

**Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation  
November 03, 2021 3:00 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 3:00 p.m.**

*The Chair:* This is the time and place that was set for the Commission for Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation posted meeting. Would staff verify that the meeting was in fact posted?

*Rebecca Palmer:* Yes sir, it was.

**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**

David Ortlipp (State Council on Library and Literacy) **Not Present for roll call. Came in later via phone.**

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

Gail Rappa (Nevada Arts Council) **Present via Zoom**

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

Antoinette Cavanaugh (Nevada Humanities) **Not Present**

***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**

*The Chair:* Just a note, please mute when you are not speaking and if you would announce yourself when you do speak, it helps those in creating minutes following the meeting when someone reviews the tape or written comments.

**3. Public Comment:**

*The Chair:* This is the appropriate time for public comment. The Commission encourages public comment. Public comment may be limited if necessary to three minutes. 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. I will also take public comment at the end of the meeting, and I will take comment before the Commission actually votes on any action item on the agenda. Is there anyone present in the hearing room, on Zoom or by phone who would like to make comment at this time?

*Carla Cloud:* I have no hands raised and have not received any notification sir.

*The Chair:* Okay, members of the public will have ample opportunity to make comments before we take any action or at the close of the meeting.

*Deputy AG, Anthony Walsh:* It appears that Commissioner Ortlipp has signed on and may be connected to audio.

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* Yes, I am here.

*The Chair:* Oh good, thank you David for being with us today, glad to have you.

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* Thank you

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

4a) September 13, 2021 meeting.

*The Chair:* Does anyone have any comments, questions, or corrections to those minutes?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I would like to make a motion to approve.

*Commissioner Rappa:* I second

No Public Comment

**Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay**

#### **5. Review of the Carlin Historical Society's request to modify their grant (CCCHP-19-22) to redirect \$18,965 of unspent funds to install a sidewalk and create an ADA accessible entrance. (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

*The Chair:* Some materials were given to the members. Would staff like to brief us, Rebecca, on what the request is.

*Rebecca Palmer:* The grantee was able to complete the project for which they received CCCHP grant funds with surprisingly less expensive contractor. As a result they now have a surplus of CCCHP funds that they would like to redirect to the items mentioned in their submission.

This must come before the Commission because it was not included in their grant application and has not been reviewed by the Commission. This is a new proposal to ensure that they are able to use the entire grant award on that property. We requested that the grantee be present if the Commission had any questions of them. Carla, do you see them on?

*Carla Cloud:* Yes, I have Ella on the line if you would like to speak with her.

*The Chair:* As long as she is there, yeah, just give us a minute. I'd like to invite Commissioners if you have questions, about one, the specific project, and two, the issue of whether or not unspent funds should be returned to the Commission for redistribution or whether they can be used by the grantee. I will open that to the Commissioners and feel free to address the applicant if that would be helpful.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Chair, the question is, we went through this packet and there are several variations, one of which is this one, where they're not asking for additional money, they simply have a savings, and they would like to redirect to a different project. We have another one where the money wasn't spent at all for the original project, and they want to completely do a dramatic change to another project. We have others where they are asking for money that was not in their original project and so there is like three or four different categories we are having to deal with. This one seems to be the easiest one in the sense that they're not asking for additional funding, they are saying we have this money left over, this is another important part including an ADA. In this narrow frame in this specific one, I would feel comfortable, even would want to say this is precedented in some way, although I don't like that word because sometimes because each one is unique. I'm really comfortable with this and I'm glad to see that they were able to find additional good use for this project. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Do other Commissioners have comment?

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* I have just one quick question. This being my first meeting, I wonder, when we granted this money to the project, were there other projects that we did not fulfill because we didn't have sufficient grant funds?

*The Chair:* That would be a good assumption. We, as usual, had to make tough decisions, and a number of other grant requests were denied or funded on a limited basis because we did not have enough money to fund all of the requests, so the answer is yes.

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* Where I am going now, there could be some argument for saying the funds that they saved and didn't use for a project that is essentially complete, should we consider funding a project that didn't receive funds? So, I am going to kind of throw that out there.

*Commissioner Rappa:* I'm going to agree with Commissioner Stoldal. I feel like this seems pretty clear to me and redistributing \$18,000.00, trying to do that process, go back to the previous grant cycle and redistribute doesn't seem like a good use of staff time or Commissioner time quite frankly. In a way it feels like we could, if not set a precedent, at least reward Carlin for coming in under budget.

*Carla Cloud:* I would like to make a comment for the record. From our understanding the actual contractor backed out of the project, so it was not complete. They have gotten a new contractor who quoted them way less than what the original contractor did. So with the portion of the funds that would be remaining, that's what they're wanting to do this work with and was awarded full funding for what they applied for originally, so there isn't any part of what they applied for that didn't get funded. They were fully funded, so this would be additional ask since they have that remaining money left.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Commissioner Ostrovsky, a couple other things. One is, one of the other things that I do before every one of these meetings is I review the Nevada Revised Statutes that covers what we do, and one of the criteria is to make sure that we have a solid geographical representation of the State, and this has been Carlin's first real effort to do something. It's not just one particular reason that I think we should do this, I think there is a whole box of good reasons why Carlin should be able to get this. If we had been funding Carlin for the last twenty years, like some of the other projects, maybe that would be slightly different. If we had passed the million dollar mark in Carlin and there was a great body of resources that Carlin could rely upon to get the money, maybe it would be different, but this is a relatively fresh grant and Carlin is so important to this state's history. For a lot of reason's I would like support this. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Other Commissioners have comments? I would very quickly like to hear from the applicant about the actual project please.

*Carla Cloud:* Sure one moment. Ella?

*Ella Trujillo:* Yes, I am here.

*The Chair:* Hi Ella. Could you give us a brief description of the project, please?

*Ella Trujillo:* Yes. The initial grant application was to remove concrete that has deteriorated at the front of the building and replace it with new while trying to restore it to more of its (inaudible) state. The additional funding that we are asking for is to basically to continue this concrete project. We are asking to create a sidewalk along the side and do some work in the back. This additional concrete work we call it phase two, because we had and will continue to have, depending on what happens today, the intention to apply for funding in the next grant cycle to do this work. We were very excited when we got the new quote back because we thought, oh my gosh, we can now do phase two without having to put it in the next grant

application and we could focus on some other project that also needs to be completed. I was able to, and I apologize that it was not in your packet, that I had submitted; the contractor had not given me the additional quote for this proposed additional work, but he did get it to me yesterday, and the additional work will cost sixteen thousand, six hundred and thirty two dollars, so that's still under our current budgeted amount, so there would still be about \$2,333.00 that is remaining. That is if the actual cost of the work and materials doesn't change.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Any Commissioners have any questions of the applicant? Would any Commissioner like to make a motion?

*Vice-Chair Stoldal:* I would like to make a motion to approve the request as stated.

*Commissioner Olmstead:* I second.

*The Chair:* Any Commissioners have any further comments? Is there any member of the public that has any comment regarding this matter? Hearing none.

**Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay**

*The Chair:* Thank you very much and good luck Carlin in the restoration work you are doing. We look forward to seeing your future grant applications.

*Ella Trujillo:* Thank you very much.

**6. Discussion and possible reallocation from applications received for of all or a portion of the \$200,000 CCCHP FY19-20 funding available.(FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

*The Chair:* Item number 6 is the reallocation of funds. Would staff give us, very quick, how did we get the \$200,000.00 on the record? I think we all know that, but why don't you tell us, and bring us up to date again. How do we have this extra money to redistribute?

