11 restoration and the scaffolding is like almost four stories
12 high and it's -- it's like -- it's rented, correct? The
13 scaffold is rented or is it purchased?

14 STOLDAL: My understanding that it -- it's -- it's
15 it's -- leased out. It -- it's -- it's -- it's rented.

16 UNIDENTIFIED: It's rented? Okay.

17 STOLDAL: Yeah.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: So, we're just talking about a couple of
19 days, but I mean, it's -- I -- I've worked on large projects
20 with large scaffoldings and, you know, it's -- it's difficult
21 to secure everything. I mean, it's -- I -- I understand that
22 price tag there because when you're talking about four stories
23 of scaffolding, you're talking about a lot of safety and a lot
24 of -- it -- it -- it's not just a quick set up the scaffolding
25 and -- and move on. So, I -- I -- but I just was curious.

1 Sometimes you could purchase the scaffolding. So, I did -- I
2 didn't know, if it was a renter or a purchase.

3 STOLDAL: Well, I -- you know, in one sense is a
4 good question. 'Cause every time I visited, and which was
5 also this past weekend, it seems that there's always
6 scaffolding up at one side of the -- by the time we're --
7 we're done with one it's four or five years have passed, and
8 we need to -- to redo it. But -- but probably renting it at
9 this point is still the --

10 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, it is. Yeah.

11 OSTROVSKY: Any further comments from Commissioners?

12 UNIDENTIFIED: That's it. Yeah.

13 OSTROVSKY: Any comments from the public, questions?
14 Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion, say aye.

15 MEMBERS: Aye.

16 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed say nay. Unanimous approval
17 of the Commissioner's present. Thank you. Item 10 is a
18 review Goldfield Historical Society, additional funding of the
19 cycle. They're asking for \$85,469.80. This has to do with
20 roofing. Staff comments, please.

21 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
22 This one is somewhat complicated, and I believe sir, that we
23 do have the grantee available if you wish.

24 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

25 PALMER: Consistent with the Commission's desire to

1 ensure that there was a complete project, and in discussions
2 with the grantee and yourself, we augmented their 19 grant,
3 with an additional amount of 85,469.80, so that they would
4 have a complete FY 19 and 20 project. This revenue will allow
5 the FY 1920 award to be completed; however, I now seek the
6 Commission's decision as to what the source of the revenue to
7 support the additional \$85,469.80 will be. It can either come
8 from the FY1920 remaining administrative funds, or it can come
9 from a portion of the grantees FY 2122 grant, which is for
10 another phase of the roofing project consistent also with the
11 Commission's desire that the project remain similar to that
12 reviewed during a grant hearing. So, I ask the Commission for
13 a decision as to what the revenue source might be. That ends
14 my report, and I'd be happy to answer any questions the
15 Commissioners might have.

16 OSTROVSKY: Let me ask -- start by asking the question
17 so I understand clearly. If we take it from the remaining
18 administrative funds that are available, it would spill over
19 then to item 11, which would then leave us approximately
20 13,000 additional dollars yet to be distributed from those
21 administrative funds. Is that correct?

22 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
23 Yes. If the 85,000, in shorthand, came from the remaining
24 administrative funds, there would be \$13,745.58 remaining in
25 administrative funds.

1 OSTROVSKY: OK. I open it for the Commissioners for
2 questions and comments. The two issues, one, do we wanna fund
3 it? And number two, where do we wanna fund it from?

4 STOLDAL: Stoldal, for the record. Well, first I --
5 this is to me is one of the essential projects statewide and I
6 would support taking the \$85,500. I would prefer to spend it
7 allocated out of the 19 and 20. We're running out of time to
8 spend that, and I'd rather we look for 21-22 for other
9 projects. So, I would recommend we take the \$85,500 for the
10 Goldfield Historical Society, that would be potentially a
11 motion after further discussion.

12 OSTROVSKY: Any other discussion of Commissioners?
13 Hearing none, would you like to make a motion, Bob?

14 STOLDAL: I'd like to make a motion to approve the
15 request for \$85,500 for the Goldfield High School, and out of
16 the CCCHP-19-20 fiscal funds? (Inaudible).

