

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

STATE OF NEVADA
DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES
MEETING TRANSCRIPT
TUESDAY, JUNE 14, 2022

OSTROVSKY: We'll discuss. And you should indicate that this is a public meeting that's actually being recorded, so understand that when you speak, you will be part of that record. The -- would you like to give us a quick review of the 2019 and '20 grant cycle, Rebecca, as indicated on the agenda?

PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer. I'd like to give a quick overview of what remains from the FY19-20 grant cycle. There were 24 grants awarded to buildings within the state. Of those 24, nine have completed their projects and successfully submitted final reports. Those final reports will eventually be posted on the website so that they'll be available for the citizens of Nevada to see the work that this commission funds. Three additional grantees have submitted final reports but they are in the process of being reviewed and once they are complete and accepted by staff, the remaining 10% of their grant award will be released. Those are Genoa Courthouse, Pioneer Hotel, and the Brewery Arts Center projects. The Ely City Hall was extended to September the 30th of 2022 per, per the request of

1 the Commission. There are nine grants that were extended to
2 January 3rd of 2022. Of those nine grants, staff would like
3 to bring to the attention of the Commission three. The first
4 one is the McGill Depot and Transportation Building. It, it's
5 two separate grants, one to the McGill Depot and one to the
6 Transportation Building. Construction on those projects has
7 not yet commenced. In addition, the staff has not received
8 the architectural drawings or other required information
9 specified in attachment A1 of the funding agreements. This is
10 concerning given the short time remaining to complete those
11 projects. The Western Missionary Museum Corporation recently
12 posted social media -- on social media that they are closing
13 the building. We have no confirmation of this, but that
14 concerns us and we will continue to watch this unfold. And
15 then finally, Goldfield High School is still working on bids
16 for the roof with contractors expressing concerns about the
17 distance to travel from their home bases. This is concerning
18 for us particularly given the limited amount of time
19 remaining. We will continue to watch these, these and all --
20 these three and then all of the other grants that were
21 extended and we'll update the Commission at their next
22 meeting. And that's the summary of the FY19-20 grant cycle.

23 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Rebecca. I, I'm going to ask
24 you in a moment to update us on the bond sales, but before
25 that, I'd like to ask the commissioners if they have any

1 questions of staff related to prior cycle, the F19-20 cycle.

2 Mr. Stoldal, I see your hand raised.

3 STOLDAL: Rebecca, the -- you used the phrase
4 specific -- for a couple times, but specifically for McGill,
5 used the phrase 'short time to complete'. How much time is
6 that?

7 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
8 The time remaining on those grants is January 3rd, 2022, so
9 there -- it --

10 STOLDAL: '22 or '23?

11 PALMER: '22. Oh, I'm sorry. January 3rd, 2023.
12 My apologies. That is a typo. I -- time is escaping me.
13 It's just --

14 STOLDAL: So, so is that for both the projects out
15 of the Nevada Northern Foundation or just the McGill?

16 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
17 It's for both of those projects.

18 BROWN: May I -- this is Kristen Brown for the
19 record. May I add something to this conversation?

20 OSTROVSKY: Certainly.

21 BROWN: I apologize. The transportation building
22 did submit their drawings recently, just this month. So I
23 apologize that that information wasn't forwarded to Rebecca.
24 We did look at the -- they are on track with the drawings.
25 The construction has not started yet on that building, but we

1 did have an opportunity to look at the drawings just recently.

2 STOLDAL: So if I understand correctly, Stoldal for
3 the record, that you've re -- there are two grants out --
4 outstanding. One is for McGill and we haven't received
5 anything for that.

6 BROWN: I believe we are still waiting for some
7 final clarification on the Depot project --

8 STOLDAL: Okay.

9 BROWN: -- with the applicant but, like I say,
10 neither -- the work has not started yet, but we have been in
11 communication.

12 STOLDAL: And the transportation building, that's
13 separate and you have received some --

14 BROWN: We -- correct. We -- this is Kristen
15 Brown. We did receive drawings recently just this month and
16 we did take a look at those and we're waiting to hear back
17 when those will be going out to bid and when they expect that
18 the work will start.

19 STOLDAL: Rebecca, my question is -- a second part
20 of the question is, the buildings and, and, and the projects
21 are, are important, but so is the money. Is there a, a point
22 that we will lose this, this grant money if these projects are
23 not completed and/or started? Help me get a better
24 understanding of the timeframe of, of when the money needs to
25 be spent.