*Rebecca Palmer:* We have \$200,000.00 in extra funds to redistribute to the existing grantees, eligible to receive the additional funds; keeping in mind that not every grantee is eligible to receive the funds. If their project is complete, they are not eligible. If they were fully funded, they are not eligible. Those were criteria identified by the Commission, as excluding those grantees from what I call, the third round of redistribution. The \$200,000.00 comes from an original grant award given to the Neon Museum to repair the La Concha lobby. Unfortunately in the process of developing a funding agreement, it became clear that the property owner of the parcel upon which the La Concha sits was not amenable to placing a covenant on the property. As a result, because this Commission requires the placement of covenants on the property in order to preserve and protect the states investment, the grant funding had to be declined by the Neon Museum, so we now have \$200,000.00.

*The Chair:* Rebecca would you explain how you reached out and we got these requests?

*Rebecca Palmer:* Yes. At the request of the Chair at the last meeting, I sent a letter out to all of the eligible grantees, explaining to them that there was two hundred thousand dollars available in this third grant round and that if they had previously applied for the second round, and they did not want to make any updates to the request, we would simply carry forward the request into the third round. If there still was unfunded projects or unfunded activities remaining. Some took advantage of that, and we rolled their round two application into round three because they were not fully funded. Others, we said if they wanted to refresh proposal, because as we all know, the cost of materials is skyrocketing and so is the cost of construction. So if any of those costs have changed, since grant round two, that they have an opportunity to refresh their proposal for the additional funding. You see before you now, all of the grantees who responded to the letter that I sent out, and all we did was take their request and make it a supplemental document. We did not edit their request, we simply took whatever they sent us and have provided it to you, the Commissioners, for your inspection. We also made it clear to all those applicants that put in a round three request that they had to be present if they wanted to receive funding in the event that any commissioner had any questions. However, we just received notice from one of the grantees, the Comstock Cemetery Foundation, that she has had a family emergency and is unable to attend for a portion of this meeting. So it is possible that the representative for the Comstock Cemetery Foundation might not be present to answer questions.

*The Chair:* Thank you. With that knowledge, is the Comstock Cemetery Foundation, are they on the line currently?

*Carla Cloud:* I do not see that she has called in, no.

*The Chair:* Okay, will you please advise me if you recognize her as calling in? If she does call in, then we will have an opportunity to hear from the applicant. You all should have received all of these requests attached to the agenda. It has also been posted on the public website for the public to see, all of these applications. Obviously we cannot fund them all. It's my intent obviously to have open discussion with the members on how to proceed, but I was not going to go into a full hearing on all these items as we would in a normal grant operation. Do any members have any suggestion on how they would like to proceed? Mr. Stoldal?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I think we do need to hit each one, certainly not in the amount of detail that we do in the original grant, but I think we wrapped up the second round relatively quick, but I think we should at least touch bases on each one of them for a moment and get a sense and then move on and once we finish, I believe there are twelve, then should we submit to Rebecca? How do we reach an agreement at the end?

*The Chair:* Well Bob, I was hoping we could discuss them more openly than following that regular process. I count eleven, do you count twelve?

*Vice Chair Stoldal: (recounts)* Okay, I got eleven the second time.

*The Chair:* Does anybody object to at least hearing from the applicants? If not I would advise the applicants to understand this is a special meeting, not a regular meeting where we have a lengthy hearing. Please, if you could explain your project and the needs and how you come up with that funding number and do it in a relatively quick fashion, please don't skip over any important items that the Commission should hear about, but understand we have limited time. If that's the case, I will run down each of them, ask them to come forward, the Commissioners, I will ask you at the end of their quick presentation if you have any questions of the applicant and I will remind the applicants even after their done with their presentation to please stay online, we may have to come back to you again and ask further questions.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I'm sorry, I wasn't really clear. My thought process was that we would come to each item and if there was any questions from the Commissioners, we would ask. I wasn't suggesting we need a presentation. I think all of us have read the documents. We may have one or two questions, but that's my idea.

*The Chair:* That's fine, I'm happy to go with the question method if that is okay with everyone. I don't see any objections. White Pine Community Choir Association is the first application up. That application total amount was \$35,500.00 for electrical design, upgrade, and installation. Commissioners now is your time to ask questions. Either discuss amongst the Commissioners or ask questions of the applicant about their request.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Just kind of reading off the report, has the specific elevator been selected?

*The Chair:* Is someone from White Pine available please?

*Carla Cloud:* Susan you are on. You will have to unmute. I will also bring on Carol McKenzie.

*Susan Wetmore:* Hello. This is Susan, Susan Wetmore from the White Pine Community Choir; can you all hear me?

*The Chair:* Yes we can.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Susan the question was, has the specific elevator site been selected?

*Susan Wetmore:* Yes. We have selected the elevator site and our construction documents are very close to being complete, they are about ninety five percent complete, so we feel that we are about ready to go out to bid by about the beginning of December. The site is in the northwest



corner of the building and its actually through a window that is already there, and it will enter into two, sort of side rooms in the building. That site was selected in consultation with the architect, the choir and the SHPO staff.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Susan, \$35,500, is that an estimate, not a specific bid?

*Susan Wetmore:* I'm not sure how to answer that. I guess it's an estimate from PK Electrical. That was their project proposal for the design phase services for \$10,500.00 and then an additional \$25,000.00 to actually install the updated electrical service. The details then are at the bottom of page one and the top of page two in the letter that I wrote.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I guess the question is if its more than \$35,500.00, what are you going to do?

*Susan Wetmore:* Well, we are going to continue to fundraise. You all awarded us \$194,000.00 and we were able to raise an additional \$80,000.00. We will just continue to fundraise to make our project viable.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Susan, thank you.

*The Chair:* Susan could you briefly tell us if you add the elevator how will that impact the building and its use?

*Susan Wetmore:* The elevator is key to the renovation of the building because there is no level that can be accessed from the outside without using steps. So in order to renovate this building and make it a community center or gathering place again, there needs to be some sort of ADA access. It's crucial, that is why we asked for those funds for our first CCCHP grant. Does that answer your question Commissioner?

*The Chair:* Yes. Do any other Commissioners have questions of Susan? I hear none, thank you Susan, please hang with us for a little while.

*Susan Wetmore:* Thank you Commissioners, very much for considering our request.

*The Chair:* Thank you. The next applicant is the Historic Fourth Ward School. Is someone available?

*Carla Cloud:* Yes sir, I will bring Nora on, one moment.

*The Chair:* If she is available, I will go to the Commissioners and ask them if they have questions of the applicant.

*Carla Cloud:* Yes, she is available.



*The Chair:* I have a question for her. I had a little trouble following the request. It talks about an additional \$15,500.00 to decrease our match and allow us to reserve those funds. Are we talking about if we were to grant you this money, \$15,500.00, that would replace money already raised for this purpose and you would use the other match money for something else? I'm just a little unclear.

*Nora Stefu:* No sir, we have raised around \$13,000.00 for the \$38,500.00 that was the original match and then on the second round, the Commissioners gave us \$23,000.00, I'm sorry, the remaining balance from the second round was \$38,500.00, so we asked for the \$15,500.00 that was original from our original grant. So basically to answer your question, is no if that makes sense.

*The Chair:* You would use all of these funds?

*Nora Stefu:* For our match, we do need \$35,500.00. \$13,000.00 from fundraising that we already have towards that.

*The Chair:* So if we were to grant you this, there is matching money available.

*Nora Stefu:* Correct

*The Chair:* Okay, thank you. Do any other Commissioners have questions of the applicant? Hearing none. Thank you very much, we will get back to you.

*Nora Stefu:* Thank you

*The Chair:* The next one, the Comstock Cemetery Foundation, they're not yet available, is that correct?

