

**Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation
September 13, 2021 1:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes**

Zoom Video Conference & Conference Calling:

Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

1. Call to order by Chairman Robert Ostrovsky, (*the Chair*) at 1:00 p.m.

The Chair: This is the appointed time for the Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation.

2. Roll Call:

Commissioners:

Robert Ostrovsky, Chairman (Board of Museums and History, Governor's Appointee) **Present via Zoom**

Robert Stoldal, *Vice Chair* (Board of Museums and History) **Present via Zoom**

Judy Michaels Simon (State Council on Library and Literacy) **Present via Zoom**

Patricia Olmstead (At-Large, Governor's Appointee) **Present via Zoom**

Gail Rappa (Nevada Arts Council) **Not Present**

E'sha Hoferer (Native American Representative) **Not Present**

Antoinette Cavanaugh (Nevada Humanities) **Present via Zoom**

The Chair determined a quorum was present.

Staff Present:

Rebecca Palmer, Historic Preservation Office **Present via Zoom**

Anthony Walsh, Deputy, Attorney General's Office **Present via Zoom**

Kristen Brown, Historic Preservation Office **Present via Zoom**

Carla Hitchcock, Historic Preservation Office **Present via Zoom**

Public Present at meeting location:

Mike Wiencek – Brewery Arts Center

Gina Lopez – Brewery Arts Center

The Chair: As a reminder if you could mute your computers when you are not speaking, and when you do speak it will be very helpful for you to identify yourself before you speak. It makes it a lot easier on staff and easier perhaps on folks from the public who maybe are calling in that may not have computer access and visibility of who is speaking.

3. Public Comment:

The Chair: This is the appropriate time for public comment. Comments will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action may be taken on any matters raised during a public comment period, that are not already on the agenda. We'll ask those who speak in public comment, please identify themselves. Is there anyone on zoom or on the telephone that would like to make public comment, please indicate so to us now, we will be happy to take your comment.

Deputy AG, Anthony Walsh: Prior to public comment, I just want to make a short announcement that, this meeting I noticed is scheduled to potentially last until 5pm, I do have an obligation in Virginia City today for the Comstock Historic District Commission Meeting at 6pm, so I may need to leave a couple minutes early depending on the length of this meeting. I have arranged coverage with another Deputy Attorney General with our office who may join in for the last half hour and that would be Tory Sunheim.

The Chair: Thank you Anthony. We would hope we will be done long before 5 o'clock, but it is hard to predict sometimes.

Deputy AG, Anthony Walsh: Thank you, I just want to be sure if I pop out, don't be alarmed.

The Chair: Okay. Again I will ask, does anyone on Zoom have public comment?

Carla Hitchcock: I do not have anyone raising their hands on Zoom.

The Chair: Is there anyone who may be calling in, that would like to make comment?

Carla Hitchcock: No

The Chair: Anyone present in the hearing room in Carson City? Hearing none and seeing none, I will close public comment and we will take public comment again at the end of the meeting. I would be happy to do that as we go along.

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

4a) December 14, 2020 meeting

The Chair: Does anyone have any comments regarding the minutes? Mr. Stoldal?

Vice Chair Stoldal: I just want to compliment the staff on the excellent minutes, second I would like to make a motion to approve.

Commissioner Simon: I second

No Public Comment

Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay

5. Staff Report and Summary of the status of the CCCHP grants for the FY19-20 cycle:

Rebecca Palmer: We've prepared a brief summary of all the grantees who were required to report progress. The last progress report was due to our office on September 1st. The summary is from all of the progress reports we received until September 1st. You will note that grantees are at various stages of progress. Some have completed their projects, and some have yet to begin their projects. Some of the difficulties that grantees have experienced recently are due to difficulty in finding contractors willing to undertake rehabilitation projects. I've been told that's because contractors are able to find projects for new construction that are far easier for them to complete than a rehabilitation project. Additionally some of our grantees have provided us with notification that they are having difficulty acquiring materials. I wanted to bring the Commission's attention to some of the projects that may be somewhat delayed. This poses a bit of concern to staff because all of the funding agreements terminate in May, 2022. The construction season for some of these grantees is coming to a close. So there may be a need to have an additional meeting sometime in the Spring prior to the grant hearing to consider extending the deadlines for those grantees that have been unable to acquire contractors or materials for an additional few months to allow them to complete their projects. We don't know that that will be necessary, but I suspect given that some of them are in the northern climate, that we may be notifying the Commission at a later date that adequate progress has not been made. You will note that not all of the grantees have made progress. So I wanted to bring your attention to those as well. We would be happy to answer any questions you have on this documentation.

The Chair: I'll open it to the Commissioners in a moment. Rebecca, what is the date in which they must have the funds used? Is there an absolute date?

Rebecca Palmer: Yes, there is. The absolute date by which all proceeds must be expended, to avoid penalties, is three (3) years after the sale of the bonds. So the bonds were sold in November of 2020.

The Chair: So if the Commission decided to give certain extensions, it would still be within that window permitted under the bond sale. Thank you. Any Commissioners have questions of Rebecca? Mr. Stoldal.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Rebecca, in reading through, there clearly are some challenges with either, as you clearly pointed out, with getting contractors and or material, but I would like to go to the last item, 19-25, the Western Missionary Museum Corporation. That seems to be a different issue. Two questions, where do we stand now and like the Chairman asked, is there a deadline on signing a funding agreement.

Rebecca Palmer: They have an executed funding agreement at this point. It was executed on May 13th of 2021. What staff had not received by September 1st, were progress reports number one and progress reports number two. Number two was due August 31st, number one was due April 30th, 2021. I bring this to your attention because it does demonstrate that we had not received, by September the 1st, a progress report as required by the funding agreement.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Have we had this occur in the past and if so, what action did your office take or what actions are available?

Rebecca Palmer: At this point the Commission has an option in two more months to withdraw or revert the entire grant amount from the grantee. If two more quarters pass without contacting the State, whatever the grantee has not received in the awarded grant funds could be reverted. As staff we can continue to keep the Commission apprised of progress being made. This staff report was prepared on September 1st, and it has come to my attention that today, we have received a progress report from the grantee. It is late, but it was received, I believe today. It indicates the grantee has reached out to a roofing company to acquire a bid or an estimate for the proposed work.

Vice Chair Stoldal: This was, looking at \$165,000, and going through the minutes, the board felt this was a really important project for Virginia City. Do we have a sense of what transpired to cause the progress report delays and do we have any concern as we move forward?

Rebecca Palmer: Staff understands that the client, the Western Missionary Organization, has a contractor that has changed leadership, and that may account for the failure to submit timely progress reports. There was no explanation to the best of my knowledge by the grantee for the reason of the tardiness for two progress reports.

Vice Chair Stoldal: I think it would be good for the board, for the Commission to get updates through you on this and if we have to meet again in 60 days, although it sounds like there is some progress made, but again, going through the minutes, the board spent some good time on this and allocated \$165,000 and I think that through Rebecca's office and through the Chair I think the board needs to be kept up to date on this.

