

Joe Lombardo
Governor

STATE OF NEVADA



Address Reply to:
901 S. Stewart St, Suite 3002
Carson City, NV 89701
Phone: (775) 684-3448

Chairman
YALE YEANDEL

Vice Chairman
ANTHONY TIMMONS

PATRICIA OLMSTEAD
ROCHANNE DOWNS
MAGGIE FARRELL
MICHELLE SCHMITTER

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

MEETING MINUTES

Thursday, February 26, 2026, at
10:00 am

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

Location:

The Richard Bryan Building
The Bonnie Conference Room, 1st Floor
901 S. Stewart Street
Carson City, NV 89701

Meeting ID: 292 400 555 489
Passcode: 4Np3aq9K

Dial in by phone

+1 775-321-6111 United States, Reno
Phone conference ID: 543 124 13#

Additionally, public comment or testimony can be submitted via email to ccloud@shpo.nv.gov or leaving a voice message at: (775) 684-3443. Voice messages received during the meeting will be transcribed and read to the Commissioners during the meeting. The Commission will make reasonable efforts to include all comments received by email and voicemail into the record. Please try to provide email or voicemail comments by 12:00pm July 31, 2025. Comments are limited to 3 minutes per person.

Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2026, 10:00 am

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

1. Call to order.

*******RECORDING BEGAN AFTER CALL TO ORDER; UNKNOWN*******

2. Roll call of Commissioners and determination of quorum.

*******RECORDING BEGAN AFTER ROLL CALL; UNKNOWN*******

Commissioners:

Yale Yeandel, Chairman
Anthony Timmons, Vice Chair
Patricia Olmstead
Rochanne L. Downs
Maggie Farrell
Michelle Schmitter

3. Election of Chair consistent with NRS 383.500.2 (a)

Motion to re-elect Yale Yeandel as Chairman, of the CCCHP:
Commissioner Anthony Timmons; second by Commissioner Rochanne Downs.
Motion Passed.

4. Election of Vice Chair

Commissioner Anthony Timmons stated he will not be standing in for vice chair. Chair Yeandel thanked him for his service, stating he would be greatly missed.

Carla Cloud indicated that there was no NRS regulation or guidelines in the CCCHP handbook that specifically states a vice chair has to be elected, but the Commission has always designated one. She further clarified that according to NRS 383.500.2(b), the Commission shall prescribe rules for its own management and governance, and that, according to NRS 383.500.3, four members of the Commission constitute a quorum, but a majority of the members are necessary to consider particular business before it and to exercise power conferred on the Commission, therefore, vice chair election may not be necessary, but will let the Commission decide.

Commissioner Anthony Timmons nominated Patricia Olmstead as vice chair. Commissioner Rochanne Downs stated she was concerned with this, as Commissioner Olmstead is not present at today's meeting. Commissioner Timmons then retracted his nomination for Patricia Olmstead and then nominated Rochanne Downs for vice chair.

Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2026, 10:00 am

Chair Yale Yeandel stated election of vice chair would be tabled until all of the commissioners are together, to be completely fair.

Commissioner Anthony Timmons then retracted his nomination for Rochanne Downs and moved to table this agenda item to a future meeting.

Motion to table election of a vice chair to a future meeting:

Commissioner Anthony Timmons; second by Commissioner Rochanne Downs.

Motion Passed.

5. Public Comment

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

There was no public comment.

6. Approval of minutes and transcript of the July 31, 2025, meeting.

Motion to approve the July 31, 2025, Meeting Minutes and Transcript:

Commissioner Rochanne Downs; second by Commissioner Maggie Farrell.

Motion Passed.

7. Discussion regarding the request from the Jarbidge Community Association Inc. to opt out of current real property covenants.

Carla Cloud gave a brief history of this agenda item. She stated, around October 14, 2025, CCCHP received a request from Shawn K. Jones, legal counsel for the Jarbidge Community Association, Inc., (JCA). They were requesting to opt out of the current real property covenants expiring December 31, 2060. The AG's office responded with a letter on October 21, 2025, stating a special meeting of the CCCHP Commission would need to be requested to present the JCA proposal.

On October 28, 2025, Shawn K. Jones requested a special meeting of the Commission. The JCA has received \$311,493 in CCA funding between 1993 and 2009, for numerous projects, including but not limited to a feasibility study, electrical, flooring, HVAC, windows, wall rehabilitation, waterline and hydrant installation, and plumbing.

Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2026, 10:00 am

Shawn K. Jones, legal counsel for the JCA then gave a brief history of the proposal. He spoke of the remote location of Jarbidge, as well as its gold rush history, causing a population swell during the early 1900s, then leaving behind a small population that has remained today. The remaining Jarbidge residents established a community hall, which is considered the heart of the community, hosting numerous public and private events. As indicated above, the residents have made requests over the years to CCCHP for necessary upkeep, renovations, and historical preservation to the community hall.

Mr. Jones then explained that there is a current need to install soffits on the building, as there is a chronic problem in Elko County of cricket infestations. He stated they leave slime on the walls, quilts, pictures, and anything inside the hall. The soffit installation is necessary to prevent the insects from gaining access to the interior of the building.

He continued by stating a significant problem for the Jarbidge community is that it is difficult to get contractors to the area to do work, due to their remote location. It is challenging, as the process of putting in a request for funding, letting CCCHP know what the job will involve, and then letting a contractor know it has been approved takes time, which is something the JCA doesn't always have in these situations. Often, when a willing contractor is found to do such remote work, the JCA needs the ability to say yes immediately, without the time constraints related to CCCHP funding.

Additionally, a few years ago, the JCA was the beneficiary of an approximately \$1 million grant from a trust of the Armstrong family, who lived in Jarbidge in the past. The related investments from the grant produce monthly returns, for which the JCA uses for operational purposes, as well as for necessities like the current soffit project.

Mr. Jones stated that, because of this, they propose to cease their relationship with CCCHP and opt out of the covenants. He cited page 4, paragraph 4, of the covenant agreement, which allows both parties to discontinue their relationship. He indicated such wording that, if the project will not produce beneficial results commensurate with the further expenditure of the funds, and that the JCA would like to discontinue the covenants.

He indicated the JCA wants a contractor to put in soffits that are appropriate for the building, appropriate for the time period the building was built in, knowing that soffits didn't exist then, but are necessary, due to the current insect problem, which will protect and preserve the building.

Jackie Gillum, Secretary Treasurer for the JCA, then spoke of how, until the JCA received the letter from CCCHP, they didn't know the covenants existed. She stated that Jarbidge is extremely far from any other village, let alone any major urban area, which makes it extremely difficult to get contractors to Jarbidge to do work, as it is a large project for contractors for even the smallest of projects. Therefore, when a willing contractor is found to do work, the JCA wants the ability to pull the trigger

Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2026, 10:00 am

on a project immediately and not have to wait for the long delays related to CCCHP funding.

Ms. Gillum stated the significant value of the community hall to not only the JCA, but the entire Jarbidge community, which is represented by the historical and continued dedication to maintenance, improvement, and preservation of the building, including the current soffit necessity. Additionally, she explained there are also bylaws within the JCA to maintain the hall, which the JCA strictly adheres to.

Chair Yeandel thanked Mr. Jones and Ms. Gillum for their explanation of the current situation and proposal. He then asked for Alexa Ravencroft from the Deputy Attorney General's office to voice her opinion on the issue.

Alexa Ravencroft, Deputy Attorney General's office, indicated her recommendation would be for termination of the covenants, contingent upon repayment of the grant funds. She stated standard procedure for SHPO is to attach deed restrictions with significant grant monies. If the covenants are in the way of or precluding necessary projects, such as the soffits, then the JCA and the Commission could work together and see if a solution could be found to streamline the process, such as modifying the terms of the covenants. Finally, she recommended not completely terminating the covenants.

Chair Yeandel then requested input from Art Krupicz, SHPO.

Art Krupicz, SHPO, spoke of how the CCCHP and SHPO funding process is slow, and it is difficult to respond quickly for such funding. He outlined steps that have been taken to speed up the process by adding staff and modifying staff schedules. He voiced his agreement with the DAG in modifying the covenants rather than terminating them, altogether, stating that the changes at SHPO have speeded up the funding process.

Chair Yeandel then asked Ms. Gillum what kind of timelines have been provided by contractors.

Ms. Gillum stated a contractor has not been found yet, as they have been waiting for an outcome from the proposal today, as they didn't want to get a willing contractor, tell them it's a go, but wait for the grant money.