17 OSTROVSKY: Do we have a second?

18 ORTLIPP: David Ortlipp, I second.

19 YEANDEL: Yale Yeandel, Las Vegas, I'd like to
20 second the motion.

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

25 MEMBERS: Aye.

1 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The motion passes
2 unanimately of the Commissioners present. Can I ask staff to
3 bring up the spreadsheet now?

4 CLOUD: Carla Cloud for the record. One moment,
5 sir, I'll bring that right up.

6 STOLDAL: So, this is 21-22.

7 CLOUD: Did you --

8 OSTROVSKY: Well, that's where you drew the money
9 from, isn't it?

10 STOLDAL: I can -- I made it out of 19-20.

11 CLOUD: Let me bring up that spreadsheet, one
12 moment, sir. So, as you can see the current amount, we have
13 remaining in the 19-20, after awarding to Goldfield, we will
14 now have 13,745 remaining in admin. To date, with the grants
15 that have not expended all of their grants we still have
16 15,000 in that. So, we are looking at currently, before the
17 other grantees finish their projects in January, we're
18 currently looking at 28,912.42 in the 19-20 grant funding.

19 STOLDAL: Let ask a question, Mr. Chair.

20 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

21 STOLDAL: When you say the 20 -- well, let's say the
22 29,000, what are the things that would drive that either up or
23 down for?

24 PALMER: Vice chair, this is Rebecca Palmer. Were
25 you speaking to staff?

1 STOLDAL: Yes. In other words, is there something
2 that could diminish -- that reduce that 29,000 that's in the
3 pipeline or is there something that could actually increase
4 the amount of money that could be allocated because projects
5 don't are -- come under budget or come over budget, or what
6 what's -- what's the factors in -- in the 20 -- in the 19-20,
7 \$29,000 that appears to be remaining as of today, if we fund -
8 - well, did we vote -- we voted on this?

9 OSTROVSKY: Yes, we did.

10 CLOUD: Carla Cloud for the record. So, the
11 remaining amount of, correct me if I'm wrong Rebecca, would
12 need to be, redistributed by the Commission, and yes, that
13 could go up if for unforeseen reason the other grantees were
14 not able to finish their projects by January, or if they were
15 not -- or if they came in under budget and had remaining
16 funds. So, this number could change after January 3rd.

17 OSTROVSKY: In addition to that can staff make some de
18 minimis changes to the amounts that they go over?

19 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
20 We would be happy to do that. Are -- are we on agenda item
21 11?

22 OSTROVSKY: We could certainly go to and agenda 11.
23 Now we're discussing funding balances and that's what item 11
24 is all about. The discussion, decision for distribution of
25 remaining funds from FY 19 to 20. So, let's -- let's take

1 this as item 11, please. Go ahead.

2 PALMER: Thank you, sir. For the record, this is
3 Rebecca Palmer. There are several grantees still working on
4 FY 19-20 projects, and they may very well come in under
5 budget, or they may have so many challenges that they may not
6 be able to complete their project, if that were the case,
7 staff recommends that there be a contingency for what to do
8 with the remaining funds, including any interest earned on the
9 proceeds before the close of the -- entire close of the grant.
10 In addition, we have one grantee, the city of Ely, the Ely Old
11 City Hall that came in under budget already at approximately
12 \$6,000. Consistent with the commission's wishes, we have
13 reverted the funding back to the pot, in the amount of around
14 \$6,000. The grantee has requested that they be awarded the
15 additional \$6,000 to augment their FY 21-22 grant in the
16 amount of \$6,000. That is certainly one option. Another
17 alternative for a decision to distribute the remaining FY 19-
18 20 funding would be to distribute the funds to all or a
19 portion of the FY 21 grantees who were also FY 19 and 20
20 grantees. Those that 13,000 will actually end up probably
21 being more in the range of \$28,000, \$912.42, could not go to a
22 21 grantee who was not also a 19 grantee.

23 STOLDAL: Actually -- fear -- I -- I think I
24 followed that. Quick question, the \$6,000 from Ely is not
25 part of the 29?

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

2 No, it's not because it occurred after the development of the
3 supplemental documents. It was a recent development. And
4 Carla, if you can tell me exactly what the number is?

