

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

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES
COMMISSION FOR CULTURAL CENTERS AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION
PUBLIC MEETING
TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 2022

PALMER: Hello. Okay. I need the (inaudible) --

OSTROVSKY: Hello.

PALMER: Good morning, sir.

OSTROVSKY: Hello.

PALMER: Or good afternoon, I guess.

OSTROVSKY: Good afternoon.

PALMER: My apologies.

OSTROVSKY: That's all right.

PALMER: We'll figure out what time of day it is.

OSTROVSKY: Well, sometimes Carson city's on a
different time zone that the rest of the states so. A little
joke there.

PALMER: Oh, it -- it definitely feels like that,
believe me. Okay. So we are having technical issues. So
what I've got -- I've gotta turn this off. No, I have to do
it. I'm gonna turn my little thingy off and choose no
background 'cause I have a member of the public with me.

OSTROVSKY: All right.

PALMER: We're having technical issues with the --

1 the computer. (Inaudible), so I am going to have this member
2 of the public here with me. If I can get this thing to work
3 (inaudible). Sorry about that. Okay. Gonna do that way.
4 There we go. So I'm in the screen and so is Janice
5 Beerwinkle. I can't answer that phone. Okay. I'll mute
6 myself.

7 BROWN: Rebecca, we have a question in the chat
8 box.

9 PALMER: Thank you, Kristen, for -- I -- I didn't
10 know what was happening. I didn't see my -- my picture and I
11 didn't see anything. So thank you for helping me out.

12 BROWN: No problem.

13 PALMER: So -- so this is Rebecca Palmer. We sent
14 individual links to the panelists and that's the link you have
15 to use, otherwise you come in as an attendee and I have to
16 promote you. So if I'm looking to see if there are any more
17 commissioners in the attendee file and I do not see anymore.
18 And this is Rebecca Palmer again, my -- sorry Chair, I have a
19 member of the public in my office because we've had technical
20 issues at our physical location.

21 OSTROVSKY: That's fine.

22 PALMER: So we -- we have notified the public with
23 a sign on the door saying the mood -- mood -- meeting has been
24 moved to my office and the member of public is sitting right
25 behind me. You can see her in the screen here. So if any

1 more members of the public need to join, they'll have to join
2 in my office, and we have made provisions for the public to
3 notify us if they wish to be at the physical location.

4 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Would you let me know when we --
5 when we have enough arrivals to constitute quorum?

6 PALMER: Sir, we -- I'm -- I'm counting six
7 commissioners.

8 OSTROVSKY: That are present?

9 PALMER: Yes.

10 OSTROVSKY: Good, good. Well then this is the
11 appointed hour for -- for the meeting of the Commission for
12 Cultural Centers and Historic Preservation. Therefore I'd
13 like to call a meeting to order. I -- it's appropriate now,
14 one, to verify that the meeting is improperly posted under
15 Nevada state law (inaudible).

16 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
17 Yes, it has been.

18 MALE: And would you, please call the roll?

19 PALMER: Yes, sir. I will. Commissioner Hoferer?
20 Commissioner Rappa?

21 RAPPA: Commissioner Rappa's here.

22 PALMER: Commissioner Olmstead?

23 OLMSTEAD: Present.

24 PALMER: Commissioner Otlet -- Ortlipp?

25 ORTLIPP: I'm here. Ortlipp.

1 PALMER: My -- my apologies, sir.

2 ORTLIPP: That's fine.

3 PALMER: Com -- Vice Chair Stoldal?

4 STOLDAL: Present.

5 PALMER: And Chairman Ostrovsky?

6 OSTROVSKY: Present. Oh, wait, we have one, two,
7 three -- five members of the commission present, constitutes a
8 -- a quorum. David it's just -- it's actually this your first
9 official meeting? David?