*Carla Cloud:* Let me double check. No sir, I don't see that she has been able to call in yet.

*The Chair:* Okay, let us know when she does. Their request is Nevada Power additional \$2500.00, power to the center, \$4,900.00, and a cleanup of \$6,550 bathrooms, windows, and outside visitor center. We will hold on that one and come back to it. The next is Eureka. Is there someone available from Eureka?

*Carla Cloud:* Yes, Garney would be available if you have questions.

*The Chair:* I will open it to the Commissioners. Their request is for \$24,679.00. It has a couple of items in it. Questions from the Commission?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Mine is only a comment. When this came up in the first round, I wasn't very satisfied with the support at that point. Again, my own expertise in this area is limited to

crawling around in the basement underneath a few historic buildings, but it just didn't look stable, and I am glad to see that they are coming back and updating their stabilization and renovating these support beams and specifically the concrete pads, so I am really happy to see it come back. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Any other questions? I had none either, so thank you very much. Don't go away though. Item number six was the Brewery Arts Center. This was a variable amount. They gave us three options. Questions of the Commissioners?

*Commissioner Rappa:* I think item six is Red House?

*Carla Cloud:* We don't have Red House on the agenda.

*Commissioner Rappa:* Okay, I was looking at one of the things sent out. It wasn't on the agenda; it was on the notes.

*Carla Cloud:* Oh, yes, I understand what you are looking at. The notes are basically letting you guys know that even though they may not have received additional funding in Round 2, they were not going to come back in Round 3 to request more funds. Their project is almost complete, so they will not need to come back and actually ask for more funds, so we were just making a note of that.

*Commissioner Rappa:* Okay, thank you.

*Carla Cloud:* You're welcome

*The Chair:* Is someone available from Brewery Arts?

*Carla Cloud:* Yes, I have Mikey on the line, would you like to speak with him?

*The Chair:* Yes.

*Mike Wiencek:* Hello, this is Mike Wiencek from the Brewery Arts Center.

*The Chair:* Hi Mike, Bob Ostrovsky, thank you for being here. I know you have three options here. They are kind of built on each other. Its either one or two or three. Three would complete everything, is that correct?

*Mike Wiencek:* Yes sir. We didn't know how much funding was being requested by everybody else and honestly we didn't want to seem greedy, but we figured we would come up with these options. Like it says, option one would get us on track to beginning to create good, safe, and efficient lighting. Option two would really benefit things and option three would really just finish that project and complete the safety upgrades on the lighting.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Chair, I am a bit confused. Are we on the Carson Brewery or the Brewery Arts Performance Hall?

*Mike Wiencek:* The options for the lighting are for the Brewery Arts Center Performance Hall.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Right but before that we have the Brewing Company

*Carla Cloud:* Right now you should be on Agenda item 6e. for 19-07 the Carson Brewing Company.

*The Chair:* I apologize, I picked up the wrong paper. The first one is the Brewery Arts Center. Would the applicant like to explain that request?

*Mike Wiencek:* Yes, sir. For the main building, what we are wanting to do is, part of the grant funding we received was to replace the roof on the main Brewery building and part of that roof project was removing four skylights that were leaking and causing troubles. That has been done, and the roof is finished. We got it done right before all of this big rain, which was huge. So now, we have sealed off those skylights, but now on the inside of the Nevada Artists Association Gallery space, there's four big holes that need to be filled in with the drop ceiling to make it match the rest of that room, because before they were just open to the skylights and now the skylights are gone, we just want to finish that part up.

*The Chair:* And that total would be \$6,500.00? Is that correct?

*Mike Wiencek:* No, sir, that was \$2,000.00. The second part of our request was refinishing the hardwood flooring in our artesian store. We have had some different renovations in there over the years so there is parts of the floor that never got refinished, and there is trip hazards, and damages from heavy use when it was used as a cafe space. The estimate on that was \$4,500.00, so the total was \$6,500 for the request for the main Brewery Building.

*The Chair:* The second request, 6f was then the Performance Hall.

*Mike Wiencek:* Yes, sir.

*The Chair:* Would you explain the options? Commissioners, please, now would be the time to ask the applicants any questions you might have. Mr. Stoldal I see you have a question.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* More of a comment, and that is that the first bullet point for \$2,000.00, that wraps up that part of the project. The \$4,500 is for something new. Unless we have some funds left over at the end of the day, I'm going to be focusing on finishing up projects that were in the original grant as opposed to adding. That is where my focus is going to be. I prefer to save the new projects in any amount to the next grant cycle. With that said, one other point and probably this should be at the end of the meeting, but we are starting to get,

this one is called Carson Brewing Company, but it's really the Brewery Arts Center. We are starting to get more and more projects from the same nonprofit and their sending in different grant proposals. We have discussed this before, and I think we probably should like we have a policy that if there is an emergency that washes away, and we move an emergency to the top. I'm thinking that we should have a policy where, and we will use Brewery Arts Center as an example, whatever their projects, come under one particular grant element, but we can save that for a later discussion. Thank you.

*Mike Wiencek:* The reason why we did that, was we were instructed to so because we have two different parcel numbers. The Brewery Arts Center is one entity, but we have two historic properties, one being the former St. Theresa's church, the other building being the Carson Brewing Company. So we were instructed to always keep the parcel numbers and historic properties separate from each other in any grant requests.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Rebecca?

*Rebecca Palmer:* We did that because the statutes identify this funding to go to cultural centers and it envisions that a cultural center is a building, structure, object; all of which have been funded by yourselves. But an individual building, structure, object. Since these are two separate buildings, we recommended that consistent with the statutes, they be treated as two separate grant applications and that is how they have traveled through the entire process.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* So if I understand correctly then, a facility like in Ely, the Northern Nevada Railroad, which has places far north at McGill, dozens of buildings on their site, they could have a grant on each one of those buildings?

*Rebecca Palmer:* It might require an AG's opinion as to whether the Commission can modify their standard practice as treating a cultural center as a building, structure, object and instead refer to a cultural center as a collection of buildings, structures, objects. I don't have the answer to the question. I know that historically, my predecessor since 1993 required individual buildings to have a single application regardless of which organization owned the building. We just continued with that practice. I am certainly open to other options, particularly when you have cultural organizations that have multiple properties, buildings, structures, or objects, and their coming in for multiple grant requests in a single grant cycle.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Thank you. I appreciate the background information. My sense is that if you have larger facilities that have multiple buildings, it kind of puts them at an advantage to smaller structures. Beyond what the statute says we will follow that and potentially at the Chair's; whether or not we want to get an AG's opinion.

The Chair: Bob, I will ask staff to put it on the next agenda, discussion of this item. I think it is appropriate, we have to talk about how the covenants reflect the various parcels and how

many we would have to have. So if staff would add it as an item to our next meeting, we can discuss that.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Thank you.

*Rebecca Palmer:* We will add that to the next agenda.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Any other questions on the Carson Brewery Company or the Performance Hall application? That moves to the Fallon Theatre. This is asbestos remediation that they were unaware of at the time of the original request. I will open it to the Commission for discussion and questions.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I tend to look at a couple things right away, the roof or the structure; the foundation. The roofing is the number one concern for this historic structure. They have a firm bid, and they have a qualified contractor and in order for this project to move forward we need to take care of the asbestos, so this seems to be a pretty clear decision.

*The Chair:* Is someone available from the Fallon Community Theatre?

*Carla Cloud:* It looks like I have Stu Richardson on the line. One moment. I don't see Mike Berney.

*Mike Berney:* Hi, Mike Berney for the record.

*The Chair:* Mike this is Bob Ostrovsky. How did this all come up? You didn't recognize it in the beginning? It was hidden obviously, huh?