The Chair: I would be happy to do that Bob, if staff will keep me up to date, I will be sure to push that information out to the board members with the understanding of course, please do not respond to the entire board, respond to staff, just under the requirements of the open meeting law, you can gather information, but you currently cannot deliberate and make decisions. Only at a regular meeting. We will do that; I think this issue may come up a little later today relative to the distribution of some other funding. Any other questions about the report that staff prepared on grant status? Go ahead Bob, did you have one more?

Vice Chair Stoldal: Surely maybe it will come up later Mr. Chair, and that is on the reallocation on the funding and the, I believe it was the White Pine Community Choir, there were several items when the board initially gave this grant, that the board couldn't fund. Maybe when it comes up in the reallocation will probably be a better place for my question.

The Chair: I agree Bob. If there are no other questions relevant, that was an information only report, I believe. Again, I appreciate staff doing that. I would like staff to keep at least me up to date as we go along later in the year, early next year, if they are still experiencing in the field, trouble getting contractors and materials, I think they are not alone in the world of construction or purchasing of materials, it has gotten difficult with the supply chain in the last couple years, so I will certainly take in consideration, but grantees need to take into consideration in their planning and timing, I would like to see that as it goes along.

6. Discussion and decision concerning the Neon Museum decision to decline the CCCHP award of \$200,000 for the CCCHP FY19-20 grant cycle (CCCHP-19-23) (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION).

The Chair: You received a number of documents attached to the agenda, some from the Neon Museum, some exchanges between staff, Neon staff and the City. Rebecca perhaps you could give us a quick, short version or long if it is necessary of what the situation with the Neon Museum is and what our alternatives are. I think it's pretty clear, but I think at least we ought to have on the record why the museum returned the funds.

Rebecca Palmer: I would like to start with agenda item labeled, Covenant History for the La Concha. It is the first attachment on the website as well. This covenant history reveals there were four (4) separate covenants attached from previous, at that time, CCA grant awards. In doing the research for the current award, CCCHP-19-23, my staff discovered that the parcel number in which the Neon Museum and the La Concha lobby sit, is actually owned by the City of Las Vegas. The prior four covenants had been prepared and written with the Neon Museum as the property owner. Property in this case is real property, the land, the parcel. The first two covenants from 2006 grant cycle and 2007 grant cycle, were actually recorded under a parcel number that is located in Henderson Nevada and has been in Henderson Nevada since 1959. I cannot explain why a parcel located in Henderson has two CCA covenants attached to it. The parcel is owned by the School Board of Trustees and again is located in Henderson. So those two covenants are for an incorrect parcel, so Anthony Walsh might have an opinion for us there, but those are not for the parcel in question. The next two covenants from 2008 and 2009 were recorded on a parcel that does not come up at all in the Clark County website. The parcel number does not appear to exist and does not appear to ever have existed. They were recorded against a parcel for which the Clark County assessor has no record. Those are the only active covenants that are reportedly to be for the Neon Museum. In the 2019 grant cycle, my staff, as I directed them to do, obtained the correct assessor's parcel number upon which the La Concha and Neon museum sits. The parcel is owned by the City of Las Vegas. In accord with our procedure, staff reached out to the City of Las Vegas as

the property owner, to inform them that we had the covenant documents ready for signature and the response we received is contained in the second document I sent you, and that is that the City of Las Vegas does not wish to have any encumbrance on their parcel, and they declined the request to sign the documents. Without a properly executed and recorded covenant, the grant cannot be awarded to the La Concha lobby consistent with the procedures set up for administering this grant program. As a result, we have the final document, which is the Neon Museums declining of the \$200,000 award, in April of this year. That is the summary of the situation to date.

The Chair: Question for you Rebecca just to be clear, no monies were ever distributed to the Neon Museum, there is no refund of any money, it's just money you are holding that has never been expended, is that correct?

Rebecca Palmer: That is correct. The funding agreement was never executed because the covenants are a part of the funding agreement and when the City of Las Vegas declined to sign the covenants, the funding agreement could not be executed.

The Chair: I will open it for questions, Commissioners, Mr. Stoldal?

Vice Chair Stoldal: Rebecca, two questions. One is, the CCA-6-05 and 7-10 as well as 8-4 and 9-7. When an applicant makes a grant request, do they submit the parcel numbers? Is that part of the grant process/application?

Rebecca Palmer: I don't know. I am unable to determine from the records remaining, exactly how that parcel information was submitted or obtained by my office.

Vice Chair Stoldal: So we are looking at the next step, the grant application, the current ones don't require a parcel number submitted by the applicant.

Rebecca Palmer: Yes, they do. They do now. I have required my staff to verify that APN number with the appropriate County Assessor. So that is how we ended up contacting the City of Las Vegas was that my staff was verifying the APN, discovered under those records that the City of Las Vegas owned the parcel and that is when we contacted the parcel property owner.

Vice Chair Stoldal: I don't get into dark conspiracy, but it is just strange that two applications and funds that were granted to the Neon Museum that had incorrect parcel numbers. So the grant application at those points did not have parcel numbers as part of a requirement, but subsequently you have instituted that as part of the process. Are you of any concern? Do we need to take any action in looking at other covenant agreements that were signed in those two time frames to see whether or not those parcel numbers are correct? Maybe a spot check to see if we have a significant problem or if it is narrowed to the La Concha.

Rebecca Palmer: About four years ago, staff sent out a letter to all of the property owners of record reminding them that covenants existed on their property and what the purpose of what the covenants was intended to do. In that original letter distribution, a number of errors or inaccuracies were revealed, and we had corrected those errors. A letter was sent to the Neon Museum with the statement of “There are four covenants on your property, here is what it means...” We did not receive a reply that, “it is not our property, or that is the incorrect APN number”, or anything that would reveal that there was a challenge. At this time, staff does not have sufficient resources to examine all of the APNs upon which we have covenants. It is something that is on our priority list for the next few years is to go through all of the remaining records to be sure the APN number is correct. I can assure the Commission since I started this grant program, we have verified all of the APNs to ensure they are accurate, that they have the correct parcel in question and the correct property owner. Those errors don’t exist in the records since 2014.

The Vice Chair: I applaud you for that and I know we have gone through court proceedings regarding and enforcing covenants, so having the correct parcel number information is essential. In some cases we found some of these covenants hadn’t even been filed. Previous to your time. Mr. Chair, thank you very much.

The Chair: Do any other Commissioners have questions? Rebecca, my only question is, looking back at the Neon Museum, we don’t have any effective covenants in place, because I think the first grant that was given, way back when, was to assist them in moving the building from its existing location on Las Vegas Blvd, to this location on North Las Vegas Blvd. I am assuming this land that they are now on has always been owned by the City of Las Vegas. I guess we don’t have any covenant rights. They were never properly executed. Without the City of Las Vegas’s signature we couldn’t attach the covenant anyway could we?

Rebecca Palmer: I believe that to be the case. I did submit this information to Anthony Walsh who might have some additional comments.