10 ORTLIPP: Oh, sorry. No, I think this is my second
11 one.

12 OSTROVSKY: It's actually your second, that's what I
13 thought. Well --

14 PALMER: Oh. My -- sir, this Rebecca Palmer.

15 ORTLIPP: Yes.

16 PALMER: My sincerest apologies. I forgot
17 Commissioner Cavanaugh.

18 OSTROVSKY: Oh, Commissioner Cavanaugh.

19 CAVANAUGH: Present.

20 OSTROVSKY: Okay, great. So we're just missing one
21 commissioner. Thank you very much. With -- just as a
22 housekeeping matter, we would hope that this meeting would not
23 exceed one hour. A number of other people I know have
24 commitments and, I think, the agenda could be clearly handled
25 in that or less time. This is -- we go onto item number 3,

1 public comment. Public comment will be taken at the beginning
2 and the end of the meeting. I will also take public comment
3 before taking any action on an item. Public comments may
4 limited to three minutes, at the discretion of the chair.
5 Comment will not be restricted based on viewpoint. No action
6 will be taken on any matters raised during public comment
7 period that are not already on the agenda. Is there anyone on
8 the phone, on the internet or present in the hearing room that
9 would like to make comment -- public comment at this time? I
10 see none. Staff, do you identify anyone that's either raised
11 their hand or --

12 PALMER: Sir, I see no raised hands in the attendee
13 area.

14 OSTROVSKY: All right. Well, thank you very much.
15 Seeing no public comment, we will take public comment clearly,
16 later during the -- during the hearing. So we'll move on to
17 agenda item number 4, which is a discussion and decision to
18 request the sale of bonds in accordance with NRS 3603.530.1.
19 In -- in both state fiscal years of 2022 and 2023, the
20 combined request for general obligation bond sales in these
21 two will not exceed 4 million. I know my phone is doing
22 strange things. Hang -- hang just a minute. I'm sorry,
23 having a little problem there. My watch is talking to me if
24 you can believe it. The proceeds of the bond sale will be
25 deposited with the state treasurer to be credited to the fund

1 for preservation and promotion of cultural resources and will
2 both be -- and will both be granted to successful applicants
3 and support the administration of the grant program for the
4 period 2022, 2023 grant cycle. This is an action item.

5 Rebecca, could you give us a brief summary of what the
6 treasurer's office has indicated to you regarding the bond
7 sales?

8 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
9 The treasurer's office has indicated that they are going to
10 hold a very unusual spring bond sale. Usually their bond
11 sales are in November, but this year because of other, like
12 the state infrastructure bank needing bond proceeds, they are
13 going to conduct a spring bond sale. This is fortuitous for
14 the commission because in any one calendar or any one calendar
15 year, the commission decides how much they want to award, and
16 then in either one of the fiscal years, they can sell up to \$3
17 million in I -- any one fiscal year. So the 4 million that
18 you will find in one of the agenda supplement items in the
19 executive budget, 4 million for CCCHP pro -- projects in the
20 biennium is still available for bond sales. The treasure has
21 indicated that they can sell it in two increments, one in the
22 spring bond sale in fiscal year that we're currently in '22,
23 and one in November, which would be fiscal year '23. And they
24 can either be equally split amongst the fiscal years, '22 and
25 '23, which is what I put in the draft letter to the state

1 board of finance. Alternatively, they could be split either
2 with 1 million in the first fiscal year and 3 million in the
3 next fiscal year. The commission should be aware that by
4 placing these in two separate fiscal years, there will be two
5 separate requirements to expand the proceeds of the bonds, and
6 so to ensure that they're appropriately expanded, staff would
7 recommend a sale of 1 million in state fiscal year '22 -- 2023
8 and 3 million, which is the maximum allowed per fiscal year in
9 state fiscal year 2023. However, the commission can decide in
10 any other increments that it wishes, as long as the total
11 request of -- in any fiscal year is no more than the 3 million
12 allowed by statute.

13 OSTROVSKY: And -- and I believe, you will find that
14 in appendix nine, you'll see listed bonds for conservation and
15 natural resources, historic preservation at 4 million. The --
16 the challenge, of course, for staff is getting the money out
17 appropriately to the -- to the successful grant applicants.
18 Timing wise, it -- it's a lot of work to get a million dollars
19 out, and usually, as it turns out for when -- when we award in
20 a grant, there's a time lag between the award and the actual
21 ability of the -- of the applicant to start to expend those
22 funds for various reasons, going back, getting final bids,
23 whether they have to get building permits. The staff still
24 needs to -- to get the appropriate documents, contracts
25 signed, covenants filed and so on. It's -- correct me if I'm

1 wrong, but I think, staggering it a bit makes it easier for
2 staff, for example, if we start with a million dollars, which
3 would have to be -- would be available in a couple of months
4 and followed by the other 3 million might be a better for
5 staff. I don't think it'll make any difference to the
6 grantees. Would -- would you agree with that, Rebecca?