*Mike Berney:* Yes, basically the original roofing contractor we had gave us the bid that we came to you with and during what's been going on, he indicated that it was going to end up being a little bit more. He didn't know if he could even fit the job in, so we actually got a Reno firm, D&D Roofing. In the midst of all that, our other contractor that is doing the stabilization work said there could be an asbestos issue up there. So we had it tested and there is and so basically that's a combination of probably material increase, also that asbestos removal. We were not aware of it at all. We should have been, probably, as old as the building is, but no one mentioned it to me until later.

*The Chair:* That's the risk when you start poking into old buildings. This is a pretty firm bid, is that correct?

*Mike Berney:* That is a firm bid and actually D&D expects to be on site I'm thinking the middle to the end of this month they will be on site to tear the old roof off and put the new roof on. Which we are ecstatic about after all the years of leaks and pumping out garbage cans of water and all that stuff in that attic, so yeah, this is a huge thing for us.

*The Chair:* I appreciate that. Thank you. Any other Commissioners have any questions of Stu or any comments? Alright, hearing none. Thank you Stu.

*Mike Berney:* Thank you

*The Chair:* That takes us to St. Mary's, let me check my agenda. Any questions of the Commissioners regarding this applicant or questions they would like to address to the folks at the St. Mary's Art Center? Mr. Stoldal?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Yes, we are facing challenges of having great projects and not have a great deal of money. I'm trying to split things in half. For the windows is there any way to do rather than eighteen, is there any way if we gave you money for two windows, six, eight, ten; rather than eighteen, is there a way you could part that if we gave you some money for some of the windows? I realize the porch seems to be the one that's, as you say, failing at an alarming rate and it sounds like that is the highest priority and has to come first. But then there is the window issue. Is there a thoughts about how we can adjust the windows, rather than eighteen, may eight or nine or something?

*The Chair:* Staff, is there someone available from the Arts Center?

*Arika Perry:* Hi, this is Arika Perry with St. Mary's Art Center.

*The Chair:* Welcome. Would you like to respond?

*Arika Perry:* Yes, thank you Commissioners. We would be able to of course do work on a portion of the windows, however, they are all in such severe disrepair that the eighteen really are pretty formidable and they open into all of the guest rooms. So in that way, they are imperative for circulation especially during the hot summer months. So we would be happy with anything, but ideally we would come closer to eighteen than not, just because they are in such severe disrepair, that they are beginning to stick and problematic and we are worried that some are some of them are actually going to fail and become un-useful. Just to give you an update on the porch, with that amazing stream of moisture last week or two weeks ago, we had substantial flooding in that print room below the porch. So those two areas are in desperate need for repair. They are starting to fail even more so, just as a side note. And then also one thing that I forgot to mention, is that we did identify that there is led in the windows; in the bare wood as well. So that is part of the expense that we are concerned about as well.

*The Chair:* There are actually three requests here, A,B & C? Is that correct?

*Arika Perry:* Yes, we wanted to give you a range and just like the Brewery Art Center, we did not want to appear greedy, so we wanted to give you options for consideration. C, being obviously the least amount and that would exclude any window work and then A & B are either the full amount or a reduction to eighteen windows.

*The Chair:* And as you responded to Commissioner Stoldal, if we couldn't give you the full amount, I guess you would have to pick and choose which were the worst windows?

*Arika Perry:* Yes, we would.

*The Chair:* Okay. Other Commissioners have questions?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* So when we are saying they are not functioning in the hot summer, it means they may be stuck and you can't open them for air circulation, correct?

*Arika Perry:* Correct. We haven't had reach that point yet, but they are very close, they are starting to stick, and people are becoming rather forceful trying to get them to be operable.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* So there are no fans or any other methods you are using currently?

*Arika Perry:* We have ceiling fans in many rooms, and we have floor box fans. We try to do cross circulation, but unfortunately it's a very hot building in the summer.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Okay, thank you.

*The Chair:* Any other questions from the members of the committee? Alright, thank you. Please don't go away. That takes us to the Norther Nevada Railroad, they have two applications. Do any Commissioners have any questions about, let's start with the first item, *I*. They are requesting \$52,000 in grant funds. Questions of the Commissioners? Is someone available from Nevada Northern Railway?

*Carla Cloud:* Yes, sir. I have Mark Bassett on the line if you would like me to bring him on?

*The Chair:* Sure.

*Mark Bassett:* Good afternoon Commissioners.

*The Chair:* Hi Mark, thank you for joining us today. Would you give us a quick explanation of the first request?

*Mark Bassett:* Sure, this is the Transportation building, and there is only one staircase to the second floor. On the second floor is where we have our administrative and train operations offices. We thought that we could do some band aid repairs. We brought in our architect Jacque Errecart, and he is suggesting our band aid isn't big enough anymore.

*The Chair:* Let me ask you Mark, this \$52,000 would complete the project?

*Mark Bassett:* Correct, that would complete it.



*The Chair:* And are you basically replacing the stairs?

*Mark Bassett:* We are going to reconstruct it in place. It's a reconstruction. Any material that we can reuse, to keep the fabric, we will, but some pieces will have to be replaced.

*The Chair:* Anyone else have questions? Mr. Stoldal?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* My concern is not that this is not an important project, just like the other projects, this was not part of the original grant process. This is a new activity and at this point trying to get my arms around wrapping up the ones that are part of the original grant process and that includes what's coming up with the McGill Depot. We've got a significant opportunity there to complete and open that facility. So there are hard choices we have to make, and my focus is on we can wrap up and clean up some of the original grant process rather than starting a new. Not that I am saying it's not important, it's just we got to stay a path here.

*The Chair:* Thank you Bob. Any other Commissioners have comments or questions? If not, the next application is regarding the McGill Depot. Mark would you like to give us a quick rundown on that project?

*Mark Bassett:* Yes, Commissioner. There are three public rooms in the McGill Depot. The Commission has generously financed the repairs to the men's waiting room, the women's waiting room, including the floors, the walls, the electricity. When we did this application we asked for funding for the floor in the Station Masters office, and unfortunately, that wasn't funded. So we are requesting funding here to complete the Station Masters office floor. The walls, ceiling, and electricity is already done, that would allow us to open the front three rooms of the Depot.

*The Chair:* If you get this \$28,900, you will actually have a building that could be put into use. Is that correct?

*Mark Bassett:* That is correct.

*The Chair:* It's currently not available for public access is that correct?

*Mark Bassett:* We do a lot of the public in the waiting room. But to actually develop the room, there is no sense in doing any development because we know we have to do the floor and doing the floor is going to create a lot of sawdust and everything, so we haven't put any exhibits or anything in there. If we put the floor in, we can now open up the building and put exhibits in.

*The Chair:* Any questions of the Commissioners? Mr. Stoldal?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Mark, I really appreciate you putting in the photograph of the project with the roof just flattened out and the amount of work that you have done in bringing this building back to life with McGill. The other thing, I added up the amount of money that the State of Nevada through this Commission has put into this building. So if we put this one in it will be about \$865,000. Would that be largest amount going into this building from one agency?

*Mark Bassett:* It would be the largest amount that has gone into this building from one agency. The foundation itself has put cash into the building and the Great Basin Heritage area has done a couple grants on this building too.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* How much do you think has been put into this building total, do you have that off the top of your head?

*Mark Bassett:* No, I don't have that off the top of my head.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* More than a million would you say?

*Mark Bassett:* No, I don't believe we have put in more than a million.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Okay, so the \$865,000 is probably the largest then?

*Mark Bassett:* Correct, the \$865,000 from the State is the largest amount invested in that building.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Thank you. If I were to look at that building, I'm not sure that I would have the courage to tackle it like you did. It doesn't look like that is salvageable, so great job Mark.