5 CLOUD: The remaining amount that Ely has, is that
6 what you're referring to?

7 PALMER: Yes.

8 CLOUD: Yes, sorry. Carla Cloud for the record.
9 Yes. According to, Mayor Robertson, it is \$6,000.

10 STOLDAL: And, Mr. Chair, just a quick question for
11 the Deputy Attorney General, item number 11, discussion and
12 decision for the distribution of remaining funds. This is an
13 action item. It appears we may have several motions --
14 different motions to distribute the remaining funds. Should
15 that be one motion that includes several items, or can we
16 make, for example -- can we make a motion to deal with the
17 request for the \$6,000 and a motion that we would add that to
18 their 21-20 funds, or do we have to add -- have all those
19 things in a single motion?

20 UNIDENTIFIED: I think a single motion should work. I
21 don't see any prohibition on that, kind of treating it as like
22 an omnibus motion to take care of all those.

23 STOLDAL: Okay. Could we do it the other way
24 though, as well?

25 UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, yeah, either one.

1 STOLDAL: Okay.

2 UNIDENTIFIED: It doesn't seem like there's a legal
3 difference to me. That should be fine as long as it's clearly
4 spelled out on the record.

5 STOLDAL: Right. Mr. Chair, then I'd like to make
6 the first motion to approve Ely's request for their coming
7 under budget of \$6,000 for the 19-20 grant that they received
8 and move that to their 20-21 or their 20-21 grant.

9 OSTROVSKY: Do we have a second for that motion?

10 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead I second.

11 OSTROVSKY: Olmstead second. Any further comments or
12 questions from Commissioners? Any comments or questions from
13 the general public? Hearing none, all those in favor of the
14 motion, say aye.

15 MEMBERS: Aye.

16 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? motion carries unanimously
17 amongst the commissioners in attendance. Thank you. Which
18 relieves us of further questions then, Rebecca what's the
19 remaining balance we need to deal with? 29,000 is that it?

20 STOLDAL: Looks like 28,000.

21 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I
22 believe the remaining balance would be \$28,912.42 cents of FY
23 19 funding. And then Carla, if you can show what remains of
24 the FY-21 funding. And so, it's 182,385.

25 STOLDAL: Well, the -- we are on item number 11,

1 which is -- deals primary with -- with singularly FY19-20.,
2 correct?

3 OSTROVSKY: Yes. Yeah.

4 PALMER: So. So, my apologies. This is Rebecca
5 Palmer. Yes. Then that amount is 28,912.42. It could be
6 slightly more with interest being earned on that.

7 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, some discussion. I -- I'm
8 thinking that maybe we provide this fund -- 'cause Rebecca
9 Palmer suggested there's a couple three ways to go, one is to
10 take the 289 from the 19-20 cycle and distribute that to the
11 grantees that were in that cycle, but are also in the 20-21
12 cycle and distribute that to them in -- in some fashion that
13 we would need to think of. We could either do it one or two
14 ways, either everybody gets the same piece or there's some
15 mathematical formula that they get some ratio to what their
16 grant is in 2021. One way is less complicated, the other way
17 is -- would be some math that I'm not capable of doing. But
18 that would be one suggestion. And the other suggestion would
19 be to simply let staff make those decisions on the most needy
20 that are coming up in the 2120 cycle.

21 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, this -- this is Bob Ostrovsky. My
22 concern is the creeping cost of construction. As we know in
23 rural areas in particular, getting contractors to work in some
24 remote areas becomes very difficult and very expensive. Just
25 the transportation costs, which have increased significantly

1 in the last 12 months makes it more difficult. I was -- I was
2 thinking that I think your way of allowing staff to augment
3 the various grantees as needed for inflationary costs of --
4 for the grants that we've already approved. Some of those
5 grantees have completed their funding. We had one with --
6 that saved money, the 6,000 we just talked about. I would
7 support allowing, you know, staff to distribute it as needed,
8 obviously reporting back to us on where those funds are
9 expended to help offset the cost of inflation.

10 STOLDAL: And, again, the math is, or the matrix is
11 the 1920 remaining funds of 28-9 can only go to those grants
12 fees that received money in 1920 and also received in money in
13 2021, is that correct?