Chair Yeandel then asked if there were any questions from commissioners. There were none. He voiced his desire to follow the DAG recommendations, stating he felt something in writing was needed to which covenants will remain and which would be excluded. He stated he understood the need for the soffits, despite that they are not historical to the era, but will preserve the building.

Ms. Gillum explained some of the features of the building, including windows that open and ceiling fans. She then stated the JCA is willing to repay the grants to be

Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2026, 10:00 am

released from the covenants, with possible negotiation on the full, \$311,000, or if there is proration for the already elapsed time, or if it is a whole or none, etc.

Chair Yeandel stated that needs to be between the DAG and JCA. His concern was about creating a precedent, and this is why he felt the necessity for DAG involvement.

Ms. Gillum stated it has been 16 years since funding has been requested by the JCA from CCCHP, and that after this request, there will be no more, because of the grant from the Armstrong family. Again, she stated the request from the JCA to either negotiate the covenants, or preferably, opting out or buying out of the covenants. She then asked what kind of a timeline for negotiation would be for this, so they can get a contractor for the soffits.

Chair Yeandel stated he did not know this, as the Commission has no details on the soffit project -- cost, timeline, etc. They can't do anything without details of the project. Ms. Gillum stated she would have to speak to the JCA board about this, but again, stated they would probably opt to pay the grant back and be released from the obligations.

Chair Yeandel stated that is a possibility, but the covenants need to be honored first. Ms. Gillum stated that they had no expectation that money would be given freely, with no guidelines or expectations from the covenants. Again, she voiced the JCA board wish to be released from the covenants.

Chair Yeandel then stated that, if the Commission received a letter from the JCA board, asking this of them, the Commission would go over this with the DAG. He indicated that the goal of the CCCHP and the JCA are the same -- preservation of the Jarbidge Community Hall, but that the correct legal steps must be taken to obtain the goals of both the CCCHP and the JCA. Chair Yeandel then stated that the letter from the JCA should state what covenants the JCA objects to and that they can no longer follow the covenants, or language like this, and that the JCA would like to give the money back. He stated that once that is accepted, the bureaucracy of CCCHP is avoided.

Chair Yeandel then asked for DAG input. Alexa Ravencroft indicated she didn't see any issue with this repayment plan.

Commissioner Anthony Timmons then asked if it was possible to remove the covenants and replace them with a lien on the property. Ms. Ravencroft stated she would have to look into that.

Art Krupicz then asked if the JCA would be willing to renegotiate the covenants and what kind of a timeline that would entail. Ms. Gillum didn't know if that had ever been considered or what kind of timeline that would entail.

Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2026, 10:00 am

Commissioner Anthony Timmons then asked, if the funds were paid back, what would happen to them. Would they be available for future grantees? Carla Cloud stated she would have to contact their grant specialist to know for sure, but believed the funds would go back to the IRS. She stated that, since this funding is from bonds, which comes from the IRS and interest earned from property taxes, it would return to the IRS. She, again, stated she would have to verify this with their grant specialist.

Mr. Krupicz also stated he was unsure of actually where the funds would go, once returned, but voiced a possible issue of expiration of bond funding. Ms. Cloud stated the funds may have an expiration date, and will look into it with the grant specialist. She stated the JCA has received funding from 1993 to 2009, from numerous different bonds.

Chair Yeandel voiced his satisfaction with decisions on the issue and plans to move forward. The Commission will be expecting the letter from the JCA.

There were no other questions or discussion.

8. Discussion for the potential release of the real property covenants of the grant agreement regarding the Dayton 1881 Carson and Colorado Railroad Depot and possible delegation of duties to legal and other staff to effectuate the necessary documentation to release the property owner from the grant agreements covenants.

Carla Cloud gave a brief history of this agenda item. She stated, in June 2020, the Carson Colorado Railroad Depot was a victim of arson, with the building completely burned to the ground. As the property is no longer standing, there is nothing for SHPO to review, within the terms of the covenants. At the direction of the chair, SHPO staff contacted Lyon County on January 29, 2026, asking if the county would be interested in removing the real property covenants. On February 2, 2026, Lyon County sent a letter requesting to remove the real property covenants.

Ms. Cloud indicated this is a new situation, as SHPO and Lyon County are requesting to be removed from the covenants, simultaneously, as there is no longer a building to review. There is a plan to rebuild, but SHPO doesn't review new construction.

Commissioner Anthony Timmons asked if the covenants had been transferred to the land, since the building no longer exists, and if this was the issue that was currently being looked at. Ms. Cloud stated the covenants are written to cover the property, in all terms, not specifically for the building.

Commissioner Michelle Schmitter asked if the Dayton Depot was going to be reconstructed, and as reconstruction is Secretary of the Interior treatment, why would the new construction not be under the covenants, as it will be on the property. Ms. Cloud stated the CCCHP program is for rehabilitation of historic structures and properties, and as there is no longer a historical structure, there is nothing for CCCHP to review or rehabilitate. As CCCHP does not do new construction, there is nothing to do.

Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2026, 10:00 am

Ms. Schmitter stated this is an unusual situation, as the building burned down and will be reconstructed. Art Krupicz stated he thought there would be some remaining materials used in the new build, making some of the original building still present in the new building. He wondered if that was what Commissioner Schmitter was thinking of. Ms. Schmitter stated she knew of old artifacts being used, but recalled there wasn't any of the building left to use.

Andrew Haskin, Lyon County Manager, confirmed that the building was a complete loss, with only the foundation remaining, which he believe was not the original, as the lost building was moved to that site in the past. He also confirmed there will be a complete recreation of the building, but it will be completely new construction. Chair Yeandel asked if there will be another historical building move to the same site. Mr. Haskin stated there will not be, no.

Art Krupicz then stated there are four plans for historical buildings at SHPO and that the program only does rehabilitation. Therefore, new construction would not be covered. Commissioner Schmitter then voiced her understanding.

Commissioner Rochanne Downs then asked for DAG input. Alexa Ravencroft stated that, since the building is no longer in existence, the purpose of the covenant has been thwarted, indicated the covenants were effectuated for the historic preservation of the building. Since the building no longer exists, termination of the covenants is appropriate.

Chair Yeandel then asked the DAG about the monies in the grant, as money had been paid for rehabilitation for this building. Carla cloud stated that the Lyon County Historical Society had received funding for projects on this building. At the time of the building burning, there was a current funding application being reviewed. Two days after their application was received, the building burned down. Ms. Cloud asked if Chair Yeandel was asking about getting the money back from previous projects. Chair Yeandel stated no, this was not his question.

Andrew Haskin, then stated Lyon County has received approximately \$130,000 in funding in the past. Carla Cloud confirmed this, listing grants from 2014, for \$52,500, and 2016, for \$130,000, both of which were many years prior to the fire loss.

Chair Yeandel then asked for a motion to release the real property covenants.

Motion to release the real property covenants of the grant agreement regarding the Dayton 1881 Carson and Colorado Railroad Depot and possible delegation of duties to legal and other staff to effectuate the necessary documentation to release the property owner from the grant agreements covenants:

Commissioner Rochanne Downs; second by Commissioner Maggie Farrell.

Meeting Minutes
February 26, 2026, 10:00 am

Motion Passed.

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.

There was no public comment.

10. Adjournment

The Chair adjourned the February 26, 2026, meeting.

1 STATE OF NEVADA
2 DEPARTMENT OF CONVERSATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES
3 COMMISSION FOR CULTURAL CENTERS AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION
4 MEETING TRANSCRIPT
5 FEBRUARY 26, 2026
6

7 UNIDENTIFIED: Sir, would you like to begin and call the
8 meeting to order? Well, I'm sorry. You called it to order, and
9 I did roll call. Would you like to proceed with the agenda, or
10 would you like to --

11 YEANDEL: Yes, I'll proceed with the agenda. Do I have
12 the candidates, please?

13 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman? This is Anthony Timmons, for the
14 record.

15 YEANDEL: Thank you. Chair recognizes Anthony Timmons.

16 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I would like to re-elect our
17 Chair, Yale Yeandel as the chairman.

18 YEANDEL: Okay, thank you. We have a motion on the floor.
19 Anyone for a second?

20 DOWNS: Rochanne Downs. I'll second.

21 YEANDEL: All right. Election of Chair Yeandel is on the
22 floor. It's been seconded. Can I hear any yeas on this NRS
23 383.500.2?

24 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

25 YEANDEL: All right. And if there are any, nays? All

1 right, hearing no nays, the chair has been re-elected, for NRS
2 383.500.2. Thank you very much. I hope this is -- will be a
3 good session. Now let's move on to item number four, election
4 of vice chair. And let's start off with discussion first. The
5 Chair recognizes Vice Chair Anthony Timmons. Do you have any
6 comments on this matter?