*Mark Bassett:* Thank you.

*The Chair:* Thank you very much Mark. Go ahead and hang on, I appreciate it. If you haven't had an opportunity to visit the, I'll call it the City of McGill, it's a worthwhile adventure. There is a lot to do and see there. This would be a great add. That is a rundown of all the applicants.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* One more, we have Goldfield

*The Chair:* We have Goldfield, I'm wrong again. I can't count. Goldfield has a request in, is there someone from Goldfield on the line?

*Carla Cloud:* Sorry, I was muted. Would you like me to bring him on? I have John Ekman on the line.

*The Chair:* Yes, please.

*John Ekman:* Go ahead John.

*The Chair:* Hi John, this is Bob Ostrovsky. John could you explain? You've got percentages in here and I am trying to figure out where we are at with this building and what the future looks like in terms of access and so on. Can you tell me about how these dollars will impact your plan?

*Carla Cloud:* It looks like he is muted and will need to unmute himself.

*The Chair:* John are you available?

*Carla Cloud:* His phone is still muted; I am not sure. He is on the line though.

*The Chair:* Until we get him on board, it appears to me, replacement of 23% or 80% of the sloped roof; \$22,000 would do an additional 10%, so were chipping away at the roof. We are not actually completing the roof and staff will verify this was all a part of the original request, but we didn't have enough funds to cover. Is that correct?

*Kristen Brown:* I was just going to suggest to John that he try to hit \*6 because I think that toggles your mute on and off if you are calling in from a telephone. At least it has for me in the past.

*Rebecca Palmer:* Kristen, could you answer the question the Chair asked?

*Kristen Brown:* Can you repeat the question?

*The Chair:* I'm sort of interested in where this project lies long term. This was part of the funding from the last cycle; we actually put money in the roof knowing we were not completing it. Is that correct?

*Kristen Brown:* Yes, that is correct. Originally they were hoping to do the entire roof at once, but in consultation with their structural engineer, they determined that it would be possible to do the roof in portions since it's a metal standing seam roof. The construction technique of that does allow for different panels, different quadrants I guess to be installed bit by bit, and so however much money they could receive would be a little bit more of the roof slowly working its way around the building.

*The Chair:* Do Commissioners have other questions until we hear from them. I think you answered my question. Go ahead Bob.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* To me this fall into the category and continues to follow into the category that I look at roof, foundation, windows, as key to preserve the building that this fall into the category of emergency. With each one of these requests you look at what are the options, and to me there are three options here. The 50,000, the 22,000 and then in the third paragraph, any additional funding would permit more than needing replacement, so it sounds like there is really three, so again, you are cutting things in half. I didn't go with 50, I didn't go with the 22, I found a number as I added everything up, I had a few dollars left over, so I came up with something in the middle rather than picking out the 22 or 50. It was any additional funding category that would help preserve that building.

*The Chair:* Yeah Bob, when I read it, I thought the 22 was sort of the minimum to do a section, so if John is not available, even if he could send something on the chat line and tell us what he could do with something less than 22. There's 22 which is needed to do the next section of the roof. That's kind of what my question is.

*John Ekman:* Hello, this is John.

*The Chair:* Yes John, thank you for being on board. The question is, is the 22,000, is anything less than that effective? Or is that the minimum you need to do the next stage?

*John Ekman:* I never put a minimum on any requests as I come with my hands out. Any amount would help us. It's just that the roof, of course, the structural stabilization; the exterior wall (inaudible) for completion. I have to go on the roof, and the roof is beginning to leak very badly. So of course the more funding we get the sooner we can stop the leakage and the sooner we can go onto the next step. Any amount is acceptable, I just put 22 as a number less than half of 50 just to kind of give your Commissioners something to consider, but we will always accept whatever you may be able to grant.

*The Chair:* Okay, thank you. Any questions from the Commissioners?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Chair, I wasn't clear. To me there are three numbers here. There is 50, 22 and then there is something in between 22 and 50. I wasn't thinking less than 20, I was thinking somewhere between 50 and 22. That's just my editorial comment. Thank you.

*The Chair:* Okay, thank you. Other Commissioners?

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* I kind of follow that thinking that roofs fall into that emergency category because in some respects if you fix the roof then you are going to mitigate any further damage to the property, so that's one of those things you might want to invest in now, because in the future if you continue that water damage, we are going to have rounds of requests in future years for things that could have been fixed now to kind of mitigate that. So I kind of fall on that thinking.

*The Chair:* David, this is Bob Ostrovsky. I think the Commission over the years, as Commissioner Stoldal has pointed out, roofs and foundations are important from keeping the structures from further damage and I think the Commission has put a lot of focus on roofs and foundations in their effort to find dollars in future cycles to do interior work and that sort of thing, so I agree with you, roofs are very important. Other comments or questions?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Just a thought, is Comstock on the line yet? If not maybe Rebecca or Kristen can answer a couple of questions?

*The Chair:* It looks like we will have to go with staff Bob.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* In going over this process, my understanding is that NV Energy's estimate was \$10,250 and that was short, so they need an additional \$2,500. In addition, a single power pole appears seems to be the heart of the second part of the request for \$4,900, so the decision apparently is that their contractor can put up that power pole cheaper than Nevada Energy. Is that the correct reading of this?

*Kristen Brown:* Thank you Mr. Stoldal for that excellent question, and I am not sure I can answer it based on the submission from the grantee. I think that maybe they did have to use their own contractor. I don't know. I apologize.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I think that is just some sort of deductive logic there that they are able to do it, it sounds like cheaper than NV Energy. What is NV Energy actually doing? I couldn't find the original grant request. What are they doing to get power, which is important to this facility, and I am going to support it, but I just need to understand, are they running cable? Are they putting in a power generator somewhere? Do we know exactly what they are doing?

*Kristen Brown:* They are bringing power from wherever it terminates through the property, closer to the building in order to supply power to the building. If you would like to know more, I could go back through the original application to see how exactly she worded that?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* No, it was more that all of these are learning experiences and opportunities to better understand somethings. I think the grant is clear, I was just looking for additional clarity, thank you. Its fine.

*The Chair:* Any Commissioners have any general comments before we talk about how we would like to proceed? Normally each Commissioner would fill out a budget, we would submit the budget to staff, they would do some calculations and we would try to then find consensus on these projects. We could do that, or we could go down each project individually and try to get a consensus number and then try to come back and balance when we go over or under budget, which might be an easier way to do it in this environment. As difficult as it is and as late as it is in the day. I would like to try and do that. Start with A., which is the White Pine Community Choir and ask the Commissioners their opinions about what they would fund

from zero to the total grant amount. How do you feel about the White Pine Community Choir Association request?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I'm at \$35,500

Commissioner Olmstead: I had the same.

Commissioner Rappa, I had \$12,000

The Chair: I guess the choice appears to me that you fund the whole thing or the design phase only. Is White Pine still available, Susan? Do we know if she is there, staff?

Carla: Go ahead Susan. You will need to unmute yourself.

Susan Wetmore: Hello, this is Susan Wetmore.

The Chair: Susan, if we were to fund the design phase for example, what would that delay cause if you had to come back in the next grant cycle and ask for installation money?

Susan Wetmore: It's hard to tell. You know the design phase is critical for the next phase of that electrical project to move forward. We have a long road ahead of us. There is an ADA access, but we also have masonry that we are going to be addressing down the road, and the interior. I have to be honest; we would fundraise and try to raise the money and as we work through the phases, we would hope to fund the additional updated electrical service, but we would really appreciate getting at least the design phase services because we know how important it is to have a plan before we go forward with any fundraising.