14 PALMER: For the record this is Rebecca Palmer.
15 That is indeed correct.

16 STOLDAL: Do you have -- can we look at - see
17 potentially who those people are? Is way to do that?

18 PALMER: For the record this is Rebecca Palmer.
19 Yes. There's a way to do that. And the way to do that is to
20 look at the summary documents I sent for agenda item number 5,
21 and those, projects are present there. So, I can read them
22 off if you'd like, sir.

23 STOLDAL: Does Carla have a -- is there a screen
24 that we can put up?

25 OSTROVSKY: Well, there is one up.

1 STOLDAL: I want, but that doesn't show the 1920.
2 Well, whichever way is easiest, Mr. Chair.

3 OSTROVSKY: Well, these would be the grantees that are
4 with projects that are not completed, is that right staff?

5 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
6 That is correct, sir. If Carla leaves that spreadsheet up, I
7 can pinpoint exactly which grantees could take advantage of
8 the 28,000 plus 289 available. That would be -- for the
9 record, this is Rebecca Palmer, that would be White Pine
10 County Community Choir Association, St. Mary's Art Center,
11 Nevada Northern Railway Foundation, the City of Ely, the
12 Goldfield Historical Society, the Carlin Historical Society.
13 And I believe that's correct. That's all.

14 STOLDAL: So, Ely is already -- we've already moved
15 some Ely money from - from -- so St. Mary's, White Pine. And
16 St. Mary's is -- is -- okay and Goldfield. And I think we've
17 pretty well funded Carlin Historical Society, although we --
18 so that's really White Pine, St. Mary's, Northern Nevada,
19 Goldfield and Carlin.

20 PALMER: For the record, that's correct. If the
21 decision is to augment a 19 grant as the costs increase. If
22 the decision is to either augment a 19 grant or to augment a
23 2122 grant, the pool of possible recipients grows --

24 STOLDAL: Really?

25 PALMER: -- somewhat larger.

1 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, because we have folks in that grant
2 period that did not receive money in the next cycle, but
3 there's projects are still ongoing. Is that right?

4 PALMER: For the record -- this -- that is correct.
5 And there are also FY19 grantees who have completed their
6 project, but who have applied for FY-2122 grant funds.

7 OSTROVSKY: Right.

8 PALMER: So, if the decision were to just hold the
9 28,000.94 in reserve for possible cost increases in FY-19, we
10 could certainly do that. And that -- I just read out the list
11 of possible grantees who could have their 19 grants augmented
12 sufficiently to cover costs. However, if the decision is to
13 include not just those remaining to be completed, but also uh,
14 FY-19 grantees who have completed their grants in FY-19, but
15 who have also applied for FY-21, 22, the population is larger
16 of those who could -- who could receive those funding.

17 STOLDAL: Rebecca, how much - Stoldal, for the
18 record. How much -- do we have to make that decision today,
19 or do we have some time to make that decision?

20 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
21 There is time to make that decision. So, if I have the
22 Commission's direction to augment 19 grants to account for
23 cost increases, the \$28,912 will shrink if we do that. And
24 then in the next Commission meeting you would receive a report
25 as to what that remaining balance will be.

1 STOLDAL: Well, we all know are going up so, Mr.
2 Chair, I think I'm leaning toward that motion.

3 OSTROVSKY: Would you like to restate that in a motion
4 form with staffs out?

5 STOLDAL: The motion would be to use the remaining
6 1920 funds now at \$28,900, but could go up, and that would
7 include any increase if projects came in under budget, and to
8 allow staff to allocate those funds to any of the 1920
9 applicants whose costs have gone up, and then with a report to
10 the board at the next meeting.

11 OSTROVSKY: Do we have a second for that motion?

12 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead, I'll second.

13 OSTROVSKY: Commissioner Olmstead, second. Any
14 further question or comments from the Commission? Any public
15 comment or question? Hearing none, all in favor of the motion
16 say aye.

17 MEMBERS: Aye.

18 OSTROVSKY: any opposed? It's unanimous amongst the
19 Commissioners in attendance. Takes us to the last action
20 item, close to the end of the agenda (inaudible).