7 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
8 Yes, I would agree with that. In fact, most applicants have
9 lag time of several months, and if -- if the precedent holds
10 that will occur here as well. So the -- the less we can put
11 in the first or request in the first bond sale, the -- the
12 less we have to expand earlier. There are, however, grantees
13 who are ready to hit the ground running.

14 OSTROVSKY: Right.

15 PALMER: And so -- and I would -- staff would
16 recommend that it would -- it could possibly be the entire 1
17 million going out the door quickly.

18 OSTROVSKY: Sir. Yeah, go ahead. Mr. Stoldal, do you
19 have a question?

20 STOLDAL: Well, I -- I'd like to respectfully
21 disagree on -- on -- on a couple of points. I -- I -- I would
22 prefer front loading rather than back loading for a couple of
23 reasons. One, as we got later in the agenda, we have the
24 opportunity to extend for what -- for -- for whatever reason.
25 So if we need to extend either because of staff or -- or -- or

1 whatever the reason, we have the authority to extend.

2 Secondly, there are projects that are ready to roll, ready to
3 take care of that are -- these buildings are -- start with are
4 old and the quicker we could get, a, either funding planning,
5 construction plans and or b, actually start the restoration
6 and -- and preservation of -- of these buildings, the better
7 off we are. And -- and thirdly, I think there's still gonna
8 be a line of trying to get contractors in -- in -- personnel
9 to work in some of these places, whether it's (inaudible)
10 Austin or -- or -- or wherever. So the quicker we can get
11 money to these grantees, the quicker they can get in line. So
12 I think that there is some urgency that I would suggest from
13 the structures themselves to the -- to -- to being able to get
14 work started. If they know they have got -- they've been
15 granted funding and the -- and the contractors know they have
16 been granting funding, it's not a, well, we put a grant in and
17 maybe next year we're gonna get that funding, they're gonna go
18 to the back of the line. So I -- I'd like to have a little
19 more discussion on maybe either two and two, or three and one,
20 and I put the staffs working hard at the very bottom of the
21 list. I say that semiconsciously. They're already working
22 hard and -- and have a great reputation around the state of --
23 of helping every grantee through the challenges with restoring
24 these old buildings. So that's my thought, Bob Chair.

25 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Let me just respond. I -- my -- my

1 view of how the grant process is gonna work is we -- we're
2 gonna hold grant hearings and we're going to award the entire
3 \$4 million in one grant sitting. We would not come back for a
4 second round of grants, so they -- they would know that
5 they're entitled to these funds, and when they would receive
6 'em. There's -- I think -- staff tell me how many months are
7 there between the -- the window of between a million and 3
8 million or 2 million and 2 million.

9 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I
10 don't have exact dates at this point. The treasurer's office
11 has indicated that it will be a spring sale and the -- if we
12 make the request today or tomorrow, it will be on the board of
13 finance agenda for March, and so the sale could occur after
14 that point. So if it took a month to prepare the sale, then
15 you're looking at May, possibly. This is all hype -- you
16 know, this is all speculation at this point.

17 STOLDAL: Yeah.

18 PALMER: May, June, July, August, September,
19 October, November, it's six months difference between the
20 spring sale and the fall sale.

21 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Commissioner Cavanaugh, question?

22 CAVANAUGH: I have two questions. The first question
23 is when let's say that we do the sale of bond, approve the
24 sale of bond, is there a penalty for us not to expend all \$4
25 million of that funding for -- that's my first question. The

1 second question is, do we have to limit our grant making to
2 one session or could we do two?

3 OSTROVSKY: Any response from staff? I -- I mean, I'm
4 assuming we could do two, if we wanted two. We could actually
5 break them. Is that right, Rebecca?

6 PALMER: For -- for the record, there is no
7 prohibition in statute that would limit the commissions
8 holding of grant hearings to one in an calendar year. There
9 could certainly be two. The answer to the first question is
10 that if the funds are not exp -- expended totally in three
11 years, the state will pay arbitrage fees.