The Chair: Okay, good. Thank you very much. So we have got with the White Pine case we have two options, either got design or complete. We could come back to that; we have two numbers to consider. Does anyone have any comment about the Fourth Ward School?

*Commissioner Rappa:* I had it at \$15,500.

Stoldal: Also \$15,500.

The Chair: Anyone else have a number? The Chair also put in at \$15,500. It's obvious that we are not in a position to fund the entire requests. Not unless we are willing to forgo a lot of other requests that are in front of us. Any other Commissioners have feelings about it?

Commissioner Ortlipp: I concur with \$15,500 as well.

*The Chair:* Thank you, David. Alright, I will plug it in at \$15,500 at the moment. Understand that nothing is complete until we are done. We may have to go back and add or subtract. The

next item was the Comstock Cemetery, and they had requested \$13,950. Do Commissioners have suggestions about how they would like to fund this?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* \$7,400.

*Commissioner Rappa:* \$7,400.

*Commissioner Olmstead:* I had \$13,950.

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* I had \$13,950 as well.

*The Chair:* And the Chair also was suggesting full funding for this project, \$13,950. I thought it was reasonable. So we've got a range there from the \$13,950 to \$7,400. Let me get this written down properly. We talked about Fourth Ward School, right?

*Commissioner Rappa:* Right, we are on Eureka Restoration now.

*The Chair:* Okay, Eureka Restoration. That request was for \$24,679. Commissioners, how do you feel about that request? What did you have Bob?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I put down \$24,700

*Commissioner Rappa:* I had full funding as well.

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* I concur with full funding as well.

*The Chair:* Any other Commissioners. Alright, Brewery Arts Center. Their first application for the skylights and the floor.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I just put in the \$2000 to wrap that project up and did not add the new project in.

*Commissioner Rappa:* I had \$2,000

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* I concur with \$2,000 as well.

*The Chair:* The second Brewery Arts Center request?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I put in \$6,200.

*The Chair:* Any other Commissioners have a recommendation? I also suggested the \$6,200, option 1. I would like to give them more money, we just don't have more money to spread around. At least not in this cycle. Any comments? I will leave it at \$6,200 right now. Fallon?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* \$29,300, full funding.



*Commissioner Rappa:* Full funding

*Commissioner Olmstead:* Agreed

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* I concur with that as well.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* St. Mary's?

*Commissioner Rappa:* I had \$11,887

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Same, I wrote down \$11,900.

*Commissioner Olmstead:* The same.

*The Chair:* I just rounded it up to \$12,000

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* I concur with that as well.

*The Chair:* Northern Nevada Railroads first request, it is item I. Any comments?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* It's a new project for me, so I did not put in any funds for it right now. We will look for it when it comes back again.

*The Chair:* Do other Commissioners have comment?

*Commissioner Rappa:* I agree with Commissioner Stoldal.

*The Chair:* Anyone else?

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* In general I concur. Anything that was existing takes priority over a new application.

*The Chair:* How about this second request from them having to do with the McGill Depot?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I've got full funding at \$28,900.

*Commissioner Rappa:* I have full funding as well.

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* I concur with that.

*The Chair:* I also had full funding. Which leaves us last with Goldfield.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Goldfield, I've got \$38,600.

*The Chair:* I guess my comment is, I have a balancing number. I'll give them what I can balancing against all the other requests. My minimum was \$22,000, but above that would be okay too.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Bob, that is what I did. My minimum was \$22,000 and I was looking to see if we could; so I think the question now is really between White Pine; well...

*The Chair:* We have a little difference in White Pine. Let's go back to White Pine quickly. The choices there were fund the full project or fund the design phase only and encourage them to come back in the next grant cycle, but I understand the need. So let's open that for discussion.

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* My concern there, is, the \$25,000 is a kind of guess. But I think that the design phase is crucial because it might identify costs in excess or less than. The \$25,000 is kind of a guess right now. It's hard to hang your hat on that and fund the amount that hasn't been determined yet.

*The Chair:* Any other commissioners?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Let's bring them back online.

*The Chair:* Sure, Susan?

*Susan Wetmore:* Yes.

*The Chair:* Go ahead Bob.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* The issue here is that clearly the design phase is a dollar figure that we can put our arms around. It would be nice to get this taken care of. How firm is this \$25,000? Cause it's got, quote, at a minimum afterwards. Or are you saying \$25,000 and you are going to raise whatever it takes?

*Susan Wetmore:* Could you ask the question again please?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Sure, the \$10,500 for design is a pretty locked in number. The question though is, the number two which is \$25,000 to install, but it says, "at minimum". How firm is that 25?

*Susan Wetmore:* What PK's proposal says, and they went into some detail, and I don't understand all of the language means. I know that we would have a good start if we could get some of the money toward the wiring of the upgraded service for that elevator. I'm sure it's not firm, like we didn't get an itemized budget. We got the estimate.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Thank you. Let me jump back in here. How much money do we still not have allocated?

*The Chair:* I'm in the process of trying to add it up Bob.

*Carla Cloud:* I am filling in an excel spreadsheet as you guys go, and I just wanted to see if I can confirm, I missed what you said for St. Mary's on 1-12?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* It was \$11,900.

*Commissioner Rappa:* Or you can just put \$12,000.

*The Chair:* \$12,000, yeah.

*Carla Cloud:* Okay, and for 19-17?

*Commissioner Rappa:* I think we agreed there was no funding.

*Carla Cloud:* Okay, that is what I have here and then you were doing the full funding for 18 correct, the \$28,876?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Yes

*Commissioner Rappa:* That is correct, yes.

*Carla Cloud:* What I have with plugging in \$35,500 for White Pine and going along with everything that you have said, I'm at 190,005.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* How much did you plug in for Goldfield?

*Carla Cloud:* One moment, I will share my screen with you. Goldfield, I have put down \$22,000 as you guys have said.

*Commissioner Rappa:* I guess I am more inclined to pay the \$12,000 for White Pine and give Goldfield the balance to put them up a little higher.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Let me ask a question though, with everything the way it is right now, we are at 190 so we still have \$10,000 and we potentially could do White Pine still at \$35,000 and put Goldfield \$32,000?

*Carla Cloud:* Yep, you would just need to take off \$5 sir.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I am satisfied with the way it looks.

*The Chair:* Mark Bassett has to give up \$5. He gets \$28,871.

*Carla Cloud:* Okay, there you go.

*The Chair:* So there is the proposed budget. I would open it to the floor, any Commissioner that would like to comment about any of these proposals? Hearing none, I would like the opportunity if anyone needs to make comment from the public before we make motion and a vote. Actually I will make a motion first. Does someone want to move to adopt this proposal?

*Attorney General Anthony Walsh:* Before the motion is made, I would recommend reading that full proposal into the record in case the screen share was not recorded. Sometimes that doesn't come into the recording the same way chat does not. If we could read that total, I would appreciate that for the record.

*The Chair:* Could staff read the proposal please into the record.

*Carla Cloud:* Yes, sir. We have White Pine, 19-01 at \$35,500. 19-02 for \$15,500. 19-03 is at \$13,950. 19-04 is at \$24,679. 19-07 is \$2,000. 19-08 is \$6,200. 19-09 is \$29,300, 19-12 would be \$12,000. 19-17, zero. 19-18, \$28,871, and 19-20 \$32,000 for a total of \$200,000.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I would like to make a motion that we accept the numbers that were just read for the third round of the grants.

*The Chair:* Is there a second?

*Commissioner Olmstead:* I second

*The Chair:* We have a motion and a second. Are there any members of the public that would like to make public comment at this time? Now would be the appropriate time. If you are on the phone or Zoom, please indicate to staff.