21 CLOUD: I'm sorry.

22 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

23 CLOUD: This is Carla Cloud for the record. I
24 just got a chat message. A question from the Cemetery
25 Foundation.

1 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

2 CLOUD: They state the Cemetery Foundation CCCHP-
3 21-02 would like to request another \$8,400 for design drawings
4 for handicap toilets to be reviewed approved by engineers.
5 So, they are bid ready. Is there another point in this
6 process where we could request that addition?

7 STOLDAL: Well, we haven't moved on to the next
8 item.

9 CLOUD: Okay. I was just letting you know, the
10 chat had come in. Thank you.

11 OSTROVSKY: Well, do we wanna take on those kinds of
12 requests now, or do wanna wait and take them in the future
13 meeting?

14 STOLDAL: Well, it's -- it's -- Stoldal for the
15 record. It's a known applicant, but I don't have any real
16 details in front of me, not that -- when \$8,400, and, and we
17 would certainly like to make the ADA facilities available at
18 the site.

19 OSTROVSKY: I guess my preference would be to get it
20 in writing and take a look at it.

21 UNIDENTIFIED: I -- I think as a point of order, we'd
22 have to put it as a future agenda item, right? Rather than
23 doing it on the spot.

24 OSTROVSKY: Well, we might slip it under 11, but I
25 prefer to get an agenda item at future meeting. That'd be my

1 preference anyway.

2 CLOUD: And Carla cloud, just for the record, they
3 do make a note here to say, see architect's quote. So, I
4 don't know if that is already included in the quote that they
5 provided before. We'd have to look. It has been included in
6 the bid submitted, but we can detail it later in the response
7 I just received from Candace.

8 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Well, I'd rather wait to the
9 detail, and we can talk about it at our next meeting.

10 CLOUD: Wonderful.

11 OSTROVSKY: If that's all right with the other
12 Commissioners.

13 STOLDAL: Makes sense.

14 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. So, we're up to item 12, then.
15 Discussion and decision on what should be required of a
16 nonprofit for an audit. For those Commissioners who weren't
17 present, we've struggled recently with a question of audits
18 which are required, and we have agencies, which -- and small
19 foundations which have not done audits. They've provided us
20 varying information about how they track expenditures, how
21 many signatures are required, bank records, et cetera, but no
22 audit per se. We all know audits can be expensive, but as Mr.
23 Stoldal said earlier, if you're getting \$400,000, an audit
24 would seem like a reasonable request if your total project
25 cost is, you know, \$19,000, and we granted it, it's hard to

1 imagine them asking spending four or \$5,000 on an audit. So,
2 I'll open it for discussion about whether we should, one
3 change our audit procedures and rules, to be more specific
4 about who should and who shouldn't, or whether an audit is so
5 important we ought to require one on some cycle, whether that
6 be 2 years or 5 years or whatever. I open it for discussion.
7 Bob, I know you had feelings about audits.

8 STOLDAL: Well, first thing I did is just what you
9 talked about is, is whether or not we need to change the grant
10 application. And I think we do to some degree. Right now,
11 there is on the grant application there's a requirement and
12 statutorily, this commission has the authority to require an
13 audit. The State of Nevada does not require nonprofits to
14 come up with an audit. And I think that that's been confusing
15 to just potentially to some of the applicants that said the
16 NRS does allow this Commission to set the standards for
17 allocating taxpayer funds. And one of the things that we
18 decided, I'm saying we generically, but way before us, the the
19 Commission decided that we needed an audit. So, we would
20 change, 'cause we use a language one copy of your latest audit
21 is required, and it's through that application. While the
22 state doesn't require nonprofits audit, it clearly reference
23 that they exist in one of the NRS 82-186 talks about the
24 ability to inspect audits of non-profits. And the attorney
25 general of the State of Nevada has a guide for nonprofits.