7 TIMMONS: Yes. Anthony Timmons, for the record. I will
8 not be standing for vice chair.

9 YEANDEL: Okay. Thank you for your service. We're going
10 to miss you strongly. You've helped the CCC's HP out
11 tremendously. And we thank you for your service. We hope that
12 your time abroad will be rewarding, and -- but we will still
13 miss you very much. Let's -- yes, go ahead.

14 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman? Anthony Timmons, for the record.
15 Just want to quickly clarify. There's -- probably abrupt and a
16 lot of people are wondering why. It's because, as of June 1st,
17 I will not be a Nevada resident any longer. So that is why I
18 will be giving up my tenure. I will be moving abroad.

19 YEANDEL: Thank you. Thank you very much. Appreciate,
20 again, your service. We hope that you have great future
21 endeavors. And we'll miss you here in Nevada.

22 TIMMONS: Thank you.

23 YEANDEL: So -- yes, no problem. Carla, do we have any
24 other points on this agenda item?

25 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record. So, you know, as

1 you just heard, Mr. Timmons has announced he'll be resigning
2 from his position as vice chair. Although neither NRS 383.500,
3 nor the CCCHP handbook specifically mentions the vice chair,
4 the commission has always designated a vice chair. The
5 commission shall discuss, if they wish to elect a new vice
6 chair, and whether the vice chair will be authorized to act on
7 behalf of the chair at meetings. Note that NRS 383.500.2(b)
8 states, the commission shall prescribe rules for its own
9 management and government. And also, please note that NRS
10 383.500.3 states that, four members of the commission
11 constitute a quorum, but a majority of the members of the
12 commission is necessary to consider particular business before
13 it, and to exercise the power of conferred on the commission.
14 Therefore, the election of the vice chair may not be
15 necessary. We will let the commission discuss.

16 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman? Anthony Timmons, for the record.

17 YEANDEL: Yes, the Chair recognizes Anthony Timmons. Go
18 ahead.

19 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I am not sure if she's here, but
20 I would like to nominate Patricia Olmsted as Vice Chair.

21 YEANDEL: Okay. Any other commissioners would like to add
22 any possible appointments or candidates that they'd like to
23 endorse on this possible election?

24 DOWNS: Rochanne Downs, for the record. I'm just
25 concerned, you know, without Ms. Olmsted being on to accept

1 that, you know, I don't think that it's fair to assign,
2 without her approval.

3 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman? Anthony Timmons, for the record.
4 I retract that. And I actually nominate Rochanne Downs.

5 YEANDEL: Okay. All right. Thank you, Mr. Timmons. Any
6 other commissioners have comments or questions?

7 UNIDENTIFIED: That wasn't a comment to be appointed, by
8 the way.

9 YEANDEL: Well, I agree with Mr. Timmons. You can't -- we
10 call it, in the industry -- what is it? -- volunteered?
11 Anyway, let's table this, until we have all of our
12 commissioners together. I think that's fair. I do agree with
13 both nominations. But, maybe we should just vote when we're
14 all together.

15 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman? Anthony Timmons, for the record.

16 YEANDEL: Yes?

17 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, I retract my nomination, and I
18 move to table this to a future meeting.

19 YEANDEL: All right, thank you. We have a motion on the
20 floor. Does anyone want to second that?

21 DOWNS: Rochanne Downs. I'll second.

22 YEANDEL: All right. Hearing a second on the floor, are
23 there any yeas, in favor of this motion?

24 COMMISSIOINERS: Aye.

25 YEANDEL: All right. Any nays on the subject? All right,

1 hearing no nays, we've decided to table NRS 383.500.2(b), for
2 future meetings. Moving on the agenda, for number five, public
3 comment. Public comment will be taken at the beginning and end
4 of each meeting. It may be taken at the discretion of the
5 chair, on agenda items listed for possible action. Public
6 comments may be limited to three minutes per person, at the
7 direction of the chair. Comments will not be restricted based
8 on viewpoint, nor action will be taken on any matters raised
9 during the public comment period that are not already on the
10 agenda. Persons making the comment will be asked to begin by
11 stating their name for the record. Agenda items may be taken
12 out of order, continued and/or removed at the discretion of
13 the chair. Carla, is there any public comment in your listing?

14 CLOUD: Hi. Carla Cloud, for the record. I have no
15 emails. And there's no one joining me today in the room. And
16 I've received no phone calls.

17 YEANDEL: All right. Thank you. Moving on to agenda item
18 six -- approval of the minutes and transcripts of the July 31,
19 2025, meeting for possible action. Those posted moment --
20 minutes have -- we have a motion on the floor to approve them?

21 DOWNS: Rochanne Downs. I make the motion to approve.

22 YEANDEL: Okay. All right. Anyone second the motion, or
23 do we have the second already?

24 FARRELL: This is Commissioner Farrell. I second the
25 motion. Thank you.

1 YEANDEL: All right. Let's take a vote on it. So any yeas
2 on approving the minutes for the July 31, 2025, meeting?

3 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

4 YEANDEL: Aye, as well. Any nays? All right, hearing no
5 nays, the minutes are approved for the transcript of the July
6 31, 2025 meeting. Moving on -- discussion regarding the
7 request from Jarbidge Community Association, Inc., to opt out
8 of current real property covenants. Carla, what do we have on
9 item seven?

10 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record. Approximately, on
11 October 14, 2025, CCCHP staff received a request from Shawn K.
12 Jones, legal representative for the Jarbidge Community
13 Association, Inc., requesting to opt out of the current real
14 property covenants that expire December 31, 2060. On October
15 21, Attorney General Nicole Ting responded with a letter
16 informing the owner that they would need to request a special
17 meeting of the commission to present their proposal. On
18 October 28th, Shawn K. Jones formerly requested a special
19 meeting with the commission. The Jarbidge Community
20 Association has received \$311,493 in CCA state funding,
21 between 1993 and 2009, for rehabilitation activities,
22 including, but not limited to, a feasibility study, electrical
23 flooring, HVAC, windows, wall rehabilitation, water line and
24 hydrant installation, and plumbing. So it's up for discussion
25 here. We do have the Jarbidge representative, Mr. Jones, on

1 the line. And we also have our Attorney General, Alexa (ph),
2 on the line. So I will let the commission and representatives
3 take over. Thank you.

4 JONES: This is Shawn Jones, for the record. I'm happy
5 to begin. And, first of all, I'd like to thank you for the
6 opportunity to meet with you today. We have with us, Jackie
7 Gilliam, who served as an officer on the Jarbidge Community
8 Association Board. Just give you some quick history, too, for
9 those who may or may not be familiar with this part of the
10 state -- tucked up in the Jarbidge Mountains is a lovely
11 little community by the name of Jarbidge. It got its start
12 back in the early 1900s. In about 1909, there was a gold rush
13 that brought a lot of people there to be involved in mining
14 activities. It was about 1936, that the mine was sold, and a
15 lot of people moved away, due to unemployment. But since then,
16 there have been a handful, quite a good handful of people who
17 have lived in Jarbidge. And among those, Jackie Gilliam and
18 her family have been there for decades, going way back. And
19 the people of Jarbidge built a community hall. And it's long
20 been a little bit of what they might consider the heart of the
21 community. And they've done a nice job, over the years, of
22 keeping it up and using it for gatherings and social events
23 and official meetings and a whole host of activities. And it
24 was in the early '90s that the president of the Jarbidge
25 Community Association sent a letter to a Lender Ritter, who

1 was the Assistant Elko County manager at the time, indicating
2 that there were a number of needs for the building, and just
3 looking for some funding help. And with the help of Ms.
4 Ritter, she sent an application to the Department of
5 Conservation Natural Resources, back in -- right about
6 November 9, 1993, requesting some money to do a number of
7 things, including roofing and ceiling, storm windows, heating,
8 water, and some of the other things that were just mentioned a
9 moment ago. That led to a great relationship between the
10 department and the JCA, to take care of a lot of upkeep and
11 historical preservation of the building, over time. It looks
12 like, from what I understand, in talking to Jackie Gilliam,
13 there's really only one major need, going forward at this
14 time, and that is to take care of putting in some soffits. We
15 have been plagued, here in northeastern Nevada, with an
16 infestation of crickets each spring and summer, over about the
17 last, I don't know, four years or so. As you may or may not
18 know, I think you're familiar, perhaps, with the cricket
19 infestation here in Elko County, they can make it inside
20 buildings. They go on the side of buildings. They leave a
21 weird kind of slime. And in addition to just being so populous
22 that they wreak havoc with meetings and have to be swept out,
23 and it's created a bit of a problem for the community hall.
24 They leave that slime on the walls. They leave kind of a slime
25 on quilts and pictures. And Jackie can speak a little bit more