Deputy AG, Anthony Walsh: That is correct Rebecca, thank you. We did review that at some length, and the conclusion was without the City of Las Vegas’s participation, we can’t have any active covenants, unless they agreed to it and that was pretty much the end of the road for us on that one. The strategy might be going forward, making sure that the City is brought into the discussion earlier on now know what we know. Thank you.

The Vice Chair: Mr. Chair, just for the record, the Neon Museum, I think in August, after having a better part of the year without an executive director, just an acting, they now have a full time director. So I think things will get cleaned up and straightened out at the Neon Museum. I think we all hope that takes place.

The Chair: This is marked as an action item. I would accept a motion to recognize and accept the Neon Museums request to decline the previously granted award of \$200,000 in the Commissions 2019-2020 grant cycle. If someone would like to make that motion, we can officially take that money off the table from them.

The Vice Chair: Mr. Chair, I'll move that we accept the letter from the City of Las Vegas and they Neon Museum to decline the \$200,000.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I second.

The Chair: We have a motion and a second. Is there any further discussion? Any member of the public that would like to make a comment before we vote? Seeing or hearing none.

Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay

7. Discussion, decision on the process for the reallocation, and/or reallocation of all or a portion of the entire \$200,000 CCCHP FY19-20 award made to the Neon Museum for the rehabilitation of the La Concha Lobby (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION).

The Chair: Now that we have officially taken them off the grant list, we now have \$200,000 available to grant back to applicants in the cycle. In your materials, there was an attached spreadsheet which gives you the original grant request, the amount awarded at our hearings; You'll recall we had a second round of hearings because we had some funds returned. This will give you details of what was finally awarded and what remains of any requests, at least of the second round of requests. We were still considerably short in the first round because we had to shave over two and a half million dollars off of that. The real question for the Commission is, how would you like to proceed? Would you like to discuss it now, would you like to go back out to the applicants as we did in the second round the first time and ask for proposals? There are any myriad of decisions, we could make on how to proceed to decide which grant applicants should be considered and what amount. Commissioners, please open it for discussion.

Commissioner Simon: I think the procedure that we followed in the past would be advisable here. It's a considerable amount of money, and the applicants ought to have a chance to amend their proposals or make a bid for that. I think it would be best to think about what money they would need to complete their project, or that could be a part of it. It doesn't have to be, it's just my thoughts.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I would concur with Commissioner Simon. I have reviewed the documents on the previous allocations for the awarded grants and the round 2 amounts, but I would also like to hear from staff as to what would be the most efficient and expedient for them as well.

The Chair: That is a good question. Rebecca, before we hear from other Commissioners, can you tell me what is involved if we go out for, I will call it Round 3, because we had Round 2.

Rebecca Palmer: Staff of course would be happy to conduct any work that the Commission found necessary to reallocate this \$200,000. We attached this spreadsheet as an opportunity for the Commission to see that there had been unfunded requests made in the second grant round. However, not all of the eligible grantees applied in the second round. In fact, we are aware that at least one grantee, in this case, the Fallon Community Theatre, has experienced a need for additional funding due to the discovery of asbestos in their roof and so the original award of \$192,000 actually is insufficient to complete their project. So while they did receive funding in the second grant round, there may be a need for additional funding to complete their grant funded project. My advice would be to use the original grant round two applications. Eliminate grantees who have either completed their project or for whatever reason are not eligible to continue to receive additional funding and request the remaining grantees who had not submitted additional requests in round two, to apply if they so choose. We still have the applications from Grant Round number two so the Commission would be able to review those. Then we would have probably an additional one or two, maybe three applications to add to that list.

The Chair: Any Commissioner have thoughts?

Vice Chair Stoldal: I get the logic of the next step, but a couple other things came to mind in reviewing the project. One is the Fallon Theatre; they are looking at a proposal from another contractor and the board is currently reviewing that. We did initially \$170,000, \$22,000 in the second round for \$192,000 and this Commission has been funding the Fallon Theatre on a significant basis and I don't think that this Commission has to be the board that funds every entire project, they need to look elsewhere. The Fallon Theatre is important part of the community, but they already got \$192,000, so I've got a bit of a question mark on that. The Brewery Arts Center, they are also on the agenda, they want to change things around and adjust some of their funding and secondly when they came up for the first time, if I am not mistaken, according to the minutes their application was a little confusing and they were applying for things they couldn't apply for or already taken care of, so I have a pretty big question mark on that. White Pine Community also there were several things in their original proposal that the Commission was not allowed to fund, but then I look at two of the applicants who have received significant funding but could wrap up. One of them is the Fourth Ward School, they've got their project, and they will only need \$15,000. My suggestion is there is two projects here that we could fund now. Give Fourth Ward their \$15,000, let them finish that needed project before the winter sets in. The other one I notice is the Goldfield Historical Society and I am wondering whether or not we can give them some additional money that would then encourage; let's see, how much did we give them? \$262,000. That is a pretty sizable chunk, \$262,000 that should be enough to encourage somebody to come down there, that's a nice quarter of a million

dollar project. I guess the question to Rebecca and the Chair is how fast can turn around another board meeting? I would like to get the money out to the applicants as they are already running out of time.

The Chair: I guess then the question is to Rebecca, if you reach back out to the applicants with sort of the language we used in the past where these are emergencies or unanticipated expenses, so that we are not asking them to re-plead, or put a pleading in for their original grant applications. What would it take to do that timewise?

Rebecca Palmer: We could start that process today and request that they submit an abbreviated application for the remaining \$200,000 or they could freshen up the application they submitted in the grant round number two, if additional details need to be added since there has been some time that has passed. If we gave them a couple of weeks, we could have those applications by I would think, by the end of the month with a possible meeting at the middle or end of October. That would be more than sufficient time to award or modify their Funding Agreements, award the funding, and then for those in the north of the state they will have already wrapped up their project for the construction season, so they won't be able to use the funding this year, but they would have until May of next year to complete it. Then for those in the southern part of the State, that construction season would actually just be starting. I think that it's certainly doable requesting the modified application this afternoon with those applications to be received by the office by the end of September. Then reviewed by the Commission for a meeting to be scheduled for some time around the middle or end of October.

The Chair: Rebecca, remind me, how many of these projects have been fully funded or completed, and would they also receive a letter, or would they be considered complete, and we wouldn't reach back out to them?

Rebecca Palmer: Those that received full funding would not be eligible for the \$200,000, and those that have completed their project, would also be not eligible for the \$200,000, because their project would have been complete. In looking at the spreadsheet that I have provided to the Commission and acknowledging that at least one of those has completed their project of the list in the column on the far right hand side labeled "Balance of Remaining Round 2 Requests", I see, one, two, three, four; four that could be eligible if not five or six additional grantees that did not avail themselves of the grant round number two opportunity.

The Chair: That is certainly a manageable number that we could probably handle in a one hour or two hour at most meeting. Is there any Commissioner who objects to following that process as recommended, for staff to take immediate action to reach out and try to ask for a response in a timely manner so that staff could prepare and be ready to reach out to the Commission and public for a meeting sometime in the last two weeks of October?