12 OSTROVSKY: Well, there's -- brilliant. From a legal
13 point of view, there's only a three-year window we have to
14 worry about. The rest of it is really --

15 PALMER: For the record --

16 OSTROVSKY: -- a policy decision.

17 PALMER: -- for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
18 Yes. The final window closes at three years.

19 STOLDAL; Bob, did you indicate one of your thoughts
20 was that we would -- for the -- the -- the first cycle --
21 well, the -- we would put out all 4 million, we'd take in all
22 the applications and allocate the 4 million, but since some of
23 that, half of that, we would tell the -- the grantees who got
24 the money, they wouldn't get it until the following year?

25 OSTROVSKY: They'd be a six month lag, I think,

1 between the first and second grants. That some would be --
2 some would be -- the first million or 2 million, whatever that
3 number would be available for distribution in the first six
4 months, and then approximately, and I think Rebecca has
5 indicated, she's not quite sure what that is, but within a
6 six-month window, the remaining balance of the bond revenue
7 would be available to us for distribution.

8 STOLDAL: So that would be a new -- a new element of
9 our grant making process that we would say, you get it the
10 first six months and you get it in -- in the second six months
11 is one we're voting or allocating.

12 OSTROVSKY: We would have to do that. We would have
13 to voluntarily ask the -- the grant applicants who's shovel
14 ready, basically.

15 STOLDAL: Okay.

16 OSTROVSKY: We could put the money out the door right
17 away or who can wait. But I understand your concern, Bob.
18 You don't wanna -- you don't wanna run short of funds either.
19 But I also understanding -- isn't -- correct me if I'm wrong,
20 Rebecca, I think 2 million is about our limit. Isn't it in
21 the first year, as indicated by the treasurer's office? They
22 don't have a desire to go higher than that.

23 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
24 The only limit is what's in statute and that is 3 million per
25 fiscal year. So it could be 3 million in the first fiscal

1 year and 1 million in the second fiscal year. The difference
2 between the two sales is six months only. So the -- all the 4
3 million will be available by November of this year.

4 RAPPA: This is Commissioner Rappa. Rebecca, have
5 we spent anything in FY 22 so?

6 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
7 No.

8 RAPPA: Okay.

9 PALMER: There are no bond proceeds available right
10 now.

11 RAPPA: Okay. This is Commissioner Rappa again.
12 I'm gonna -- I'm gonna go with the original staff suggestion
13 of 1 million for the remainder of 20 -- FY 2022 only for
14 budget and bookkeeping purposes. It just seems like a very
15 tight turnaround for -- for accounting for that money for --
16 for these organizations, and then -- and then starting a new
17 fiscal year with another budget in -- on July 1st.

18 OSTROVSKY: I -- I appreciate your comments. I -- I -
19 - Rebecca, one other piece of information would be helpful. I
20 think the Commissioners making that decision, is from your
21 past experience, from the time bond sales are initiated to the
22 time you can actually put money out the door that -- that
23 process we are already know takes a few months. Is that
24 right?

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

1 The answer is yes, because first it has to go before the board
2 of finance to make sure that there is sufficient debt capacity
3 to sell bonds.

4 OSTROVSKY: Right.

5 PALMER: And then once that decision is made, it
6 takes about a month for the treasurer's office to get the sale
7 ready. Once the sale occurs, then the proceeds are deposited
8 -- relatively quickly if the bonds offered for sale are
9 purchased. So we are probably looking at -- the board of
10 finance would -- would meet -- I would imagine they'd meet in
11 September for the November sale. So they would meet in
12 September, it would take a -- a month to prep. So we have
13 received bond proceeds in the middle of November,
14 traditionally. So those grantees who were awarded funds, who
15 did not receive funds from the first bond sale, will be able
16 to start their projects sometime after the middle of November
17 because I can't authorize funding agreements if I can't don't
18 have proceeds to support those funding agreements. So we --
19 those would have to wait in advance until the proceeds are
20 deposited in the account. But the only thing that could wait
21 in advance could be the covenants. Everything else could be
22 prepped in -- in advance, but the state could not place
23 covenants on a property if it does not award actual proceeds.