1 to this, if you would like. But it has become necessary to
2 install soffits on the building. From what we understand, and
3 Jackie might speak to this as well, it's very difficult for
4 the association to get contractors to come there. And with the
5 current relationship with the department in getting requests
6 for funding and to let them know what the job is going to
7 involve, by the time there is an answer back from the
8 department, it's been difficult for the association to keep a
9 contractor at the previous submitted bid. In addition to that,
10 a couple years ago, the association was the beneficiary of a
11 significant grant from a trust by a family who lived in
12 Jarbidge years ago, and who developed a real love for the
13 community. Now, this family's name is Armstrong (ph). And they
14 left just over \$1 million to the association. And a local
15 attorney -- I was not involved in the distribution of those
16 funds. But a couple years ago, attorney Robert Wines, here in
17 Elko, helped the Armstrong family wrap up their trust, and was
18 able to grant to the association, just like I say, over \$1
19 million. They went ahead and put it in a U.S. Bank wealth
20 management account, from which they get monthly returns. And
21 they use that to put in local checking and savings accounts,
22 for operational purposes. And it looks like, going forward,
23 the association would like to use those funds for things like
24 soffits. And they've used it for other things in Jarbidge --
25 working on the cemetery, and creating a better access to the

1 cemetery, and buying some equipment, and things like that. So
2 going forward, they proposed to cease their relationship with
3 the department and to opt out of the covenants. From what I
4 understand, reading through the covenants, it looks like page
5 4 of the agreement, in paragraph 4, allows both parties to
6 discontinue their relationship. It looks like the wording is,
7 if the project will not produce beneficial results
8 commensurate with the further expenditure of funds. And so,
9 the association would like to move to discontinue the
10 covenants. Their hope is, is to have a contractor put in
11 soffits that are appropriate for the building, appropriate for
12 a time period that the building would've been built in. There
13 wouldn't, of course, been soffits back in that time. But they
14 would like to continue to maintain the building in a way that
15 does keep its heart and soul, and be respectful to its
16 historic nature to, hopefully, use wood soffits to maintain
17 historic integrity, while also meeting the needs of making
18 that building more secure from crickets and actually other
19 types of infestations, as well. But if you have any questions,
20 please, ask away. And if Jackie would like to add anything
21 that I may have forgotten, please Jackie, go ahead and fill
22 in. But that's -- those are the main points we'd like to
23 present today.

24 YEANDEL: Thank you very much. Jackie, yes, if you could
25 just fill in the blanks, if you will, with your knowledge of

1 the same subject. Jackie, or -- can you hear us?

2 JONES: Jackie, I think you might be muted.

3 GILLUM: There we go. Sorry. Sorry. My computer locked
4 up. I apologize. This is Jackie Gillum. I am the Secretary
5 Treasurer for the Jarbidge Community Association. We were
6 unaware, until we received the letter from CCCHP, that these
7 codes and covenants even existed. The boards that obtained
8 these funds have, you know, cycled out, over the years. I've
9 been on the board, I believe this will be my eighth year. So,
10 what we're finding for us is, we are two-and-a-half hours from
11 Twin (ph), driving. We are, depending on the route you take,
12 three to four hours from Elko. So it's extremely difficult to
13 get contractors to come into Jarbidge and do work, because
14 it's just a big outlay for them to bring crews in, find
15 housing for them, feed them, all of those things. So when we
16 do get a contractor, we kind of need to be able to strike
17 while the iron's hot. If they agree to do the work, we need to
18 say, yes, and get it done. We certainly want to maintain the
19 integrity of the hall. And realizing like, there are some
20 things that are not period-appropriate, because they didn't do
21 that in the early 1900s. But without, like, for example, the
22 soffits -- without the soffits, you are open to weather
23 intrusion, insect and small animal intrusion -- mice and
24 whatnot. And all of those have a detrimental impact on the
25 care and maintenance of the hall -- having to clean the

1 byproducts of those creatures inside the building, the damage
2 they're potentially able to do. So it's just our desire to be
3 able to properly maintain the hall, without an extra layer of
4 oversight. We have -- our bylaws require us to maintain and
5 preserve. That is our ethical responsibility to the hall, to
6 the community. And that's what we hope to uphold. So that's
7 just kind of where we're at. It's -- our main thing is, it's
8 very difficult to get someone to come in here and do work. So
9 we need to be able to strike when the iron's hot and not have
10 to wait for an oversight process from someone who's not
11 necessarily familiar with our remote location. Is there
12 anything else I can answer?

13 YEANDEL: Thank you. No, that wraps up quite nicely. I'd
14 like to hear from our DAG on this, the positions of the
15 covenants. Is our DAG available to speak?

16 RAVENCROFT: Hi. That's me. Alexa Ravencroft, for the
17 record. So my recommendation would be for the termination of
18 these covenants, to be contingent upon repayment of the grant
19 funds. It's standard operating procedure for SHPO to attach
20 deed restrictions, when they, you know, expend significant
21 amounts of grant money. This is very standard. And so, I think
22 also, if the covenants are getting in the way of installing a
23 soffits or, you know, precluding any kind of other
24 maintenance, then perhaps, the Jarbidge Community Association
25 and the commission could kind of work together and further

1 discuss to see if you can come to a solution to make
2 maintenance easier, or perhaps even consider modifying the
3 terms of the covenant. But I would not recommend completely
4 terminating the covenants, altogether.

5 YEANDEL: I see. I'd also like to hear from Art Krupicz
6 on this issue. Art, are you available?

7 KRUPICZ: Yes, I'm here. Hello, everyone. Art Krupicz,
8 SHPO. Jackie, it's great to meet you. I look forward to seeing
9 you in person, when I'm up in the area. I'm fairly new, and
10 I'm starting to get out more, across the state. So it's great
11 to meet you. Yes, it has been mentioned, Jackie -- Shawn had
12 mentioned that, yeah, often, our -- at SHPO, our covenant
13 reviews have been slow, and that you can't always react to --
14 the cost will change, etc. We recognize that, at SHPO.

15 Actually, before me. This is more thanks to my Deputy, Robin
16 Reed, and others. But we recognize that our reviews were often
17 fairly slow. We would assign that out to people who could fit
18 it into their existing schedules. So what we've done, is we've
19 gone and hired -- we have two positions. In fact, starting in
20 mid-March, we have two architectural historians starting with
21 us, one of whom is going to be dedicated to covenant reviews
22 like this across the state. So we are serious and -- about
23 reducing, significantly, those times that it -- the time it
24 takes to do these reviews, so that when you do get a bid, you
25 can act very quickly, and our review is not really any

1 significant part at all in the process, or it -- like it
2 doesn't take long, any longer. So I will -- I mention that,
3 because given what Alexa said -- her suggestion about how that
4 might be accomplished, paying back the monies that have been
5 given to this property or awarded to this property. Maybe an
6 alternative is to stay with the covenants, knowing that the
7 reviews will come more quickly. I'm not even necessarily
8 advising that, in any sense. But it is another option for
9 Jackie and the group, potentially, knowing that we are going
10 to be reviewing much quickly -- more quickly and we have we
11 have staff coming in, who can increase that capacity. Thank
12 you.

13 YEANDEL: Thank you. Thank you, Art. I appreciate your
14 comments. Obviously, we need to look at some timelines here.
15 So there seems to be a very urgent, at least immediate,
16 concern about the soffit contractor. So what are the timelines
17 that he's provided, or this contractor's provided?

18 GILLUM: We have not currently found a contractor. We've
19 been kind of holding fire on that, until we knew what we were
20 going to be dealing with, going forward because we didn't want
21 to get a contractor pulled in, and then go, but wait. We have
22 this process that has to happen, and it'll be some amount of
23 time. We're not sure how long. So we were kind of holding fire
24 until we resolved the codes and covenants issue. You know, the
25 restrictions that we have, we were waiting to approach any

1 contractors for this project, until we have this resolved.