The Vice Chair: I have questions on whether or not we need a motion to what Commissioner Simon proposed?

The Chair: I don't think that it ever to have a motion to direct staff. That would be fine if you would like to make one.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I think it would be in our best interest to make sure that we cover this with a motion as recommended.

The Vice Chair: Going back to Commissioner Simon's statement, I will go ahead and make the motion that staff send out a letter to the remaining applicants to see if there is a need for additional funding or if they could request additional funding and we will schedule a meeting in late October to respond to that.

The Chair: Bob, would you include in that motion to reach out to those with the exception of those who have completed those projects.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Yes, I'm sorry, I need to include that as well. Rebecca, is this enough information for you moving forward?

Rebecca Palmer: Yes, that will be sufficient.

Vice Chair Stoldal: That will be my motion Mr. Chair.

The Chair: Is there a second to that motion?

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I second that motion.

The Chair: Thank you. We have a motion regarding the procedures to be used to accept proposals for the additional \$200,000 we have to expend. Is there any other Commissioners that have comments? Is there any member of the public who would like to make comment either on Zoom or on the phone before we take a vote on the motion?

Carla Hitchcock: I do have Susan Wetmore on the phone who says she would like to speak.

The Chair: That's fine, Ms. Wetmore?

Carla Hitchcock: One moment let me bring her on. Susan you can unmute yourself and you can speak.

Susan Wetmore: Thank you very much. Commissioners, I wasn't sure if you had questions about the Community Choir. As I listen to the conversation, I think that my comments are more fitting at the end of the meeting, so I'll just wait until then. Thank you.

The Chair: Thank you. We will be sure to get back to you.

Susan Wetmore: Thank you Sir.

The Chair: Any other public comment? Hearing and seeing none.

Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay

The Chair: Thank you staff. I understand that it is extra work but as indicated, as significant amount of money can make a difference for some of these projects.

8. Review of the Brewery Arts Center's request to modify their grant (CCCHP-19-07) to redirect \$7,473.00 of unspent grant funds to replace carpeting and repair flooring. (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION).

The Chair: I will call on staff to give us the background, please.

Rebecca Palmer: The Commission awarded grant funding to the Brewery Arts Center with the requirement that plumbing fixtures in the bathroom of the building would be repaired or replaced. The grantee however after the execution of the Funding Agreement decided to use other funds to repair and/or replace the plumbing fixtures in the bathroom. This leaves them with a surplus of \$7,473 in their original grant award. This funding, the grantee would like to use to repair and or replace carpeting in the public areas of the building. The carpeting and flooring repair was not part of the original grant application. Hence, it was agendaized for this meeting so that the grantee could answer any questions you might have and that the Commission could determine that this proposal was appropriate to redirect that surplus to.

The Chair: Just to make it clear to everyone, I believe the decision here, correct me if I am wrong is to either authorize this expenditure for that purpose or in fact withhold that amount from the grant applicant to be redistributed, I am assuming. Is that correct?

Rebecca Palmer: That is indeed accurate. The Commissions procedures are to only award activities in the scope of work that were a part of the original application, unless the grantee comes forward, as they are doing now to request permission to modify the original award.

The Chair: Thank you. Commissioners have comments or questions?

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I have a question for the proposed flooring. It says two ramps to theatre. Do you know if that is to facilitate ADA compliance?

Rebecca Palmer: Is the grantee available?

Carla Hitchcock: Yes, we have him right here. Mike.

Mike Wiencek: Yes, both of these ramps run in and out of our black box theater and the carpeting has gotten pretty bad and kind of scary in a few places. It is indeed, we are not fully ADA compliant with that as it has been grandfathered because of the age of that part of the building, but it will make it safer for patrons to come in and out of the theatre.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: Thank you for that answer and clarification.

The Chair: Any other members?

Vice Chair Stoldal: Rebecca, this fits within the guidelines of the Department of the Interior and all those things so if we granted this request its not going to be a mark against the Brewery? I make a motion to approve.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I second that motion.

Rebecca Palmer: Staff has reviewed the proposed request and finds that it does adhere to the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation.

Commissioner Simon: I appreciate that.

The Chair: Any other questions on this agenda item? We have a motion to second. Is there any public comment regarding this motion? Seeing and hearing none.

Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay

The Chair: Good luck with the theatre. It's a wonderful addition to Carson City.

9. Review of the Comstock Cemetery Foundation's request for modifications to the scope of work and budget for their FY19-20 CCCHP grant (CCCHP-19-03) (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION).

The Chair: I will call on staff to explain the request.

Rebecca Palmer: We received a request to reimburse for the purchase of replica tin ceiling tiles and a barn style sliding door for the bathroom in the Comstock Cemetery Foundation building. Staff reviewed the request and the 100+ emails that came from the grantee, and found that the proposal as outlined, to place tin replica ceiling tiles in the main room and a barn style sliding door was inconsistent with the Secretary of the Interior Standards for

Rehabilitation, for which the funding agreement requires adherence to. The grantee had requested an opportunity to bring their proposal for these two items, the tin ceiling tiles to be placed in the main building adjacent to the stove and in the non-historic bathroom addition in the rear of the building and then the barn style sliding door as well. So those two different items, the grantee had requested Commission review on these two items. Documentation provided by the grantee was included in your package.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Mr. Chair, before we hear from the applicant, if I could ask Rebecca a question. Is this Commission required to legally follow the Department of Interior Standards or do we have the authority to grant funds, State funds; in other words, what power do we have if any to grant this request?

Rebecca Palmer: It should be noted that the Funding Agreement clearly states that all work will adhere to the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. It is a legally binding document that the grantee signed. In addition, my office is required to adhere to the Secretary of the Interior Standards as part of our federal funding. The short answer to your question is that the Commission can decide to fund items that staff may not believe, based on their professional opinion, adhere to the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. It should be noted that in the modifications to the draft grant manual for the next grant cycle, which is another agenda item coming up, we have inserted the adherence to the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Rehabilitation in that document to make that clearer.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Thank you Chair

The Chair: Is there someone from the Cemetery Comstock Foundation available to address the Commission?

Carla Hitchcock: Yes sir, let me bring her on. One moment.