24 MALE: Okay.

25 STOLDAL: I'm -- I'm trying to -- you have a sense

1 of -- of just the actual -- the actual dates of -- of -- of
2 when the first grants hearing would be held or -- or when the
3 -- back it up, even when we would staff would send out a note
4 to saying, this money is available, whether it's a million or
5 two or three, and then you need to have your grants in request
6 in by this date, and then we would hold a public -- a public
7 hearing. And then there is the cycle -- after that as the one
8 that the money that would be available, and they would be
9 different dates for whether we have a million dollars in
10 front, two or three. I -- I don't have a -- a calendar sense
11 of -- of -- of starting off of which is best for the client,
12 which is best for the grantees, which is best for the people
13 out in the trenches trying to get these things done, when is -
14 - when is the -- the -- the most people can get the most --
15 the most money. I was trying to write down some dates, but I
16 just -- I can't -- I don't have a good tracking of -- of each
17 of those potential options before this commission. The one
18 year now, or the 1 million or the 2 million or the 3 million.
19 I know we can't do four, but we can do one, two or three in
20 front. And then what another million. If we go with three in
21 front, we can do another million, six months later. Yep.

22 PALMER: For -- for the record, this is Rebecca
23 Palmer. Sir, that is correct. You could do 3 million in the
24 spring sale and 1 million in the November sale. This is --
25 for the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. This is a good trial

1 run for what the commission will need to do if the executive
2 budget has more than \$3 million in any biennium because this
3 will have to be done every single time. So I'm -- staff
4 recommends -- I -- any -- any increment we can work with, and
5 this is a good trial run to see if -- if -- if the commission
6 chooses three and one, whether that works for the applicant,
7 and if it doesn't then the next by biennium it could be
8 reversed, and it can be one and three or -- or two and three,
9 de -- you know, if the commission we're so graced with
10 additional --

11 STOLDAL: Right.

12 PALMER: -- bond proceeds. So this is a bit of a
13 trial run and staff will work with whatever the commission
14 decides.

15 CAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Cavanaugh. I -- I
16 would concur with -- with Commissioner Rappa. The -- the
17 staff has recommended a one and a three, and given that it's a
18 trial process, I -- I would like to honor their request to go
19 with a one in three to work through this situation that has
20 this blessing, this fortuitous event to -- to see how we can
21 work through it. I -- I think they have a better idea on what
22 the staff can handle and what we need to go through
23 procedurally to make this work in the most efficient and
24 successful way.

25 OSTROVSKY: Any other (inaudible) --

1 STOLDAL: Chairman -- okay. If -- if we're talking
2 about one and three, are you still thinking about all the
3 money is -- is allocated, all 4 million and -- and then we
4 divide it up into one in three?

5 OSTROVSKY: This is my thinking, but see, yeah, we --
6 we would allocate the entire 4 million in one hearing process,
7 and it's just a matter when those funds are distributed out to
8 the grantees.

9 STOLDAL: And the -- and the gap between the two, if
10 I understand correctly, would be six months?

11 OSTROVSKY: That's my understanding, is that correct?
12 Rebecca, approximately six months? I don't know where Rebecca
13 went, but that's what she said, six months.

14 RAPPA: This is Commissioner Rappa. Just for
15 clarification. So really what we're just -- we're talking
16 about this is a normal biannual cycle that we're on, it's just
17 that we have more money, and that we can't allocate the whole
18 amount because of fiscal year limitations. So it's not
19 really, I don't think that different than what we normally do,
20 it's just that we're gonna have a little bit of a time gap
21 before the second round of money comes through. And I guess,
22 especially given what we have later on the agenda of -- of all
23 of these asking for extensions, it just seems like, you know,
24 I don't -- I don't we're by postponing that second.

25 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Does any other Commissioner have a

1 comment? If not, I would certainly entertain a motion. Any
2 commissioner like to make a motion?

3 STOLDAL: Well, I think we -- what I would recommend
4 that we, it sounded like, the best way to go would be the
5 staff's recommendation of -- of one in -- one in -- one in
6 three with the concept that we would allocate all \$4 million
7 at one grant hearing, but some would get it in the first
8 slice, and then the next would be six months or whatever the
9 time period is would get the in -- in -- in the second slice.

10 OSTROVSKY: Right. (inaudible). Is there a second to
11 the motion?

12 RAPPA: This is Commissioner Rappa, I second.

13 OSTROVSKY: Any commissioners have questions or
14 comments about the motion?

15 CAVANAUGH: I only have one comment. For the record,
16 this is Commissioner Cavanaugh. I want to be careful that
17 when we --* when we proceed with this that we -- in -- make
18 sure that the staff is able to handle \$4 million worth of
19 allocation in -- in the grant cycle. They -- I wanna make
20 sure that they feel free to let us know whether or not they
21 have the capacity to make it work. That's (inaudible).