2 YEANDEL: Thank you for that. Does any other
3 commissioners have any input or suggestions that they'd like
4 to mention at this time? Hearing no questions from the other
5 commissioners. I think this is a -- I -- my intuition is to
6 follow my DAG. And it almost seems like we need to have
7 something in writing to look at which covenants are to remain,
8 and which are to be excluded. Obviously, we're talking about
9 the architectural look and preservation of the building. So,
10 you know, that's -- but you also have to account for the
11 inconveniences of these infestations. And, you know, I
12 understand that the need for the building to be sealed. I've
13 worked on a few of these projects myself, and having to sort
14 of close up soffits to keep the bird and wildlife out of a
15 building. And then, it also sort of turns over another set of
16 problems, because, now you have to -- you don't have the
17 natural breathing. The reason why these buildings were
18 designed this way was to allow for air flow and to, you know,
19 keep the building cooled naturally. So now you have to look at
20 air conditioning and HVAC systems and things, because it's
21 going to be super stifling in the summertime. Yes, you don't
22 have crickets to worry about, but you can't have a meeting in
23 there, if no one can breathe, either. You know, do the windows
24 -- are they stationary? Do they have to open now, or, you
25 know, or --

1 GILLUM: Our windows open. We have --

2 YEANDEL: The windows open?

3 GILLUM: We have windows that have the ability to be
4 opened. We have --

5 YEANDEL: And there are screens on those windows?

6 GILLUM: Yes, sir. There's screens on those windows. And
7 then, they have exterior storm windows that we put on, in the
8 winter. We also have large ceiling fans installed that move
9 the air, circulate the air within the hall. As a board, we
10 have previously discussed this. We are willing to look at
11 repayment of the grants to be released from the covenants. I
12 don't know if there's any room for negotiation there on it
13 being the full \$311,000, or if there's a proration for the
14 time that it's already elapsed. I would want to know if
15 there's any -- if it's the whole thing or none.

16 YEANDEL: Yeah. Again, I think that needs to be a
17 negotiated, written document between our DAG and the
18 homeowner's association. I don't know if the commission can,
19 itself, really determine, yes, you get the funds, or no, you
20 know, you -- because it could, you know -- the thing we're
21 worried about here is, just the precedent. So if we allow you
22 to keep some, or part of the funds that were already given to
23 you without the covenants, then we'll have other groups
24 saying, well, they don't have to honor their covenants. Why do
25 we have to honor ours? So --

1 GILLUM: Which is reasonable.

2 YEANDEL: Yes. You know, so that's why our DAG is -- has
3 been involved with this, because we want to help you guys. We
4 understand the need. You know, it has to -- we're -- our
5 function, our mission statement is to, you know, preserve
6 these period, time-withstood, cherished relics of our
7 community. But it also has to keep an eye on the modern needs,
8 you know, if it's, you know, accessible to handicap; if it's,
9 you know, if there are these other things that we have to make
10 sure that it's within our rules and regulations of making it,
11 you know, on a historic building, with indistinguishable
12 improvements that still don't destroy the architecture,
13 integrity, or the historic nature of the building. So, it's
14 definitely a fine line. We want to work with you guys. We want
15 to help you. But we do have to sort of keep an eye on the ball
16 a little bit, because we're concerned that, you know -- and
17 sometimes, you know, it's a sort of a good thing to re-look at
18 some of these, you know -- if you look at the monies given,
19 you know, that this has been a while since, you know, you
20 mentioned eight years, that, you know, you even looked at the
21 --

22 GILLUM: Well, it's been 17 years since then.

23 YEANDEL: Seventeen years, total, right.

24 GILLUM: Sixteen -- yeah, it's been 16 to 17 years since
25 the Community Association has received any funds from you.

1 YEANDEL: Right.

2 GILLUM: Nor, do we anticipate ever asking for money
3 again, because we're --

4 YEANDEL: I see.

5 GILLUM: -- we've been -- the Armstrong family set up a
6 trust that benefited four nonprofits, one of which was the
7 Community Association. And we're making an effort to be good
8 stewards of those funds, so that the proceeds from those funds
9 will far outlive anyone on our current board, will probably
10 outlive the life of the hall. But -- that that money will
11 always be there, and there will always be a dividend from that
12 money to provide for the maintenance of the hall, which is
13 what we're using it for now. Those funds come in, and we use
14 them for promoting the hall. We use them for maintaining the
15 hall. We use them for just basic operating expense of propane
16 for our furnace, and, you know, just keeping the lights on, is
17 what we're using those funds for. We, like I said, we are
18 definitely open to looking at either, if possible,
19 renegotiating the covenants, or if it comes right down to just
20 brass tacks, buying ourselves out of it.

21 YEANDEL: Right.

22 GILLUM: What would be the timeline for negotiating
23 those covenants, so that we can be looking at getting a
24 contractor this year to do those soffits?

25 YEANDEL: I mean, that's the thing. It's sort of like the

1 cart before the horse thing. We don't know what the soffit
2 enhancement's going to look like. We don't know how much the
3 cost of the -- you know, even if you guys are paying the
4 contractor or whatever, you know, we would like to know if you
5 know how much it's going to cost. If it's a lasting thing. We
6 need someone like Art to review the architectural improvements
7 that are part of the -- our review process. So, you know, I
8 think the sort of -- you know, and I know it's difficult to
9 work with contracts, to even get a quote. But I think that's
10 sort of the next step, is to sort of get a quote, with some
11 visuals. You know, there's all kinds of 3D, virtual renderings
12 that they could provide that, you know, SketchUp does, for
13 instance, that they could show what the improvements would
14 look like on the building. I think that would sort of put us
15 at ease, as well. You know, if we're talking about, you know,
16 putting soffits in that are just, you know -- I don't know
17 what I'm looking at. So we don't know what -- how big they
18 are, if they're intrusive, if they're, you know, barely
19 noticeable, if they're giant, you know?

20 GILLUM: Well, that's our, is that they would be
21 unobtrusive, and, you know, do the job without impacting the
22 look of the building. We --

23 YEANDEL: We're on the same team here. I mean, we want --

24 GILLUM: We have the same goals.

25 YEANDEL: -- the same things for the building.

1 GILLUM: It's just how to get there. Probably what I'm
2 going to have to do is, take this back to my board. I think
3 they're going to be inclined to -- what would -- they're going
4 to be inclined to want to just pay the grant back, and be
5 released from the obligations.

6 YEANDEL: I mean, that's a possibility, too. I mean,
7 we're not denying you that, you know, ability. We just want to
8 make sure that the money that's already been spent, you know,
9 and those covenants, or some of those covenants, are met. We
10 can have discussions later on. But, sort of the ball is, we're
11 not going to say, we're not going to honor the covenants
12 first, and just give you free --

13 GILLUM: Yeah, with no -- and we have no expectation of
14 that. But what -- where my board is, and the feedback I've
15 gotten from my board, coming up to this meeting, is that they
16 are disposed to just repaying the covenant and being released
17 -- the grants, and being released from the covenants. That's
18 where my board's mindset is on this is, we want to be released
19 from these covenants. And we are willing to repay the grants
20 to have that happen.

21 YEANDEL: Okay. I mean, that seems fair enough. If we
22 could get a letter from your board, basically giving us that
23 ask. And we would go over that with our DAG. And, you know,
24 that -- I don't see a problem with that. I mean, you know,
25 it's -- we're all on the same page here. We're trying to take

1 care of this building, and take care of your community, as
2 well.

3 GILLUM: Agreed.

4 YEANDEL: Yeah. So, my suggestion would be for your board
5 to send us a letter, to SHPO and our DAG, and -- basically
6 saying, look. These are the covenants that we object to, that
7 we can, you know, we can no longer follow these covenants or,
8 you know we'd like to, you know, give the money back. You
9 know, is that possible, basically.

10 GILLUM: Okay.

11 YEANDEL: And then, you know, then, once you guys own it,
12 then you don't -- you won't have the bureaucracy of SHPO and -
13 - but we'd still want to help you maintain the integrity. And
14 we want to help you, you know, take care of this, sounds like
15 a beautiful space.

16 GILLUM: It is.

17 YEANDEL: Yeah. And, you know, the these are cherished
18 items. A lot of these places no longer exist. And, you know,
19 we need to take care of them, and that's why we're here to
20 assist you. But that's in any way possible. If assisting you
21 the best way, is for you to give us the money back, I'm sure
22 that, you know, that could be worked out. I'll have to check
23 the DAG to see if that's -- you know, sometimes it's harder to
24 give the money back than back than it is to --

25 GILLUM: Back.

1 YEANDEL: Yeah. But, I'm pretty sure we can do that. Is -
2 - am I speaking out of hat, our DAG? Are we on the same page?