*Carla Cloud:* Yes, I believe Mike from the Brewery Arts Center would like to make a comment.

*The Chair:* Fine, Mike please, introduce yourself.

*Mike Wiencek:* This is Mike Wiencek, director for operations at the Brewery Arts Center and it's not so much a comment before your vote and all. It's more of an appreciation that we would like to express to the Chair, the Commissioners, and the staff. We are so thankful for the funding and the support we received from SHPO to accomplish these upgrades. It's made an immediate and drastic impact on our two block campus, that as you know consist of two buildings built in the 1860's. Kristen and Carla have been so knowledgeable and helpful and very patient as I am learning all of this. Our artist's, students and performers are so motivated by the new lighting and upgrades. We really appreciate all you do for our communities.

*The Chair:* Thank you, any other public comment? Hearing none.

**Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay**

*The Chair:* Applicants, I want to thank you for taking the time to submit your proposals for Round 3. Please don't forget we have another round coming and we look forward to seeing your applications. I think you heard from the conversation, these are all worthy projects and hopefully we will have a little bit bigger budget going into the next cycle and we can give further consideration to these requests. They are very important, these are very important buildings and have taken enormous amounts of community support which is what the intent of it all was and I think it's been very successful, so thank you very much. That leads us to item 7, discussion, and possible decision to any remaining funds; that is what we did actually, was we actually redistributed the funds.

**8. Review of the Western Missionary Corporations request to modify their grant (CCCHP-19-25) to redirect the entire grant award scope of work and budget of \$165,000, from Roof Replacement to Architectural and Engineering services. (FOR POSSIBLE ACTION)**

*The Chair:* The Chair felt this change was so significant, that it required full review of the Commission. Could staff give us a little background please?

*Rebecca Palmer:* I'll be happy to give you a summary. This particular grantees advisor for their grant, has withdrawn their support for the program due to staffing issues at their home base in Las Vegas. As a result this grantee has taken step back and decided they need to re-evaluate what the building might need. This whole discussion occurred in the last two weeks. I would characterize this proposal, not as a complete proposal, but as a request to the Commission to consider in principal whether the Commission would agree to modify a grant originally proposed for construction, in this case, roof repair and replacement, and move the entirety of the grant to construction design documents. It's really a matter of, in principle, would this be an acceptable change? I recognize with a very quick turnaround; the grantee's have had, and the very recent discussions about losing their support for this grant and having to reevaluate what they are going to do for their building. But this proposal is incomplete. One of the possibilities could be that the Commission simply says whether or not they agree in principle to make this very drastic change from a construction project to a construction document project and you could request, if you so desired, to have the grantee come back with more details when they are available.

*The Chair:* Thank you Rebecca. Commissioners have questions of staff or comments?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I would actually like to move forward and make a motion and we can hopefully discuss that motion.

*The Chair:* You're free to make a motion.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* As Rebecca said, this is asking the Commission to accept the radically changed grant from a construction project to a development project. My motion would be to accept the concept of moving from the capital construction project, repairing the roof. However, this concept as Rebecca just addressed, was just really created over the past couple of weeks, is incomplete. If the Commission is going to accept this change from an actual roof construction to the creation of construction documents, it should also include a priority list and supporting construction documents. What's not in there is the development of, there seem to be two buckets; the first bucket where their timeline is to create these construction documents, and I think we should request a priority list, the roof or whatever, and then the proposal then jumps to they are going to negotiate with a contractor and then they're going to oversee the project. I think what's missing in the middle there is getting the funds. I would personally support the planning, development, the construction documents, and a priority list, but I would suggest we need some supporting specifics in the documents as to what they are

going to do. We were told, this Commission has been told now at least twice, if not three times, the roof is in bad shape. Even on the churches website it says that the roof is in bad shape. So now we are saying the roof is not in bad shape? I don't know, but what I do support is my motion would be to accept this concept, however we would ask them to come back with a very specific plan with quotes, with estimates, with bids. Who is going to do this work? I really like planning documents. We could move forward and here is a plan to move forward. I thought we had those with the church, but apparently we didn't have that, we had a building assessment, but it didn't have a priority list and those kind of things, so I would just ask them to come back in a meeting, maybe 60 days, mid-January. In the meantime also, there is another little asterisk in there. I would suggest they sit down with staff and see which administrative costs in fact are not allowed. I think there is a real challenge there with some of the language. So my motion is, accept the concept, but not accept the dollar figures until there is more details. And I will say, and please don't anyone take offence. We granted \$165,000 to fix the roof. They are now suggesting that the development plans are going to cost an identical \$165,000. It seems that those numbers shouldn't match exactly. Hopefully they will come back in 60 days with a well thought out development plan. That's my long winded speech.

*Then Chair:* Mr. Stoldal, you are suggesting a motion that we would basically ask the Western Missionary Museum Corporation to continue their study and bring us a more detailed budget and request?

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Yes, give them 60 days.

*The Chair:* Because the alternative is that money comes back to the Commission and we redistribute it, so your saying put the money aside basically for right now but ask for detail from them on how they intend to spend this money. What the documents would contain, what they would look like, and a full budget.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* One little asterisk is more of a question; I would ask Rebecca. Do we have time to do that? Is the clock ticking on spending this money and if it is, so we need to redirect the funds now or do we have time to let them come back with a real plan?

*Rebecca Palmer:* All of the funding agreements right now expire in May 2022. However that is because we set up the funding agreements to be 18 months in length. That gives sufficient time for staff to wrap all of the activities up and make sure the funds are expended and then avoid arbitrage fees, which we have been successful since 1993 to avoid arbitrage, which is not true for all of the other bond programs. However the IRS allows 24 months, 2 years, or 3 years for the bond proceeds to actually be spent. So there is additional time that we can add to these funding agreements, and we will probably have to do that because several of our grantees are having trouble either finding contractors or scheduling work around the seasons. Particularly in Northern Nevada. So, it is very likely that the Commission will have to meet sometime in the Spring, probably in January or February to do several things, one of which is

to consider extending the Funding Agreements that need to be extended for those grantees who need additional time due to Covid-19 related issues. They will also have to request the sale of bonds for a Spring bond sale if one were to occur. The third item is to determine what to do with additional remaining bond proceeds. We always have proceeds remaining because either we earned interest on the funding, or someone hasn't fully expended their grant, or someone just reverts because they want to revert and all three of those have happened. So we will probably need to have a meeting in February to do that. If we were to extend the funding agreement for this particular grantee, it could be done all the way to November of 2022. Which probably would give them sufficient time to prepare those construction documents. Kristen, what's your general thought about how long these documents might take to be prepared.

*Kristen Brown:* I think you are correct. It does take several months. Right now, our understanding of this proposal from the architect is that it will be a full set of drawings including engineering, electrical, a number of specialists that would have to be contributing to a full set of drawings, not just architecture. So that would include things like wiring, HVAC, civil engineering, and all different components of the project. That is a lot of moving parts for the project manager to reign in and those type of drawings do take time as you noticed in the submission. It does talk about the different steps from the schematic, the design and finally the construction set and that would have to be reviewed by our office along the way to ensure they meet the standards. They are definitely looking at several months at least. Would you mind if I spoke to a couple of points that Mr. Stoldal made earlier?

*The Chair:* No, go ahead, please.