22 OSTROVSKY: Well, I -- I totally -- totally agree and
23 -- and they -- they -- they do -- they do have experience that
24 they're gonna have to learn from, as -- as was pointed out by
25 staff earlier. Is there any member of the public, either in

1 the hearing room, online or on the telephone that would like
2 to make a comment before we take a final vote on this matter?

3 PALMER: Sir, sir, for the record.

4 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

5 PALMER: I have one hand raised.

6 OSTROVSKY: That's fine. Why don't you permit them to
7 speak, please?

8 PALMER: Okay. Ron Applegate, you're on and can
9 speak.

10 APPLEGATE: Yeah, I -- you going through this, I, you
11 know -- I kind of, you know, appreciate the troubles you're
12 going through there to help us out there. The thing I with
13 was -- was thinking about is, especially with the, Stoldal
14 comments, is that fact is that if you had more money in head
15 in there, those things such as roof repairs and stuff like
16 that, you know, won't have to go through another wet season
17 like we did last time with our roof repair, and that might be
18 -- maybe that's how you're gonna choose who gets what first,
19 you know, ones that are really need the money. That's my only
20 comment.

21 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mr. Applegate. Any other
22 comments? All right. You've heard the motion. All those in
23 favor, please say aye.

24 MEMBERS: Aye.

25 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? All right, the motion

1 carries. The Chair votes in favor. Thank you very much.
2 Item 5, review of the Western Missionary Corporations request
3 to modify their grant and the grant is 19-25 to redirect the
4 entire grant award scope of work and budget of \$165,000 from
5 roof replacement to architectural and engineering services.
6 This is an action item. Rebecca, like to give us a little
7 background, please.

8 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
9 In the commission's last meeting, they asked this grantee who
10 requested to modify their entire grant from a construction
11 proposal to a development document prose -- proposal to review
12 the proposal and come back to the commission with a revised
13 scope of work and budget to address the grant. We believe
14 that this submission, previously provided to you and available
15 in the supplemental materials, meets the original request of
16 the commission.

17 OSTROVSKY: I -- do any commissioners have a question
18 about the -- we -- we're the ones that actually triggered this
19 request, asking for them to submit this to us. The
20 Commissioners have any questions about their submit --
21 submission or -- or the process?

22 STOLDAL: Chairman.

23 OSTROVSKY: Mr. Stoldal.

24 STOLDAL: Rebecca, you said that the language you
25 used was that this application meets the request of this

1 commission. Does it meet the standards required by the bond
2 process and by the existing rules and regulations of -- of --
3 of the Commission of Cultural Affairs and Historic Places? I
4 know there's -- there's detail of -- of each of the -- a
5 budget to some degree of -- of each of the elements that's in
6 this overall budget. Does it meet the proper standards for us
7 to move forward and take a vote?

8 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
9 Sir, yes, it does.

10 STOLDAL: Okay. Straightforward answer. Pending
11 any further discussion, I'd make a motion to approve.

12 CAVANAUGH: I'll second. This Commissioner Cavanaugh.

13 OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second. Approved
14 item number 5. Any other commissioners have questions or
15 comments?

16 ORTLIPP: This is Commissioner Ortlipp. I -- I
17 would concur with the -- with the discussion there. It seems
18 to make sense to be a little bit more thoughtful and not have
19 a situation where we piecemeal this and kind of make -- make
20 the best use of public money, and this seems to be the best
21 way to do that so.

22 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank you. (inaudible) --

23 RAPPA: This is commissioner -- this is
24 Commissioner Rappa. I just have a question for Rebecca.
25 Rebecca, did they apply for review for April? Do you know?

1 PALMER: For -- for the record, this is Rebecca
2 Palmer. I don't understand the question.

3 RAPPA: For the next grant review. I mean, have
4 they applied again?

5 PALMER: For -- for the record, this is Rebecca
6 Palmer. We have only received one application and it is not
7 this grantee.

8 RAPPA: Okay, got it. Okay. Thank you.

9 OSTROVSKY: Seeing no other questions from the
10 commission, anyone member of the public online, on the phone
11 or in the hearing room like to make a comment?

12 PALMER: Sir, this is Rebecca Palmer. I see no
13 hands raised.

14 OSTROVSKY: All right, fine. Given that opportunity,
15 now, we have a motion in a second before the Commission. All
16 those in favor, please say aye.