3 RAVENCROFT: Yeah. I don't think that there's any
4 issue, whatsoever, with receiving a letter from the board, and
5 then proceeding with draw -- I would probably, at that point,
6 drop some sort of document about repayment, and then we would
7 circulate it. But I don't think there's any issue with going
8 with the repayment route.

9 YEANDEL: Okay. Does that -- are there any other
10 questions? Do you feel that that might be the answer, or is
11 that --

12 GILLUM: The opinion of the board, like I said, the
13 feedback I have from the board, coming in, was that, one way
14 or another, we would like to be released from the covenants.
15 So, if repayment is the necessary route, then we would take
16 the steps to do that.

17 YEANDEL: All right. Well, that sounds good. Yeah. If we
18 can get a letter, and copied to the DAG, we would really
19 appreciate, you know -- I think that would -- that might be
20 the best thing for everyone.

21 GILLUM: Okay.

22 YEANDEL: We don't have to vote. That's really kind of --
23 the ball is in your court. But if you need us for anything,
24 please, you know, don't hesitate to contact the SHPO office.
25 Obviously, Art and Carla are very helpful. So they can even

1 point you towards resources, or maybe there's future monies
2 that you might need, or, you know -- because, we do want to
3 help.

4 GILLUM: We appreciate that.

5 YEANDEL: Okay. Good. All right. If there's anything
6 else, Carla, do you have any other --

7 GILLUM: I just have one quick question.

8 YEANDEL: Yeah, go ahead.

9 GILLUM: Just the contact information for who all I need
10 to send that to.

11 YEANDEL: Yeah. Carla, can you provide some contact
12 information, through an email, or --

13 CLOUD: Yeah. Carla Cloud, for the record. I will go
14 ahead and email you the appropriate contacts.

15 GILLUM: Thank you so much. You have been incredibly
16 helpful in this process. And we really appreciate you.

17 CLOUD: Oh, you're very welcome. Anytime. Thank you.

18 UNIDENTIFIED: Chair Yeandel, we have two hands raised.

19 YEANDEL: Yes. Mr. Timmons, I see your hand is raised.

20 The Chair recognizes Anthony Timmons.

21 TIMMONS: Yes. Anthony Timmons, for the record. Thank you
22 so much, Mr. Chair. I want to ask the DAG, is it possible to
23 release the covenants -- remove the covenants, and instead
24 replace it, maybe with the lien on the property?

25 RAVENCROFT: I would have to look into the lien. But,

1 yeah, I can look into that and get back to you. I'm not
2 certain, off the top of my head. I haven't really dealt with a
3 lot of liens.

4 TIMMONS: Anthony Timmons, for the record. That would be
5 perfect. Thank you so much. Because that would, at least
6 release them from the covenants, and then make sure that we're
7 kind of assured repayment, with a lien on the property,
8 whether the property is ever sold or transferred. Thank you.

9 YEANDEL: Good point, Mr. Timmons. I see, Art, your hand
10 is raised. The Chair recognizes Art Krupicz.

11 KRUPICZ: Oh, thanks. Art Krupicz, for the record. I --
12 the -- Jackie, correct me if I'm wrong, but the way I heard
13 you earlier, is that repayment is an option, if it needs to
14 be, but renegotiating the con -- the -- oh, my goodness. Yeah,
15 it's what we're talking about today -- the covenants -- pardon
16 me -- renegotiating the covenants. You'd be amenable to that,
17 too. To be honest, we haven't talked to our DAG about that,
18 specific -- like, what renegotiating would look like. So I
19 just want to be clear, for you and for everyone, that that
20 didn't really come up. I've only heard that today, and that's
21 fine. But that's totally fine. But we haven't really addressed
22 that. So if you want to talk about -- and I don't know what
23 that would mean, necessarily. This is all pretty new for us at
24 the SHPO. We looked back, historically, and there haven't been
25 any other folks, grantees who have wanted to get out or from

1 under the covenants. And that's fine. We'll -- we're working
2 it out. That's perfectly fine. But that's why I say, what
3 renegotiating would look like, I'm not sure. So I just want
4 you to know that.

5 GILLUM: I don't know that we've ever considered
6 renegotiating. We've always, just been really looking towards
7 being released, so we can do what we need to do, in a timely
8 manner. We've not ever considered renegotiating. I don't know
9 what that would entail, and I don't know what the timeline for
10 that would be.

11 KRUPICZ: Okay. And if I misheard that, then fair enough.
12 Okay. If we're all on the same page about some form of
13 repayment, okay. Then scratch all that. But I'm glad we
14 covered it. Thank you. And I'll defer to Tony, if I may?

15 YEANDEL: Yeah. Thank you. I'll recognize -- the Chair
16 recognizes Anthony Timmons.

17 TIMMONS: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. Anthony
18 Timmons, for the record. My question is for the leadership of
19 SHPO, whether that's Director Krupicz or Director Reed, or --
20 Administrator Krupicz, or maybe Carla, maybe can answer this
21 one. But what would happen with the funds once they return?
22 Would those funds then be used for future grantees? Is that
23 how it kind of works? Because, imagine this was part of a bond
24 issuance back then?

25 CLOUD: Yes. Carla Cloud, for the record. I will have

1 to confer with our grants gentleman, down in our director's
2 office, who is very well adverse with our bond program. My
3 understanding is that the money would probably go back to the
4 IRS. But I will verify that, and relay it back to you all when
5 I can get confirmation on that. But I believe it would go back
6 to the IRS. I don't think we could just keep it to go back
7 into the funds for future grantees. So, that will be looked
8 into.

9 TIMMONS: Anthony Timmons, for the record. Thank you so
10 much.

11 GILLUM: I'm sorry. This is Jackie Gillum again. So
12 instead of being able to use that money for other grantees and
13 furthering the state of Nevada, the federal government would
14 get it?

15 KRUPICZ: Art Krupicz, for the --

16 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record -- I'm sorry. I was
17 going to say, Carland Cloud, for the record. Again, I would
18 have to verify that. But that is my understanding, is that the
19 -- it is bond funding that comes from the IRS. It's interest
20 earned off of property sales taxes. And the way the bonds
21 work, I believe it does go back. But I would have to verify,
22 so.

23 GILLUM: To be --

24 KRUPICZ: Art Krupicz, for the record. Yes, it's tied to
25 how -- we're not certain of that. We're still -- quite

1 honestly, we're -- to both Jackie and Tony's questions, we're
2 still working out, with our finance team and our bond team
3 here at DCNR -- we're still working out how -- where the funds
4 would go. We hope, of course, at SHPO, that most of it would
5 be able to go forward, in -- to other grantees. But at least a
6 portion of it, given the rules around bonds, especially -- and
7 older bonds that are, like in -- are closed or otherwise
8 passed, there may be some -- some of the funds, maybe not all,
9 but some of them may have to -- there may be a -- yeah, we
10 have to pay interest on those, or -- so, that's where we're
11 going. We're not sure quite where it would work. It's not
12 necessarily that all of it would go back. But some of it may
13 have to. We're working on that now. Thank you, Carla.

14 CLOUD: Yes. Carla Cloud, for the record, again. And,
15 Mr. Thelan (ph) made a point here, that the funds may have an
16 expiration date. So we'll definitely look into that. It's very
17 possible. There was multiple bond sales that funded this
18 building. So you got between 1993 and 2009. So there's
19 multiple different bonds that supported this. So it is going
20 to be something, on our end, that we have to look into. I
21 recall talking to the gentleman before, and it was something
22 stated that we would have to look into. Because some of these
23 bonds may have reopened and may be getting renegotiated. And
24 if any of those bond funds are open -- you know, bond years
25 are open at this time for renegotiation, we'd have to look

1 into how that works, with what we get back. So, it will be an
2 interesting topic to learn. Like Art says, this is the first
3 time this has come before us, and become before me. So I am
4 interested in learning on how this all works. But yes, once we
5 get the money -- of course that's not going to necessarily be
6 the problem of the Jarbidge association. That will be
7 something we have to look into next, on how that works. So
8 stay tuned. I will let the Commission know, as I am aware of
9 more information.

10 YEANDEL: All right. This is Yale Yeandel, for the
11 record. I think, at least, we have a direction for this
12 applicant, for Jarbidge Community Association. And you know,
13 we'll try to assist you and help you in any way we can. But
14 obviously, you know, the rules are the rules, so we have to
15 follow the rules that are already established. But we will do
16 our best to follow through with this. I think we're pretty
17 good. I don't think there's, really, a vote or anything we can
18 take on this. We'll be expecting that letter, from the
19 Association. And Carla will respond with the best she's able
20 to, with the -- finding out which bonds may or may not be
21 applicable. Let's move on to the next agenda point here. This
22 is agenda number eight -- discussion for potential release of
23 the real properties covenants of the grant argument regarding
24 Dayton 1881 Carson and the Colorado Railroad and possible
25 delegation of duties to legal and other staff, to effectuate

1 the necessary documentation and release of the property owner
2 from the grant agreement covenants. So this is, again, another
3 covenant release. Carla, do you have additional information on
4 this item?