Candace Wheeler: I think I have a pretty good solution to this issue. To start with, we don't need any money or change in the budget. The prior owners of the structure that we are working with is going to fund these two treatment plans if we are allowed to give them a try. I know that you guys probably know, but when you're working on stuff in the field, real time, things just kind of come up and happen and sometimes impacts our plans. We are always juggling historic characteristics and features with our ability to publicly interpret things and of course we are looking at our adaptive use rehabilitation plan and how to get our needs met. For the record, we no longer wanted to put pressed tin in the main room. We took that off. I really appreciated the staff's comments on that. We are looking to use pressed tin in the back wall, which is non historic, in the bathroom which is not public use, and it's 5x10. Part of the reason we want to do it, is the room itself lends itself to interpretation of mining on the Comstock, which is one of the missions that we have. The other thing that I think will make this all a little easier, is this is clearly modern, its not distressed, and its

completely reversible. It's put up with little, teeny tacks. We discovered a lot of metallic paint and actually pressed tin was used in the bathroom, which really wasn't created until 1989, when they outlawed outhouses. But the fact that it is very modern, it allows us an opportunity to explain the use of pressed tin on the Comstock, and I could literally remove it in probably 30 minutes. It lets us talk about mining and we work with elementary teachers on how we can work that kind of information by just using that little room and how we decorate it. The other issue really kind of plays into our ability to use 240 square feet of space effectively. We have no closets, we have no shelving, we have no storage, and part of our public use plan is, this is where people are coming to learn about the cemetery to access family information, so we need to find a way to always maximize our space. The wall to the bathroom was hastily put up, just like about everything else on this structure and it was done so if you were actually sitting on the toilet and you had to open the door, it would hit you in the knees. Even if that didn't happen, the door is three feet, two inches long and the wall space on which it opens, is two feet, one inch. So there is no way that you could open the door, without losing about twelve square feet. If you open it in the other room, into the bedroom area, you're still losing that space. If you flip it to the other side, you block the exit. So we were looking for solutions and one of them is just to use a sliding door. So again, it requires, a band of metal that is four inches thick, to be put on a non-historic wall, and it allows us to slide this door back and forth. The door is in keeping with the historic character. And let's say at the end of the day, after working with the public, or the staff comes and see's it and don't like it, the door is perfectly suited to be hung on a hinge. Both of things I am just asking to give a try. I really think they will work. I think they fit into our plan, and we can reverse them, no problem.

The Chair: Candace, what was the dollar value of your grant you want to expend doing this?

Candace Wheeler: I don't want to expend anything. Its being funding by a long term family on the Comstock, so no money, no reallocation, no additional funds. If we are allowed to give this a test try, it wont cost or cause any paperwork.

The Chair: I have a question for Rebecca. To what extent does the Commission have authority over portions of the building that it didn't fund.

Candace Wheeler: Oh, no you did fund this, I'm sorry. The bathroom rehabilitation was funded. I'm sorry, I didn't make that clear. It has required a lot more stabilization than we actually expected, but we have been able to handle it budget wise, absolutely.

The Chair: Remind me just out of curiosity, when was this building built?

Candace Wheeler: Originally, 1870, but has been moved four times and over 90% of the material culture is derived from salvage and reuse.

The Chair: Okay, thank you. I'll open it to the Commission who have questions for the applicant on their request.

Vice Chair Stoldal: I look around and I see everybody on the Commission, we listen to what staff have to say. We listen to what Rebecca Palmer has to say and we take that as pretty solid. However in this case, I am going to propose a motion that we approve the changes. I think this building has gone through so many different iterations over the years, that these two things as the applicant has state that we can take them off, without doing damage. So I am going to make a motion that we approve this. Thank you.

Commissioner Simon: I would second that.

The Chair: Any discussion on the motion? Is there any further comment on the motion?

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I have a question, and maybe its more of a clarification. I heard we are not covering the cost of these renovations, but at the same time, its part of the grant, so I need some clarification on that please.

Candace Wheeler: The bathroom reconstruction to stabilize it, is definitely part of the grant. But as you know, we have covenants and once that comes to light, the SHPO staff reviews those for you. And so even though we didn't specifically write in the thing that oh, we want to do pressed tin back here, and we want to put a sliding door in, it still impacts that structure and so the staff is still reviewing it. Like I said, we just want a chance to give this a try and if it turns out that it is not working well with the public, or the staff comes and see's it in person, and really feels strongly that it should be removed, no problem. We have a little donor that said, "Oh, I would love to see this happen for the school kids, so I will fund the whole thing." But it's still under that umbrella of getting the bathroom usable. Did that help?

Commissioner Cavanaugh: It is my understanding from what you said earlier is the bathroom is not for public use.

Candace Wheeler: That doesn't mean they are not going to see it. When you are dealing with 240 square feet, we want to use every possible space to be able to tell the stories that this structure has to tell. Residential living, mining, and the cemetery, so yeah, we don't have water hook up, they can't go to the bathroom or wash their hands, that doesn't mean they can't go into the space, that they can't look at the space. For example, if little 6th grade kids are in there and we tell them to multiply this room by three, that size is exactly the size of the quote-unquote room that John Mackey first discovered when he struck ore. So we are working with elementary students on our interpretation plan and yeah, they can't go to the bathroom in there, but that doesn't mean we can't get a bang for a buck out of the public being able to educationally interact with that space. Not to mention, we need a closet.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: Thank you for the clarification.

Candace Wheeler: You're welcome.

The Chair: I have one question, Rebecca, if we approve this, does it have any other impacts on your certification with the feds in any way?

Rebecca Palmer: To avoid that possibility, I believe it would be in the best interest of staff to avoid commenting on this at all. Since there will be no funding, and therefore, no request for reimbursement, I would suggest we have no further action to take her.

The Chair: Okay. Any other comments? Any further public comment? Hearing none.

Motion passed 3 Yea, 2 Nay

10. Review and approval of two draft documents required for the CCCHP grant cycle for fiscal years 2021 and 2022 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION):

10a) Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation Information, Application Form, and Instructions; and

10b) Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation Grants Manual General Administrative Guidelines Fiscal Year 2021-2022 with all attached documents.

The Chair: In the materials sent to you and in the materials attached, on the agenda and online, you will see the draft documents for the CCA grant in the next cycle, 21-22, and I think there is a mockup in there that shows any changes. My review for the most part is technical. They have changed some addresses, and some names. Rebecca would you like to point out anything you believe is a significant change in there other than those technical issues.

Rebecca Palmer: Yes, I would like to point out as I had in previous agenda item, that we have inserted in the application, discussion of the Secretary of Interior Standards for Rehabilitation. I believe it was inserted in agenda item 10a and agenda item 10b, so you will see those changes. Additionally, on page 10 of 16, at least in the track changes version, its labeled as, Grant Application, FY21-22 draft with tracked changes. On page 10 of 16 you will see in the middle of the documents, a request for the name of the property owner of record as well as the address of the property owner. We think this will make it very clear when we are preparing funding agreements, exactly who we should be

consulting with for the development of covenants attached to that parcel. With that, there are no other modifications.

The Chair: Thank you. Commissioners have questions about the documents?

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I have a question on the marked up document on page 2 of 16. It states all applications must be postmarked or are due to the SHPO by, and it has a date. Is it typically the last Friday of February for each year?

Rebecca Palmer: The schedule for the next grant cycle, FY21-22 cycle, has not been decided. I believe that is agenda item eleven. When the schedule has been set, we will insert in the final document the appropriate dates.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: Thank you for that information. I just wondered if it would be prudent to, let's say people don't always apply on an annual basis, but they have an understanding of a typical date. Is this a standing application that occurs annually, could it simply be stated that it be received at a certain time of the year, or do we decide on that each year?

The Chair: Because we are a creature of the legislature, we only circulate the requests for grant applications in cycles which we have been funded. There have been years where we have no grant cycle at all because we never received funding through the legislative process, so it does change. Its not an annual application. I wish it was, but its not. I hope that answers your question.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: It certainly does, thank you.