17 MEMBERS: Aye.

18 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The Chair votes in favor.
19 It's unanimous for the approval of agenda item number 5. A --
20 agenda item number 6 is a review of the grantee's progress to
21 date, discussion decision stand the May 10th, 2022 project
22 deadline for grantees requiring additional time to complete
23 their grant from the projects. This is an item that I kind of
24 been -- been in the background for some time now. I think the
25 commission has talked about it before about the difficulty

1 grantees are now having -- getting contractors or getting
2 materials to finish their progress reports for our per our
3 agreements with them. It was not my intent to go through
4 every one of these. I -- I will have staff, however, whether
5 there's anything unusual or -- or -- or any concerning request
6 that you have in the list that you had before you, which --
7 which indicates the status and those that will need some
8 extension. To staff, any -- any comment?

9 PALMER: Sir, for the record, we have no comment,
10 These, as you very clearly and concisely stated, these are
11 supply chain and contractor issues, primarily.

12 STOLDAL: Chairman, I did have a question.

13 PALMER: Yes.

14 STOLDAL: In the past -- Stoldal for the record.
15 I'd asked his AG's office just for a -- a -- an -- an opinion
16 about whether or not we can, in -- in fact, 'cause we're
17 exceeding, I think a couple hundred thousand dollars here,
18 whether or not we can take this as a clump because there are
19 different requests in here, and -- and let me back up,
20 Rebecca, what's the -- the -- the item 6 says, discussion and
21 decision to extend the May 10th deadline. So there's -- there
22 is different -- the extension is -- is to -- are all the
23 extension requests to the same deadline or to the same date,
24 or are we just generically extending them to some -- to -- to
25 some -- to some point because it -- I -- we're asking them to

1 extend it. How -- how far are we extending it, and are there
2 different extension requests for the different applications?

3 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
4 Staff would recommend a single extension date for all
5 applicants or all -- excuse me, all grant -- grants. That's
6 why all existing grants will expire on May 10th of 2022.

7 Staff recommends based on feedback we have received from the
8 grantees, who still have work to complete, that the extension
9 be to January 3rd, 2023. This will accommodate every single
10 grantee.

11 STOLDAL: Great. Okay. And so then just back to
12 the original question, Anthony is -- is can we do this in one
13 big clump or do we have to -- are these individual requests
14 and we need to deal with them individually?

15 ANTHONY: I think that's articulated clearly enough
16 for the record to be taken in one group.

17 STOLDAL: Okay.

18 ANTHONY: Yeah. Thank you.

19 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. They -- the January 3rd date, by
20 the way, new year's is Sunday, Monday's generally a holiday
21 following that, so this is really the first business day of
22 the year in 2023 and that's how that date ended up January
23 3rd, as opposed to the second, for example.

24 STOLDAL: Oh, I'd like to make a motion to extend
25 this, uh, to January 3rd, 2023, staff's date any, uh,

1 CAVANAUGH: Second, Commissioner Cavanaugh.

2 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Does anyone have any questions
3 about any of the -- the -- the listed grants here on this --
4 that were included in the agenda?

5 STOLDAL: I just had one Chairman. Stoldal, for the
6 record.

7 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

8 STOLDAL: And -- and that is Rebecca, generically,
9 or overall, you said this is a -- an issue with getting
10 contractors. Are there any other issues that this commission
11 should be aware of as we move forward in this new day and age
12 of -- of other things that are coming up that -- delay getting
13 these projects done? Are -- are you seeing anything other
14 than not being able to get contractors or prices going up?

15 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
16 Thank you for that excellent question. Yes, there is indeed a
17 concern across the state, and fran -- in fact, across the
18 nation on finding contractors who can work on historic
19 buildings. It is becoming critical. Historic preservation
20 projects require knowledge of historic buildings and
21 appropriate treatments, and across the nation, we are
22 experiencing a shortage, of craftsmen, of contractors. And so
23 our state preservation plan has in it a proposal to support
24 training opportunities at the universities and at trade
25 schools, so that we can grow the next generation of

1 contractors, and we are already experiencing this with our
2 current grantees in finding contractors willing to work on
3 historic buildings is becoming increasingly challenging. So -
4 - and I -- this -- I do not believe that will change in the
5 near -- in the future staff.