1 And in reading that it mentions audit several times, and that
2 it should be done by an independent accountant to ensure
3 accuracy. So, it's not that the State of Nevada prohibits
4 audits. So, it just really leaves it up to the particular
5 agency and, we would need to adjust our application, and our
6 grant manual with that. That said, we get back to the
7 fundamental challenge of a nonprofit, how it can fund a
8 \$10,000 annual audit. But I think what we are trying to get
9 at is this board, this Commission needs to be assured that
10 there is some financial accounting process of something that -
11 - that, and so in doing a limited amount of research, Mr.
12 Chair, there are things called professional audits,
13 professional reviews, and professional complications, and they
14 are some form of review of the accounting process. The review
15 is less extensive than an audit but involves more than a
16 complication. A review engagement consists primarily of -- of
17 an analysis of the procedures of the financial of that
18 particular nonprofit. And the last one is the computation,
19 for whatever reason that doesn't wanna come out -- is simply
20 something that's done by an independent CPA looking at what
21 the process is that they are using. Not saying the math all
22 adds up, but here's what the processes they are using. And so
23 I was thinking in the most broadest terms that we put this
24 into our process rather than just a straight word, the word
25 audit, which has a very specific requirement when you audit

1 something, that we add these other reviews and attach to them
2 something that includes the amount of revenue, the amount of
3 how much the grant is. So, if they're getting a quarter
4 million dollars in grants, we would need potentially an audit.
5 And some of these agencies have gotten more than a million
6 dollars. So, I would certainly look for an audit from some --
7 one of these nonprofits that received that kind of money.
8 Now, whether it's an annual audit, but I want to use the word
9 recent, because that could be the last one, and that was done
10 in 2010. So, I think there's some language that we need to
11 draw up that includes the opportunities for the smaller
12 nonprofits to do an audit or a review, or a computation.
13 Secondly, that there's some connection with the amount of
14 revenue that this nonprofit is receiving. And then the third
15 element I was thinking about was some relationship to an audit
16 that needs to be done. Maybe some of them annually, or some
17 of them over 3 or 2-year period.

18 OSTROVSKY: Other Commissioners have comments about
19 thoughts about audits?

20 ORTLIPP: Commission Ortlipp. I would say that for
21 smaller grants, that would be something that would be perhaps
22 too onerous. So, maybe what we do is we -- we put a -- a
23 (inaudible) on this and say, grants above a certain amount
24 that's been awarded would require this. 'Cause, you're right
25 I think if -- if -- if it's a very small project and someone

1 who's getting 15 or \$20,000 to -- to repair some steps or a
2 roof or something, it would seem to be a little too onerous to
3 have the same level of accountability for someone who's
4 receiving a million dollars. That's kind of my thoughts on
5 that.

6 OSTROVSKY: Let me ask staff a question. Staff, when
7 would the next grant request proposal go out where we have to
8 specify that if -- if we change the rules, when do we need to
9 do that? Do we need to do it at this meeting or another one?

10 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
11 Assuming that support for the Commission, and for the sale of
12 bonds appears in the ledge-approved budget next year, the
13 first opportunity for the Commission to decide the grant cycle
14 would be July of 2023, when the new, executive ledge-approved
15 budget is in place. So, the answer to the question is the
16 decision does not need to be made now, but it should be made
17 before the Commission approves the application and forms for
18 any future grant cycles, which would be after July of 2023.

19 OSTROVSKY: Is there -- I know that the legislative
20 counsel bureau has an audit division, the state has an audit
21 division. Is there any expertise we could go to, that you
22 could think of, to help us guide on what would be reasonable?
23 I mean, could we ask for assistance just in formulating a
24 policy? 'Cause my thought is I don't think we're prepared to
25 do it today, but perhaps we could get some recommendations

1 from even the board of accountancy over what they might
2 recommend there as a board, for us to follow as a guideline
3 that would be reasonable. Is that possible?

4 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
5 Staff would be happy to do some research on what's available,
6 what's a reasonable audit request for a nonprofit, because
7 that is essentially the population, we're addressing here are
8 the nonprofits, because the local governments and the
9 governmental entities already have audit procedures in place.

10 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

11 PALMER: I would be happy -- staff would be happy
12 to reach out to our sister agencies, the Arts Council, the
13 Humanities, and find out if there are some policies or, best
14 practices for nonprofits in those fields that we could provide
15 that information to the Commission at its next meeting.

16 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Is that acceptable to the
17 Commissioners?

18 STOLDAL: Well, except the Arts council and the
19 Humanities don't give out two or \$300,000 grant; they give out
20 two or \$3,000 grants to artists and authors and put on single
21 events. Bob, you -- Mr. Chair, you talked about the Nevada
22 Board of Accountants.