The Chair: Any other questions about either of the draft documents? If there is none, I would take a motion to approve them for this next grant cycle.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I move that we approve this revised document.

Commissioner Simon: I'll second it.

The Chair: Any further discussion amongst the Commission? Any member of the public, either on Zoom or on the telephone or present at the meeting that would like to comment?
Hearing none.

Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay

The Chair: Thank you for your work staff and going over those very carefully. It seems like every cycle we find another little piece of information like the parcel numbers, or the

property owner are always good additions, and sometimes we ask why we didn't ask for them ten or twenty years from now, but it's nice to make those changes.

11. Discussion and scheduling of application submission deadline and grant hearing for CCCHP grants for fiscal years 2021 and 2022 (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)

The Chair: You received in your materials and is posted online, last cycles dates and processes. You'll see it was for the cycle 2019-2020, starting with the grant applications being available October 1, and then following through up to the actual grant hearings in June of 2020. I'm going to ask Rebecca first, did you find any significant problems in the timing in that grant cycle? Were these adequate for staff to perform their functions?

Rebecca Palmer: To answer your question sir, we found the schedule worked very well both for staff and for the applicants. It provided sufficient time for the applicants to prepare their application, it was adequate for SHPO and our sister agencies to review the applications prior to the grant hearing and to prepare comments for the Commissioners consideration at the grant hearing. However, staff here at the Historic Preservation Office, suggest that in the FY21-22 cycle, two additional dates be added to the schedule that would assist both the staff of my agency, the applicants, and the staff of my sister agencies to best advise and assist applicants. The first being a final date by which an application should request technical assistance from SHPO staff while preparing their grant application. We had a number of applicants asking for technical assistance very late in the process. Staff is suggesting maybe one month prior to the due date of the application, be the final date for requesting technical assistance. We believe this will give staff perhaps the opportunity to perhaps visit the resource in question, provide technical guidance on what type of activities could or should be prioritized and any other issues that staff notes. This will give the grantee a chance to address those issues before the due date and won't overwhelm staff with requests at the very last minute. Additionally based on some experience we had in this last grant cycle, staff is recommending that a final date to submit a revised scope of work and budget be added to the schedule after the grant hearing. We had a number of successful grantees who were quite late in providing revised scopes of work and budget and that would delay the execution of funding agreements and therefore delay their projects in a manner that could compromise the ability to expend the funds. With that I have not other comments.

The Chair: On the last item, what date are you proposing for that? Sorry, maybe I just missed it.

Rebecca Palmer: Staff is suggesting three months after the grant hearing. So that would be September, it could be October as well. For the record, we have been informed that the Treasurer's office generally sells these bonds in the first part of October with the proceeds being deposited in our account for reimbursement in November. So having a revised scope of work and budget submitted to staff by the end of September would give staff a chance to

review the revised scope of work and budget with enough time to prepare a funding agreement in the event that the grantee would like to begin work as soon as possible.

The Chair: Thank you Rebecca. Commissioners, any questions for staff regarding this schedule. Hearing none. The only other change I think I might like to request, did we put in a date certain in at this point two years ago for the grant hearings or can we say June? The scheduling of the Commission sometimes is dependent on the availability of the Commissioners. I know at a grant hearing we try to have all of the Commissioners there and try to find a date. So the question is, can we find a date now or can we just put grant hearings to be June of 2022 as opposed to a date certain? Is that acceptable to you.

Vice Chair Stoldal: I don't disagree with you, although, just saying the sooner we can get a date. This grant hearing is really an important date in the calendar and as soon as we can lock in a date, I think we will all schedule around that date because of the importance of having everyone there, the sooner we can lock in a date, the better.

The Chair: Let me look at the calendar. It is a two day meeting and if you go to the first week of June, Wednesday is June 1st. So the 1st, 2nd, or 3rd. If we could pick a date that would be fine with me. Commissioners have any calendar issues in the first week of June. Any of the Commissioners that are on the line?

Vice Chair Stoldal: We are talking 2022 right?

The Chair: Yes, 2022.

Commissioner Simon: My calendar is clear, but I think that we have had problems with things like graduations and that sort of thing in June. We could put a date out and see how it goes. Would that be helpful?

Vice Chair Stoldal: Yeah, we lock in a date or pencil in a firm date. When will we have our meeting before that?

Commissioner Simon: October I think we said.

Rebecca Palmer: Staff had suggested a meeting in October to consider the redistribution of the \$200,000.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Maybe we could put it off for another month, I'm not sure what difference that will be. I think if we schedule the 2nd and 3rd, the Thursday and Friday, or maybe Wednesday, Thursday and Friday?

The Chair: June 2nd and 3rd?

Vice Chair Stoldal: I suggest we pencil in for June 2nd and 3rd and we can re-look at that again in October.

The Chair: We could modify that, but we can start with the, you said second or third?

Vice Chair Stoldal: Based on that Rebecca, what would be the earliest date that the Commissioners could get the grant and start reviewing.

Rebecca Palmer: If the schedule is approved as written, the applications would be sent to the Commissioners sometime around the end of April. The current schedule for 2019-2020 had the date as Monday, April the 27th.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Is four weeks enough for the Commission to review the easily 12-15 applications. Is that enough time for us to do that?

The Chair: It has been in the past.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Staff is going to get them roughly by the first day of March.

The Chair: We will get them approximately April 25th.

Vice Chair Stoldal: I suggest we go with the April the 25th date to get them to us.

The Chair: Is that possible Rebecca?

Rebecca Palmer: Yes that is certainly doable. Just as a quick note, there will be close to four million dollars available, so it will be more funding than this current grant cycle. This current grant cycle resulted in 27 applications, so you can expect a significant number of applications.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Four weeks sounds like a long time, but if we are going to 25, maybe 30 grant applications, what is the earliest you would feel comfortable getting those to the Commission. I know your staff has to review them as well.

Rebecca Palmer: That Monday the 25th really is the earliest I could envision getting them to the Commission because that gives us just about two months to review all the applications that come in. Staff could review them quicker, but they are somewhat dense documents, so assuming that we get a number equal to or greater than the current grant cycle, that time frame from the end of February to the end of April, really is what staff would be required to review those.

Vice Chair Stoldal: I respect that. I also respect that fact that each of us individually, we now have to review individually the same thing as staff. I'm wondering or not if we should

change the process in any way? Rather than staff has completed all, let's just say twenty-five reviews, whether or not we could get them after the first ten are done, if they could be sent out, rather than all of sudden we get a box or an email full of twenty-five applications to review, whether we would want to cut that, maybe get the first half; if there are twenty-five maybe we get the first half done and we get them a little earlier? I just put that out there as an option.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I have a couple questions. Rebecca, number one, when the applications are submitted and your staff determines that some of the applications don't meet the qualifying standards, are those held back or are those also forwarded to the Commission?