*Kristen Brown:* Mr. Stoldal had some excellent points, but I wanted to point out that the historic structures report from 2017, that assessment of the building, it does in way set out some prioritization. It doesn't present it in necessarily in a timeline fashion and it doesn't propose phases for actual construction, but what it does, is it breaks down all of the different components of the building such as roof, walls, flooring, windows, ceiling, electrical, that kind of thing, and it rates them in terms of priority, such as serious or minor or moderate. I think that the Diocese will be able to use that document to help with that prioritization and phasing in the future. I also wanted to mention that this grantee has also received other grants, so that might speak to your question about why the proposal seems to jump to managing the project and liaising between the contractors, that might be because they intend to use some of that outside grant money to do the brick and mortar work and have the architect be sort of watching over that work. The grantee is present on the phone and I'm sure that she would be able to clarify that.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Kristen and Chair, those were my questions. I know there was \$153,000 Save America Treasure grant and \$125,000 Sacred Places grant. There was some confusion and if the person is on the line, first with the \$125,000 Sacred Places grant, going over the



minutes, Heidi Swank said it was for bricks and mortar and then someone else said it was for training. Can we clear the \$125,000 up and has that money been spent?

*Carla Cloud:* I have Tia on the line.

*The Chair:* Go ahead and bring her on.

*Tia Mittelstadt:* Hi, this is Tia Mittelstadt and I have to say, I am a volunteer, and I don't know a lot. I have been with the project for a little bit over a year. I have access to all of the other grants. The Sacred Places and the NDF, and the yeah, you know what I am talking about.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Yeah, the Park Service, Save America's Treasure's grant.

*Tia Mittelstadt:* Sorry, this is all so new to me. Anyway, I would have to look at them to tell you the specifics. We had entrusted Nevada Preservation Foundation with this grant management, and they had a turnover in their leadership and our ball got dropped. I am just trying to pick up the pieces. So I don't know the specifics of the grant, I would have to look them up specifically. But nothing has been spent because we have to match both of those grants, so we don't have that money. We were hoping that possibly one of them might allow this money to be a match. When we met with Kristen and Carla a couple of weeks ago, they were not sure if that was possible and so that is something that I have to do some research on to see if they will even allow that. I don't know if that answers your question at all.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* Chair, I spent a little bit of time in trying to get to the bottom of it, the Save America Treasures grant for \$153,000 is a one to one match and maybe Kristen you could help me with this. I thought it had to be match within 12-18 months and that was back in 2018. Are these grants still viable to be matched?

*Tia Mittelstadt:* Yes, I am actually in contact with both of them. One of them, I think is Sacred Places, wants to meet with me. Yes, Sacred Places. I have a meeting set up next with them, and as I said I am so new to this and very green. I don't know what I am doing, and I am trying to figure it out, because this is not my specialty.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I don't think that the Chair or the Commission is criticizing you, that is not the issue. Just trying to get our arms around whether or not these grants, Save America Treasure, both are matching one to one, and would be great if they are still viable. If not then we move on to the next step.

*Tia Mittelstadt:* They are still viable.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* If you could get that detailed information to staff, I think that would be helpful to have an actual record of that.

*Tia Mittelstadt:* Yes, I can do that.

*The Chair:* Bob would you put a date in which this needs to be returned to staff by? Either January 1<sup>st</sup> or January 15<sup>th</sup> if we have to meet in February?

*Commissioner Rappa:* Can I make a quick comment before Commissioner Stoldal puts a date out. I guess it would be to ask staff, I would be more inclined to give them more time especially given the holidays, if we could give them six months? I guess the question is, because we are not giving them any additional money right now, if they could have more time to get their ducks in a row in a way that they feel they could make a good presentation. We really don't have anything to lose, we can still roll that money into the next grant cycle.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* What I was trying to do Chair, I was trying to give them some slack on the back side, because it's going to take, I think Kristen said, to produce these documents is going to take several, 6-7 months. So, what I was asking if they could come in with a formal proposal in 60 days. At the end of January, I will ask Rebecca and Kristen, with the holidays, is that a decent amount of time to get a bid in and go through all those things, mechanical, electrical, and all those things to get bids in?

*Kristen Brown:* Yeah, I believe since the Diocese and the Western Missionary Museum Corporation are already working with an architect and already have been in conversation, I would imagine that since they have kind of the beginnings of a team established, that they could get that. Now it's a different matter if they intend to be going out to request bids for multiple architects, where people are new to the project and don't know the background and aren't familiar with building and might take more time, but I can't speak to that. At our meeting recently, Tia indicated like she just said, she has been in contact with both the Sacred Places and Save America's Treasures granting organizations, and it sounds like they are pretty responsive. Tia, maybe you can correct me if I am wrong, but it sounds like they are reachable by email and phone when they do have questions, so I think that they should be able to obtain some of those answers within a reasonable amount of time.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* We still have two major holidays, two or three major holidays. What about the third week in January, Gail, is that still too tight?

*Commissioner Rappa:* Yeah, I mean I just want to give them as much time. I sympathize with volunteer supervision of this, and I just know that it does factor into how much time can be invested into the process.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I am just going to throw out a motion, the third Monday in January. I don't know what date that is, to get to staff, and then the staff would work with Chair to work out a timeframe for a meeting.

*The Chair:* Yeah, Bob I agree. If they are unable to produce a plan, we're going to be in a situation of having to redirect these funds back and do a fourth redistribution of these dollars to these folks that we just talked to today, and they need time, so sometime before the end of January or the third week of January is okay with me, but I think this project needs to get; I understand they lost their support, for reasons that had nothing to do with their project, of the Preservation Foundation. I am certainly going to be looking to staff to make recommendations whether there is a management structure capable of furthering this project. Which I would like to see furthered, it's a good project. So if you want to put the end of January in there, and we would meet after staff has a chance to review it. Maybe in early February and make some decision.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* That would be my motion to include the third Monday in January, or at the call of the Chair.

*The Chair:* Well, the Chair calls the third Monday. I think we just need to move. We need to decide what we want to do here. We don't want to get into an arbitrage situation. We have a lot of other folks out there who could spend this money pretty quickly if we had to, including the folks that we talked to today. Is there a second to Bob's motion?

*Commissioner Olmstead:* I second.

*The Chair:* I have a motion and I have a second. Let me ask if the public has any comment regarding this matter. Now would be the time if you're on the phone, in the room or on Zoom, please indicate to staff and we will make time available.

*Carla Cloud:* No indication sir.

*The Chair:* Okay, hearing none. Does the Commission have any questions or discussions on the motion?

*Commissioner Ortlipp:* Just one quick comment, as it seems from the proposal that some of the funds they have got there is pre-production, some of it is contract administration, which is actually doing construction, so I'm kind of on board with taking my time, because I think a more thought out proposal and giving us that extra information will give us all that extra comfort that we are making the right decision I think. Even if you look at the original proposal of \$165,000 for repair of the roof, 18 months ago, I can tell you from working in construction that's probably more like \$200 - \$210,000. I think getting their ducks in a row, with time being of the essence, a more thought out proposal is going to have a much better chance of success than it does right now.

*Vice Chair Stoldal:* I'm going to suggest that if there is a timing problem, things don't work out, there is some issues, that they get ahold of staff in time and then work with you to move the meeting later. But I think we're adopting this concept or the idea that the Commission is

open to this but there is a big step that needs to take place, and if the 60 days or the 70 days is not enough time for this important document, they need to let staff know and staff needs to let the Chair know and we can go from there.

*The Chair:* Thank you. Any other comments? Thank you David for reminding us that in the environment that we live in, these costs are rising very quickly and getting projects done in a timely fashion and on budget are becoming more and more difficult and the Commission always needs to consider that as well do the folks who are actually out in the field. Hearing no comment, those in favor please say aye. Any opposed?

**Motion passed 5 Yea, 0 Nay**

*The Chair:* Thank you very much for your time and effort today. It's been 2 hours. I will now take public comment.

**9. 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.**

No public comment

**10. Adjournment 5:01 pm**