6 STOLDAL: Staff, I -- and Chairman, I -- I -- staff
7 already has plenty of work to do, but I -- I think it would be
8 very valuable if this commission could get a presentation on
9 this particular topic from staff with the -- with one of the
10 solutions and -- and that's a -- a training. Something
11 similar was going -- is going on with the -- with railroads,
12 historic railroads. Staff that -- and people that are able to
13 repair these historic trains are -- are -- are not in -- they
14 don't exist, and -- and so there's training programs and a
15 whole -- whole separate silo of -- of craftsmen that are being
16 -- being developed. But I think it would be beneficial for
17 this commission to get a -- a real good understanding of that
18 so if -- if the opportunity comes up, we could be very
19 supportive at the legislative level.

20 OSTROVSKY: Well, that's fine. I -- It's a good idea.
21 And I would ask staff to add it as an agenda on our discussion
22 at a future meeting. There may be things we can do that --
23 that you -- as you indicate, support -- basically supporting
24 our grantees now and in the future. Any other questions about
25 any specific item on the list agenda as -- as in item 6 for an

1 extension?

2 PALMER: Sir, I have --

3 OSTROVSKY: Yes, ma'am.

4 PALMER: -- one -- one hand raised in the
5 attendees.

6 OSTROVSKY: I see no -- no further questions from the
7 commission. Now would be the appropriate time for the public.
8 If someone has raised a hand, could you Rebecca, bring them on
9 please?

10 PALMER: Okay. Ella, you have been brought on.

11 TRUJILLO: Hi. For the record, this is Ella Trujillo
12 with the Carlin Historical Society. I am curious with the
13 extension, if -- if it passes, will staff be indicating to us
14 when additional progress reports will be due, or is that
15 something that the board will be deciding or I -- it may be in
16 statute, I don't know?

17 OSTROVSKY: Good question. I -- I will take the
18 time out to let staff try to respond to that.

19 PALMER: Okay. For the record, this is Rebecca
20 Palmer. The grant manual indicates that if a grant is
21 extended, additional progress reports will be required. So
22 when we extend your grant via amendment to the grant, we will
23 incorporate the dates upon which those additional progress
24 reports will be due to our office.

25 OSTROVSKY: Is there any other public comment, either

1 online, by the phone or in the hearing room? I -- I hear num
2 -- none. All those in favor of the motion to approve agenda
3 items 6, please say aye.

4 MEMBERS: Aye.

5 OSTROVSKY: Anyone opposed? The Chair votes in favor.
6 It's unanimous, made carried and ask staff to take the
7 appropriate steps to prepare those dates and to notify the -
8 the grantees of -- of the change in their -- their
9 requirements under their grant. Now would be appropriate time
10 for further public comment. We would encourage public comment
11 and may limit its time to three minutes if necessary, the
12 Chair's request. Is -- is there anyone member of the public
13 in the hearing room, online or on the phone that would like to
14 make a public comment at this time?

15 PALMER: For the record, sir, I see none.

16 OSTROVSKY: All right. Any commissioner like to make
17 any comment under public comment?

18 CAVANAUGH: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is Commissioner
19 Cavanaugh. I would like to thank the staff for putting that
20 list together and keeping us updated on the progress of the
21 projects that we have granted. This really does help add to
22 our fiduciary responsibility as commissioners to oversee how
23 those funds are expended, so I'd like to extend my gratitude
24 to all of the staff who worked on putting that together.

25 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Any other Commissioners?

1 Hearing no other comment, that is the -- the end of our
2 agenda. I -- I do appreciate everyone's participation today,
3 and we will let you know the next date that we can try to get
4 everyone on board for the next -- the next step in the process
5 of moving along that exciting \$4 million. It's a lot of money
6 and, it will be very helpful to the various communities to get
7 the money out as quickly as possible and as appropriately as
8 possible. So I really look forward to that opportunity to
9 have a little room in our budgetary process. Hopefully, we'll
10 also bring in some, maybe new applicants, so it'll be
11 challenging for us, but at the same time, very rewarding. I
12 thank you very much for taking the time out today and wish you
13 all a happy February. Bye folks. Thank you and meeting
14 adjourned.

15 MALE: Well done, everyone. Thank you.

16 FEMALE: Have a nice day, be well.

17 FEMALE: Thank you. Bye-bye, everybody.

18
19 [end of meeting]
20
21
22
23
24
25