5 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record. Yes. So, in June
6 of 2020, the Carson Colorado Railroad Depot was a victim of
7 arson, and burned to the ground. As the historic property is
8 no longer standing, there is nothing for the SHPO to review,
9 within the terms of the covenants. Per the direction of the
10 chair, SHPO staff contacted Lyon County on January 29, 2026,
11 to inquire if the county would like to be -- or if they would
12 be interested in pursuing removal of the real property
13 covenants. On February 2nd, Lyon County responded with a
14 letter requesting to remove the real property covenants, as
15 well. This is also new for our office, kind of opposite of
16 what we're looking at, with Jarbidge. They're requesting to be
17 removed, and here, we and the county are requesting it, as
18 well. But in this case, we don't have a building to review.
19 And they are going to be rebuilding this. However, we don't
20 review new builds. So there's nothing that -- for us to do
21 here. So that is points on agenda item number eight.

22 YEANDEL: All right. This is Yale Yeandel, Chair, for the
23 record. Any other commissioners have any comments or questions
24 on this matter? I don't see any --

25 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman? This is Anthony Timmons, for the

1 record.

2 YEANDEL: Okay, go ahead Anthony.

3 TIMMONS: Anthony Timmons, for the record. I just have a
4 general question. I assume the covenants have been transferred
5 to the land, as opposed to the building, since the building no
6 longer exists, and that's the issue we're looking at?

7 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record. I'll answer that,
8 to start with. But the covenants are written to cover the
9 property, in all terms. It's not written to the building,
10 specific. So the covenants cover the property, regardless.

11 TIMMONS: Anthony Timmons, for the record. So I assume
12 that's the entire parcel, per se?

13 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record. Yes, sir.

14 TIMMONS: Perfect. Thank you. Anthony Timmons, for the
15 record. Thanks for the clarification.

16 YEANDEL: This is Yale Yeandel, for the record. I see
17 Michelle's hand is up. The Chair recognizes Michelle.

18 SCHMITTER: Yes. Thank you. Michelle Schmitter, for
19 the record. If the Dayton Depot is going to be reconstructed,
20 and reconstruction is the Secretary of the Interior treatment,
21 I'm just wondering why, then, it would not be part of this,
22 and if the covenant is on the actual property, which is the
23 land plus the improvements?

24 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record. The CCCHP program
25 is for rehabilitation of historic structures and properties.

1 And there's no longer a historic structure there for us to
2 review for rehabilitation. We do not review reconstruction,
3 under this program. Thank you.

4 SCHMITTER: And -- okay. I understand that. But this
5 is an unusual situation, where this building was burned down
6 and is going to be reconstructed.

7 KRUPICZ: Art Krupicz, for the record. I didn't raise my
8 hand. Pardon me. Michelle, are you getting at the idea that --
9 I have heard -- and I don't know if this is accurate or not --
10 that the reconstruction may include some remaining materials
11 that they had, older materials? So there may be an element of
12 -- some of the original may be there, be present in the new
13 building. Is that what -- maybe what you're referring to?
14 Otherwise, it would -- it's an entirely new building, with no
15 -- there's -- you know what I mean? -- no old materials or
16 anything like that.

17 SCHMITTER: I know. The historical society did have a
18 lot of artifacts. And I don't think we're -- well, they had
19 some that they did lose in the fire. So, I know we don't even
20 have a corner to reconstruct from. Right?

21 KRUPICZ: In a sense, that's true. Yeah. I mean, it's --
22 from what I'm hearing, it's a recreation of the old building.
23 But there's nothing old about what will be coming -- being --
24 what is about to be erected, there's nothing old about it,
25 essentially. And that's where our -- yeah, our reservations

1 come, about keeping covenants on. I see Andrew has his hand
2 up. Sorry, Chair Yeandel. I'm just going from hand to hand, if
3 that's okay? Pardon me.

4 YEANDEL: That's fine. I didn't -- I don't see Andrew's
5 hand. Yeah. Andrew, Chair recognizes Andrew.

6 HASKIN: Andrew Haskin, Lyon County Manager. And I,
7 first off, just want to thank you for considering this
8 application today. The discussion is absolutely correct.
9 There's no -- the building was completely burned down. I mean,
10 the foundation was left and that was it. And I don't believe
11 the foundation was even original. We had moved that building
12 to that site. And so, it'll be constructed with completely new
13 materials. The idea is to complete -- to basically do a
14 recreation of the building, but -- as best we can. Obviously,
15 because it is a new building, there have to be some changes to
16 make sure that it meets certain requirements of code. But that
17 is our intent.

18 YEANDEL: This is Yale Yeandel, Chair, for the record.
19 Andrew, I have a question for you. So are you considering
20 moving another historic building to that same site?

21 HASKIN: No, not at the -- not at this time.

22 YEANDEL: Okay. Because I know that that's another
23 possibility. But if you're not considering that, then it is a
24 new building. We went through this, I believe, with Virginia
25 City at one time, that they wanted to do a new building, to

1 add in an ADA restroom. And we denied that, because, we don't
2 do new buildings, or they withdrew their application, I
3 believe. But yeah, it's a shame. I mean, this is why we're all
4 needed, to preserve these buildings and protect them from
5 things like fire and homeless people moving in, and such.
6 Yeah, it's a loss. I'd like to make a -- or ask the Commission
7 that they make a motion to release the covenants --

8 CLOUD: I'm sorry, sir.

9 YEANDEL: Yeah, go ahead.

10 CLOUD: Sorry to interrupt you. Carla Cloud, for the
11 record. We have Art Krupicz, with his hand raised.

12 YEANDEL: Oh, I did not see your hand there, raised, Mr.
13 Krupicz. Go ahead, Art. What do you have any comments on?

14 KRUPICZ: Oh, pardon. Yeah. Thank you. Art Krupicz.
15 Michelle, I just want to emphasize that our program -- there's
16 obviously -- well, you know. But for the group, there's four
17 treatment plans for historic buildings, that are broadly
18 recognized. And this program does only do rehab. So yeah, no
19 reconstruction, etc. And that's more for the group. So that --
20 again, that's where we're coming from, is if it's a new
21 building, yeah, we don't really have a proper, appropriate
22 angle, so to speak, there. I hope we're, between Carla and I,
23 we're addressing your question, or your concern, Michelle.
24 Pardon me, if we're missing it somehow.

25 SCHMITTER: No, that was great. Thank you. Michelle

1 Schmitter, for the record.

2 YEANDEL: Yale Yeandel, for the record. Yeah, Michelle,
3 you cut out there at the end. Did you have additional
4 comments?

5 SCHMITTER: No.

6 YEANDEL: Okay. Well, getting back to the agenda item.
7 You know, this is just for discussion. But I'd like to take
8 action on this. Since there's no building there, there's no
9 covenants needed to protect the building, because there's no
10 building. So I'd like one of the commissioners to put up, on
11 the floor -- we'll do a vote to release this. Well, we would
12 have to --

13 DOWNS: Rochanne Downs, for the record. I just have
14 like, one question. Just maybe, if our DAG can just comment on
15 that, because I agree with that. But I want to make sure that
16 that's okay.

17 YEANDEL: Yes, good idea. Yes, let's hear from our DAG.
18 Chair recognizes the DAG.

19 RAVENCROFT: Alexa Ravencroft, for the record. Just to
20 clarify -- you're asking if you have the authority to
21 terminate this covenant? Is that the question?

22 YEANDEL: That's the question, yes. Yale Yeandel, for the
23 record.

24 RAVENCROFT: Yeah. So, in this particular instance,
25 since the building is no longer in existence, the purpose of

1 the covenant has essentially been thwarted. The covenants were
2 to effectuate the historic preservation of the building. But
3 since the building's gone, then I think termination of the
4 covenants is absolutely appropriate, in this case.

5 YEANDEL: Yale Yeandel, for the record. Yes. So we can
6 vote on termination of the covenants, or -- so what about the
7 monies in the grant? That question's for the DAG, please.