23 OSTROVSKY: Yes. There's a board of accountancy,
24 which is the one that licenses the CPAs in the state.

25 STOLDAL: I see. I think -- I think we need to

1 reach out to that level because I -- again, the Arts Council
2 and Humanities really don't -- we should ask them, but I think
3 that they're -- the amount of grants that -- they probably
4 don't ask for audits for some of the smaller grants. But
5 going to the agency you talked about, and -- and I mean, I did
6 a little bit of that surface research on -- on -- on with
7 them, and -- and there are the different levels of accountants
8 of -- of audits that are not called audits, that I think would
9 give us some -- some feeling of security that there is
10 something in place that the nonprofit uses to -- you know, the
11 one that we received from White Pine, it lists in detail what
12 they do, but they don't -- the one thing they don't have, and
13 I think is key is an outside agency. They probably have very
14 good internal checks and balances, but we would be looking for
15 some form of somebody coming in and doing a full audit or one
16 of the lower ones, which would cost less. But going to that,
17 to the -- the State Board, I think would be a perfect place to
18 go.

19 OSTROVSKY: So, it's all right if I direct staff to do
20 research and bring it back and we agendaize this item again?

21 STOLDAL: I think it'd be great.

22 OSTROVSKY: Okay. So, we will do that. That'll take
23 care of item number 12 for the moment, but it will appear on
24 our next agenda. And staff, I appreciate your help in
25 reaching out, even if it's the State Audit Division or would

1 be helpful in just looking for some guidance, appreciate that.
2 Which leads us to 13, the next to the last item. The staff
3 would like to bring us up to date on the handbook application
4 and forms.

5 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer and
6 in the interest of time and the fact that it is later, we'll
7 keep this brief. But I have with us today, Rayette Martin,
8 who has, I believe reached out to all of you as Commissioners
9 and working on the handbook, the application and forms. So, I
10 will pass you off to Rayette.

11 MARTIN: hi, I'm Rayette Martin for the record, and
12 I have been tasked with kind of upgrading everything that we
13 have when it comes to the application, the guidance and the
14 forms. My goal is to make it as easy as possible for not only
15 the applicants, but the grantees and yourselves to know what
16 happens during each step of this granting process, so I broke
17 everything down into when you apply, to when you receive the
18 grant, to what are your responsibilities afterward. I took
19 all of the forms, and I standardized them into interactive
20 PDFs, and they reference the pages within the handbook so
21 people can double check that quite easily. I am also --
22 worked on the application and forms that are kind of separate,
23 so there's like three different documents that work together.
24 So, sitting in today's meeting, I have been taking notes to
25 make sure that these issues and things that come up are

1 reflected in that handbook. I've gone through all the old
2 meetings and through conversations with you all, and then also
3 former applicants and people who've come to informational
4 sessions, incorporated their questions and concerns as well.
5 So, this has been a long going process to get this information
6 together. So, I did wanna make a quick comment about the
7 audit and talking about accountability. In the grant manual,
8 which is now gonna be in the handbook, there is a request for
9 an adequate accounting system for all applicants, and it has a
10 number of bullet points that it goes through that explains
11 what that looks like and what that needs to be. So, when
12 you're ready to have the conversation about what type of audit
13 or substitute for that, that's adequate there is some -- some
14 language that's already being used and I'd be more than happy
15 to help with that as well.

16 OSTROVSKY: So, if you could share that language with
17 the Commissioners, we'd appreciate it.

18 MARTIN: Yeah. I'll just, you want me to email it
19 out or put it in the chat or --

20 OSTROVSKY: Well, you can email it out as long as the
21 Commissioners understand that they cannot communicate with
22 each other. They can only communicate back to staff with
23 comments, that that would be appreciated.

24 MARTIN: Yes. Yeah. I thought that would be
25 helpful. And that's part of the -- the kind of the issue is

1 we have a great manual; it covers everything that we need.
2 It's just, if you're not familiar with it, you may not know
3 where to find everything. And so, I have a big table of
4 contents and all that stuff to help navigate people through
5 this process.