Rebecca Palmer: Staff forwards all applications to the Commission. Ultimately it is the decision about whether an applicant or a resource is eligible to receive funding.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: The second question or suggestion I would have been that staff and Rebecca, propose some schedules or schedule that works for them and then we select dates during those weeks that works with the Commissions dates for rolling out the next grant cycle and have that prepared for the October meeting.

Then Chair: Rebecca, you intend, based on what I read here, to have these a ready by October 1st of this year, is that correct?

Rebecca Palmer: Yes, that is correct. The Commission decided at the last grant cycle that we would like to give the applicants as much time as they possible could to apply for his grant program. So we created a schedule where we expedited the availability of the application, and then extended the dates for when it was due, all the way out to the end of February. One alternative would be to reduce that amount of time and perhaps create a new date where applications are due perhaps at the beginning of February. That would still afford the applicants with several months to prepare an application. Alternatively, perhaps, staff could review these applications along with staff from our sister agencies with who we share these documents, could review these applications as they come in, and then submit them to the Commission as they are received within maybe a month review on the part of staff. Let's say an application came in in the 1st of February, we would submit it to the Commission four weeks later with staff notes attached. We would simply keep track of those applications as "one of. One of two, one of three, one of four" or something like that, so we can keep track of those application.

Vice Chair Stoldal: I don't speak for the rest of the Commission clearly, but will say, I enjoy reading the applications, they are really an eye opener to various historic projects and communities around the State and so its not a painful process, it just the opposite. It just takes time. You want to review it, think about it, make notes, read staff notes. I enjoy the process. The more time that I have to go through it would be great. I think there are three

options. One the way we are doing it now, just get submissions to us all and we have four weeks to review twenty-five or however many there are, pick a point where you receive ten or fifteen of them and submit half of them to us when they are done, and we will get the other half later on, or as you maybe suggested as soon as staff gets done, send that out to the Commission. I think there are a couple, three options that are there, I'm not sure. I guess I can keep track of (inaudible)

The Chair: My computer is breaking out a little bit, so I may be a little behind time here. We can just say in April, April 25th final applications sent to Commission. I don't know that we need to be more specific than to direct staff to that in the period between February 28th and April 25th that when they get a significant number or half of them, they forward them to us and then the other half. The idea of tracking each application on whether or not it's been sent to the Commissioners sounds like another task that I wouldn't want staff to have to live with. I can see sending half now, half later, but tracking them individually, were they sent, were they distributed to all of the Commissioners and were they received, it's a lot to ask, I think.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Rebecca, what do you think about half and half? Cut the grants in half?

Rebecca Palmer: It is my understanding that once the applications are received, by my office, they are public record and can be available through a public records request. So an alternative might be that staff could post the applications as they are received on a web page on our website. Then once staff has completed its technical review of the documents, the Commissioners would receive the staff comments individually via email or mail, whatever the Commissioner proposes, and that way the applications are available at any point in time. What would not be available would be the staffs professional review of those documents. That's another alternative to give the Commissioners the maximum amount of time to review the applications. What would not be available on the website would be the staff comments which could follow later.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Although the challenge with that, you will look at an application and reject it to a certain degree, or it won't have all the necessary documentation that is required. How often does that happen. I am starting to lean towards half and half with the staff review.

Rebecca Palmer: It's been my experience for the most part, that the applications are generally complete when they are received. On several occasions there have been some additional details we have had to ask the applicants to submit prior to the deadline. For the most part they are generally complete. I would be happy to do whatever the Commission would like to do. Half and half or posting them someplace so that someone could get a jump on the review if they knew they didn't have sufficient time. I am open to whatever alternatives the Commission might wish.

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I would prefer to not see any of the grants until the grants have had staff technical review so that I don't have to go back and look at them a second time in case there were any grants that came back with technical errors.

Vice Chair Stoldal: I would like to make a motion that once staff has completed 50% of the received applications and they have reviewed 50% of the applications, they send them to the Commission with staff notes.

The Chair: Is there a second to that?

Commissioner Cavanaugh: I'll second

The Chair: Was there a second?

Commissioner Cavanaugh: Yes, that was a second.

The Chair: Okay, a motion and a second. This has to do with the distribution of the grants after they have been received not the entire schedule. Any further comments? Any comments from the public either online, on Zoom or present at the meeting? Hearing none.

Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay

The Chair: Let's get back to the schedule itself. It appears to me that you are looking at October 1, 2021 for application availability, November 1, 2021 for letters of intent, February 1, 2022 for all requests for technical support, February 28, 2022 all applications must be received by SHPO, and the final applications have to be to the Commissioners by not later than April 25th, based on the other motion, half would come earlier. The grant hearings would be scheduled for June 2nd and 3rd of 2022, and the final schedule item is, and you have to help again here staff, September 15th, what is it you want done Rebecca? My notes were not very clear.

Rebecca Palmer: We would recommend that date be for the revised scope of work and budget to reflect the grant award made by the Commission.

The Chair: I am suggesting September 15th.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Mr. Chair, I am just looking at the dates, February 28, 2022, that is a Monday. Rebecca, do you want to make those Friday dates. Let me look at the calendar again.

Rebecca Palmer: We are fine with the dates which the Commission would like to select. A Monday for a due date would mean that the applicants would have to ensure that its either postmarked by that date or deliver it on a Monday.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Friday, February 25th 2022. Do Friday's work for you? We can just change it to the Friday rather than Monday.

Rebecca Palmer: Friday's work perfectly fine with us.

Vice Chair Stoldal: I would suggest we change February 28th to February 25th which is a Friday. What are we doing in November? You want to do Friday, November 5th?

Rebecca Palmer: Friday November 5th would certainly work for us.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Did we pick an October date?

Commissioner Cavanaugh: That was October 1st.

Vice Chair Stoldal: October 1st is a Friday, okay.

The Chair: You've got the dates Bob; would you like to make a motion?

Vice Chair Stoldal: I am looking at the next one, April 25th is a Monday, that's fine, okay. I did not get the last two additional dates.

The Chair: That was February 1 2021, and September 15 to submit final scope of work and budget.

Vice Chair Stoldal: We passed February 2021, Rebecca what dates did you have for the technical assistance?

Rebecca Palmer: February 1, 2022, which will be a Tuesday, but it's a nice beginning of the month, so that's always helpful.

Vice Chair Stoldal: And then the final revised, what is the date on that one?

Rebecca Palmer: The Chair suggested September 15th, 2022.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Mr. Chair, I would like to make a motion that the grant cycle for Fiscal Year 21-22, is:

Applications available from the SHPO website - October 1st, 2021
Letter of Intent for new applicants for new building- November 5th, 2021
Applications due to Carson City or postmarked by this date - February 25th, 2022
Applications sent to the Commissioner when 50% are done - April 25th, 2022
Grant Hearing - June 2nd and 3rd, 2022

Technical assistance from SHPO office cutoff date - February 1st, 2022
Final date to submit revised scope of work and budget – September 15th, 2022

The Chair: Thank you for the motion. Any second?

Commissioner Olmstead: I second the motion.

The Chair: I have a motion and a second. Any further comment from the Commissioners? Any comments from the public on Zoom, on the phone or at the meeting? Hearing none.

Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay

The Chair: Thank you very much. All very important dates for those applicants and keep everyone on the same page.

12. Staff Report on the status of an update of the 10-year plan.

The Chair: Staff has asked for an opportunity to report on the 10 year plan. Rebecca are you prepared to do that?

Rebecca Palmer: The Commission is required by statues to have a 10 year plan in place. There is indeed a 10 year plan, but it is somewhat out of date. We have been updating it as grants are awarded, but it is time to update that 10 year plan. We now have sufficient administrative funds to complete that 10 year plan update and we have hired by contract a very capable individual to conduct that work for us. I would like to introduce the Commissioners to Rayette Martin. She will be able to discuss both what she has done to date to update the 10 year plan and what her proposal is for the next few months as we move forward. Just so you are aware, we are hoping to hold either in person or remote meetings in all 17 counties and will be reaching out to grantees to assist us in establishing and setting up those meetings. Its an opportunity to advertise the work of the Commission and to gather public comment at the same time. We prepared a working draft document that I submitted to the Commission of an overview of the history of the Commissions work and I would like to introduce Rayette Martin at this time. Rayette are you available.

Rayette Martin: Can everyone hear me okay? Thank you for nodding. The initial steps that I have taken to work on this plan is I have reviewed the statues and the manuals over the years, and I have reviewed all of the past meetings all the way back to 1993. I want to say it is nice to see faces to go with names from those meetings and I know that you have done a lot of work over the past years, so I commend you for all of that. I prepared the informational sheet and some statistics on past recipients, and the way the program runs and operates so I will be prepared to go into those 17 county meetings and explain what the CCCHP is created for, to talk about previous recipients, and to get public input on what

they would like to see happening moving forward and address any other questions or issues. As Rebecca said, we will be reaching out to prior recipients to have them help us set up meetings, so I have created a stakeholders list of all of those folks, even going back to the 90's if they are still available to reach out to them. What is really nice is doing a, not just adding to the old plan, but we have an opportunity to create a plan that is going to work for the current Commission, and that can be used in the future for new Commissioners as things change. Also a document that may assist with applicants and furthering peoples understanding of what you all are doing. I would like to put that out there, if you have any ideas or content that you think would be beneficial for the Commissioners and the applicants. For example, since I went through all of the meeting minutes and some audio recording, a summary maybe of the decisions made by the Commission concerning procedures and operations to carry out mandates and statues to infographics that may make it a little simpler for people to get a big picture of what is going on. So while I am doing this process, I want you to feel confident in reaching out to me if you have any of those ideas, because it is good to have those before you have the public commenting and set up those meetings so that I am asking the right question and reaching out to get that information. I just wanted to introduce myself, let you know what I am doing and if you want to reach out to me, if there is anybody that is calling in or not visible on Zoom, my email address is ramartin@shpo.nv.gov and so you can reach directly out to me and I will be happy to have conversations about your ideas for the 10 year plan.

Rebecca Palmer: Just so the Commission is aware, Rayette was responsible for the Nevada State Historic Preservation Plan, layout, design; it is quite a wonderful work of art, not just a bureaucratic guidance document but it is a very informative plan I would encourage everyone to review. She was the primary artist behind that. Designed it, created the layout for it, made it very user friendly, so I have every confidence that we will have a similar product for the Commission and the applicants and the grantees to use, well into the future. It was my suggestion that perhaps the Commission might want to have in it, as an attachment, or an appendix, a list of decisions that they have voted on about how the Commission would operate, who would be eligible for grants, how the grants would be awarded. If the Commission so chooses. However if the Commission does not want to include that type of appendix, because it would provide citations for where in the minutes of each meeting that decision can be found, but it would also be a record that might be used to limit the Commissions decision making authority at a later date. So it's something to consider as an appendix, but it might not be something the Commission wishes to have. I know that on a number of occasions, the Commissioners have asked, "Well, what did we do in the past?", and Rayette made the effort of going through all of the minutes to find out what the Commission did do in the past, and she has prepared that kind of attachment. It could be, perhaps, a confidential attachment. Its all public record, but it doesn't necessarily be part of the 10 year plan. With that, if the Commissioners have any thoughts about content or anything they would like to provide at any point of time between now and June of next year, that would be the time to provide it.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Where is the current and maybe some of the previous; are there three previous 10 years that we have done?

Rebecca Palmer: There are two 10 year plans.

Vice Chair Stoldal: Are they online somewhere?

Rebecca Palmer: The current 10 year plan is posted on the website for the Commission.

Vice Chair Stoldal: If the first one could be found and posted, and we could read those. This is really just Mr. Nitpicker talking here, I thought we had 16 counties and one independent City? I don't think we have 17 counties. I think we have 16 counties and one independent, but that is Mr. Nitpicker talking.

Rebecca Palmer: You are absolutely correct sir.

The Chair: Rebecca, what is the schedule for this plan in terms of timing.

Rebecca Palmer: We are using administrative funding of the 5% Diminimus available in the 2019-2020 grant cycle. So we would have to expend most of the funds by no later of November of next year. However, the current plan if you see it on the website has a 2014 date on it, so we are somewhat behind in the preparation of a current 10 year plan. So to provide you with a date, I would suggest that we hopefully will have something in draft form by no later than November of next year.

The Chair: Commissioners have any questions? Thank you very much. I look forward to seeing the plan, working on it, and contributing to it as we develop that. Thank you very much.

13. Public Comment:

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

The Chair: Is there anyone on Zoom, on the phone, or at the meeting who would like to make public comment.

Carla Hitchcock: I still have Susan Wetmore on the line if you would like me to bring her on?

The Chair: Yes.

Carla Hitchcock: Susan you can unmute yourself, and you are on.

Susan Wetmore: Now this is the third meeting I have sat in on, and every meeting I am really impressed by the thoughtfulness of the staff and Commissioners of going through your agenda items and our requests. I kind of sensed that in agenda item 5 and 7 that there might still be a little confusion. Going back to our original request in the grant cycle, we did have five options that were confusing to the Commission and that came from our inexperience since this was our first time. We have been very grateful to the SHPO staff for advising and assisting us and educating us in terms of our project to help ensure success. One thing that one of the Commissioners said, I think back in June, is that if you don't have a roof, you don't have a building. We are getting our roof slowly through the EPA Brownfields program so that is moving along at kind of a turtle's pace but, it's happening. Our ADA access we feel is coming along well. We have raised \$84,000 in addition to the \$194,000 from the CCCHP funding, so we are feeling confident about our building to complete this project in a timely fashion, and I just wanted to make sure the Commissioners still didn't have any doubts or confusion about our project. Thank you very much.

The Chair: As long as you are on the line, does anyone have any questions. Hearing none. Thank you very much for the update, its always fun for the community to come together as it has there in White Pine County and Ely and do some great things in the community.

That officially ends our agenda. I would like to thank all the Commissioners for the time and thoughtfulness they put in today in the support of staff and will be looking forward to our next meeting.

14. Adjournment 3:05 pm