8 RAVENCROFT: Alex Ravencroft, for the record. Can you
9 clarify what you mean about the money for the grant?

10 YEANDEL: Well, we paid money to -- this is Yale Yeandel,
11 for the record. We paid the grant money, correct Carla, to
12 initiate the refurbishing of this building?

13 CLOUD: Well, yeah, the -- Carla Cloud, for the record.
14 The organization, the Lyon County Historical Society, had
15 received previous funding, I want to say, back 2016 maybe.
16 They had received previous funding from us, but -- and at the
17 time, when the building burnt down, they had applied. They
18 were being awarded a certain amount of money. We were going to
19 award them the money to, hopefully, be matched for what they
20 were getting for the de -- from the -- from NDOT. We were
21 going to have a meeting with NDOT to get them the remaining
22 funding to complete this building. And then, two days later,
23 the building burned down. So we were not able to do that. So
24 no other funding was given to them.

25 YEANDEL: No other funding. Okay.

1 CLOUD: The funding previous -- and I -- you know, this
2 is my opinion, solely here, and -- is that, I don't think that
3 the funding should be considered in this situation. They're
4 not asking to get out of it for any other reason. There's just
5 no building. It was an unfortunate mishap. So I don't know if
6 the Commission still wants to get that funding back. Is that
7 the question you're asking, or is --

8 YEANDEL: No. Since the funding was not officially
9 awarded, it was just in the process of being awarded. I don't
10 think there's money to be returned. I just was curious, as to
11 -- if it had been awarded or not, if they had gotten a check
12 from us, and then the building burned down. But I -- you
13 clarified that, Carla. So my question is now, to the board
14 members, to, you know, let's release this applicant from the
15 covenants and vote on that, if I can get a motion on the
16 floor.

17 DOWNS: Rochanne Downs. I'll make the motion to release
18 the real property covenants for the Dayton 1881 Carson and
19 Colorado Railroad Depot, due to the fire destruction of the
20 building, therefore, making the covenants no longer
21 applicable.

22 HASKIN: Mr. Chair, I --

23 KRUPICZ: Arthur Krupicz, for the record. I'm sorry.
24 Andrew has his hand up.

25 YEANDEL: Yes, Andrew? The Chair recognizes Andrew.

1 HASKIN: Perfect. Andrew Haskin, Lyon County Manager.
2 Not to muddy the water here, or complicate this, but then, in
3 the name of transparency, I do believe that we did receive
4 \$130,000. I'm looking at the covenant agreement now. I wasn't
5 here in 2016. But, I do believe that we did receive funding.
6 That's why the covenants were in place. So I don't know -

7 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record. Yes, that is
8 correct. Looking it up, there was two different grants awarded
9 to this property. In 2014, it was \$52,500. And in 2016, it was
10 \$130,000, for a total of \$182,500, that was previously
11 awarded, many years prior to the building burning down.

12 HASKIN: Yeah.

13 YEANDEL: Well, thank you, Andrew. This is Yale Yeandel,
14 Chair, for the record. Well, that does -- I mean, I understand
15 that that's -- was 2016. And this fire was, literally, a month
16 ago, correct?

17 HASKIN: Oh, no. The fire happened in 2020.

18 YEANDEL: Oh, 2020?

19 HASKIN: So, yeah. So, Lyon County, I mean, we did
20 follow through with the covenants and with what we were
21 supposed to do with the funding and the building, at the time.
22 My understanding -- and again, I wasn't here with the county
23 at that time -- but my understanding is, that the building was
24 actually in a different location and was moved onto this site.
25 And that's part of what the funding was for. I could be wrong

1 in that, so maybe, don't quote me, but, yeah.

2 YEANDEL: I see. To move the physical building.

3 HASKIN: Yeah.

4 YEANDEL: Yeah, I gotcha. This is Yale Yeandel. Thank
5 you, Andrew, for trying to fill us in on the history. All
6 right. Well, I say we still take a vote on -- we have a motion
7 on the floor to release Dayton 1881 Carson and the Railroad
8 Depot from their covenants. Do we have a second on that
9 motion?

10 TIMMONS: Mr. Chairman? Anthony Timmins, for the record.
11 I'll go ahead and second that motion.

12 YEANDEL: Thank you. This is Yale Yeandel, for the
13 record. Yeah, hearing a motion and seconded on the floor, if
14 the Commission could take a vote, all those in favor say, yay.

15 COMMISSIOINERS: Yay. Aye.

16 YEANDEL: Aye. All those not in favor, say nay or no. All
17 right, hearing no nays or nos, that motion passes on the
18 floor, regarding the Dayton eight -- I'm sorry, 1881 Carson
19 and Railroad Depot, releasing them from their covenants.

20 HASKIN: Thank you.

21 YEANDEL: No problem.

22 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record.

23 YEANDEL: Go ahead, Carla. I'd just like to make sure
24 that that includes, with the agenda item, where it was to
25 delegate the duties to the legal and other staff to effectuate

1 the necessary documentation to release the property owner from
2 the grant agreements and the covenants. So I just want to make
3 sure that that motion includes releasing the delegation of
4 duties to our DAG, to handle the paperwork to make this final.

5 YEANDEL: Yeah. Question for the DAG. This is Yale
6 Yeandel, Chair. Yeah, do we have to revote on it, to add those
7 items that Carla just mentioned?

8 RAVENCROFT: Alexa Ravencroft, for the record. While I
9 know it's a bit tedious, I would recommend revoting on it,
10 with the language that Carla used, just to be on the safe
11 side.

12 YEANDEL: Okay. This is Yale Yeandel, Chair, for the
13 record. This is -- well, I can't make the motion. Can I get
14 another motion on the floor, for the specific legal jargon
15 necessary, on Dayton 1881 Carson and Colorado Railroad Depot,
16 for -- and possible delegation of duties to legal and other
17 staff to effectuate the necessary documentation to release the
18 property owner from the grant agreements covenants?

19 DOWNS: So moved. Rochanne Downs.

20 YEANDEL: Go ahead, Rochanne. The Chair recognizes
21 Rochanne.

22 DOWNS: Rochanne Downs, so moved.

23 YEANDEL: All right. So moved. Hearing the full
24 description, any commissioners would like to vote, yes or aye,
25 on this agenda item?

1 FARRELL: This is Commissioner Farrell, and I second the
2 motion.

3 YEANDEL: Oh, thank you, Commissioner Farrell. Now that
4 the motion's seconded, can I get a vote from the commission on
5 this agenda item eight?

6 COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

7 YEANDEL: Aye. Okay. Do I hear any, nos or nays? All
8 right, hearing no nos or nays, I say we passed the release of
9 the real property covenants of grant agreements between Dayton
10 1881 Carson and the Colorado Railroad Depot, for possible
11 delegation of duties to legal and other staff, to effectuate
12 the necessary documentation to release the property owner from
13 the grant agreements covenants. All right, moving on. Carla,
14 is there any additional public comment that you've noted while
15 we've had the meeting?

16 CLOUD: Carla Cloud, for the record. I show no emails.
17 I've received no phone calls. And nobody's here in the room
18 with me. Thank you.

19 YEANDEL: All right. Let's see here. I can't adjust my
20 screen here, to see the end of -- the public comment will be
21 taken at the beginning and end of the meeting, and may be
22 taken at the discretion of the Chair, on agenda items listed
23 for possible action. Public comments may be limited to three
24 minutes per person, at the discretion of the Chair. Comment
25 will not be restricted, based upon viewpoint. No action will

1 be taken on any matters raised during the public comment
2 period, that they are not already on the agenda. Persons
3 making comment will be asked to begin stating their name for
4 the record. I cannot advance -- Carla, that's your screen.
5 Okay. All right, well, this one was a -- it was a tough
6 meeting. We -- we're going to miss you, Tony. And we'll have
7 to gather for a vice chair, make sure everyone's here. We
8 don't want to elect someone who's not at the meeting. But, I
9 really believe in the work that we do here, and I appreciate
10 your time and patience. This was a difficult meeting, because
11 of technical issues. But thank you very much for your time.
12 And I am moving to adjourn the meeting. Members of the public
13 who are disabled and who will require special accommodations
14 assistance for the meeting, can request to notify the State
15 Historic Preservation Office, in writing, at 901 South Stewart
16 Street, Suite 3002, Carson City, Nevada, 89701, or by calling
17 775-684-3441, no later than 9 o'clock on February 26, 2026.
18 All right. I -- if I can get a motion on the floor, to adjourn
19 the meeting -- or I can just adjourn the meeting right now. I
20 adjourn the meeting. Thank you, everyone.

21
22 --RECORDING ENDED--
23
24
25