6 OSTROVSKY: Well, anything you can share with us would
7 be helpful in our own personal thinking, and then if we have
8 any comments, we can certainly get back to your individually
9 about question or comments on the materials.

10 MARTIN: Yeah. I'll work with Rebecca Palmer to --
11 when we've done our internal review of everything that I've
12 written to see what's appropriate to share that with you all.

13 OSTROVSKY: Okay, great. Thank you very much.

14 MARTIN: Thank you.

15 OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible) your work. Anything else
16 Rebecca on this item?

17 PALMER: Yes. For the record, this is Rebecca
18 Palmer. Just a reminder that this document will also be the
19 10-year plan required by statute. Additionally, given the
20 modifications that occur on a regular basis with Commissioner
21 representation, we are also including a section about previous
22 Commission decisions. So that if there's a question about
23 when did the Commission decide that audits were required or
24 something other like that, you will be able to look in this 10
25 year plan document and find when that decision was made, and

1 be able to do research, and perhaps even look at the minutes
2 for that particular meeting, and the discussion, for that
3 particular aspect of the application. I believe that was
4 important. I found the reading of the old minutes from the
5 nineties and early two thousands to be incredibly
6 enlightening, and we felt that the Commissioners would
7 appreciate having that historical information available to
8 them. And with that, I have no further comments.

9 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank --
10 thank you staff for all of your work. I can't tell you how
11 much time and effort staff puts into, one managing these
12 grants to dealing with the Commission. The time and effort is
13 enormous and we -- we all appreciate it. This would be
14 appropriate time for public comment. I'll first ask the
15 Commissioners whether they have any comment?

16 STOLDAL: Just a quick one. Rayette, the project
17 she's working on, when is -- when's her deadline? What's --
18 when is that project gonna be done?

19 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
20 Rayette's project will be completed by the beginning of the
21 next grant cycle.

22 STOLDAL: Great. Thank you.

23 OSTROVSKY: Any other comments or questions of
24 Commissioners? Now's the appropriate time for public comment.
25 The commission seeks public comment. Is there any member of

1 the public, in the hearing room online or on the phone that
2 would like to make comment?

3 CLOUD: This is Carla Cloud for the record. I
4 have a few items to address here. I first will note a chat
5 from David Ortlipp that unfortunately he had another
6 appointment, so he had to cut off early.

7 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

8 CLOUD: He may be able to continue for audio for a
9 while, so he may still be even listening. To go back to
10 agenda item number 12, I had two comments come in for that,
11 one from an anonymous attendee it states, saying could there
12 be an operating budget threshold to trigger more formal audit
13 requirements. Nonprofits starting out and raising funds for
14 capital costs may have little to no revenue for a formal audit
15 if their building has been closed or unavailable in generating
16 revenue. The second comment I had was from Candace with the
17 Comstock Cemetery Foundation. And she says, thank you for
18 being sensitive to small income nonprofits, maybe an income
19 related solution. We have a paid bookkeeper, double
20 signatures and a board treasurer. We try to provide security
21 in how we handle our donations and grants, but affording an
22 audit is a hardship. Connection to income would be helpful.
23 And then also as a public comment, I have Susan Wetmore
24 raising her hand.

25 OSTROVSKY: Fine. Susan, you'd like to comment?

1 CLOUD: Go ahead, Susan.

2 WETMORE: Yes. This is Susan Wetmore with the White
3 Pine Community Choir Association. And I just wanted to thank
4 the Commissioners and the staff for your willingness to work
5 patiently and supportively to ensure successful projects. It
6 really -- you -- you spend such time and thoughtful expertise,
7 and we really appreciate it. And I just wanted to say thank
8 you very much. It's -- it's really a service.

9 OSTROVSKY: Well, thank you for participating in your
10 communities. It takes folks like you all over the state to
11 make this happen. Thank you. Any other comments? Has any of
12 the Commissioners received any text or email comments? All
13 right. Hearing and seeing none that's completes our agenda.
14 Sorry it took a little longer than I thought, but it was all
15 very important decisions that needed to be made. Seeing no
16 further agendized items I will now adjourn the meeting. Thank
17 you very much for your time.

18 STOLDAL: Thank you, Chair.

19

20

21 [end of meeting]

22

23

24

25