1 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
2 There are varying opinions as to when the money needs to be
3 spent and that is because this is a combination of development
4 plans and construction. Construction has three years from the
5 date of the sale of the bonds, but development has two, so it,
6 it's, it's a question of interpretation. We've always given
7 them as, as much time as we have available. At this point,
8 January 3rd, 2023 is the drop-dead date. Because these are
9 general obligation bonds, there, there is a deadline. I'm
10 just alerting the Commission that progress needs to begin
11 sooner rather than later so that these projects can be
12 completed by that January 3rd, 2023 date.

13 STOLDAL: So I, I, I'm still not understanding
14 though. The January -- I've got that date, January 2023, that
15 the project needs to be completed, but let's assume worst-case
16 scenario, it is not. Do we lose the money?

17 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
18 No.

19 STOLDAL: Okay.

20 PALMER: There is a slight bit more wiggle room,
21 but we -- it would be ill-advised to give them any additional
22 extensions.

23 STOLDAL: Chairman Ostrovsky, what -- where I'm
24 going with that is, yes, January 20 -- of '23 is the time the
25 project needs to be done, but, but if they're not done, what

1 happens to the money and if we've only got a couple of weeks
2 to spend it or a month or so to spend it or two months,
3 shouldn't there be an earlier timeframe that, that, okay,
4 folks, you're not going to get it done, so we could reallocate
5 that money to some projects that may be shovel-ready or, or we
6 weren't able to fund them fully?

7 OSTROVSKY: This is Bob Ostrovsky. Yeah. That --
8 interesting point. Rebecca, if we -- if they fail and, and --
9 to complete by the January date and we tried to reallocate,
10 there's, there's no project that can get done that quickly.
11 Should the Commission be thinking about establishing a -- an
12 earlier deadline that would give us -- to show at least
13 progress, which would indicate completion by the date? Or
14 could we then withdraw the funds if they don't and we could
15 reallocate that?

16 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
17 Withdrawing the funds is certainly an option. However, the
18 Commission had anticipated that the extension to January 3rd,
19 2022 would be the very last that this could be extended and it
20 -- as a result, the Commission very wisely put in place
21 multiple progress report requirements, so as we move forward
22 through the construction season, there are required progress
23 reports that must be submitted by those who had received the
24 extension, so we will be able to catch projects that aren't
25 making adequate progress in those reporting periods. So the

1 next reporting period is August the 1st, 2022, and it -- I
2 would, I would recommend to staff that by August the 1st,
3 2022, if adequate progress has not been made, then the
4 Commission could make a different decision.

5 STOLDAL: And, and just for the clarification,
6 Rebecca, I think you, you use the, the date January '22 again.
7 I think you meant '23?

8 PALMER: Oh.

9 STOLDAL: Sorry, sorry. Just so the record's clear.

10 PALMER: My apologies. When I say January the 3rd,
11 2022, I mean, January the 3rd, 2023. My apologies. I --

12 STOLDAL: No, no.

13 OSTROVSKY: Rebecca, if you would, after that August
14 deadline, would you advise the Chair and Vice Chair of this
15 Commission of the status of those, those grants so that we
16 could make a decision about whether or not we need a --
17 another meeting of the Commission to take whatever action is
18 necessary to see that, that -- those funds are properly made
19 available and expend -- expended in the appropriate time? So
20 if you would notify us, we could make that decision?

21 PALMER: For the record, the
22 his is Rebecca Palmer. Yes, we will do that.

23 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

24 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, do you know -- Stoldal for the
25 record -- if the applicant from Goldfield, or Rebecca or

1 staff, if that person is online or intending to join this
2 meeting? Do we know?

3 PALMER: Yes. Goldfield is on the line.

4 STOLDAL: Okay. All right, great. 'Cause I think
5 you bring up a great -- a challenging question for a lot of
6 the grants and that is getting contractors at, at some of
7 these places to, to come out and, and do the work, even though
8 it's -- anyway, thank you.

9 OSTROVSKY: Well, I think we will hear from Goldfield
10 later on the agenda, unless, Bob, you want to ask them that
11 question now. You're more than -- you can do that if you'd
12 like.

13 STOLDAL: Yeah, I think I'll, I'll wait, 'cause we
14 got a lot of, a lot of work to do.

15 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Any other commissioners have any
16 questions of staff? Seeing none, Rebecca, could you, could
17 you bring us up to date on the bond sales for this current
18 cycle?

19 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
20 The first bond sale has occurred. That was for \$1 million and
21 I don't believe the proceeds have been deposited into the
22 account yet, but we're awaiting that, and we'll -- I will
23 update when the proceeds are actually deposited. The second
24 bond sale for \$3 million, so that the total of \$4 million is
25 available, will occur in October. And the proceeds should be

1 deposited sometime in November. So there's two separate bond
2 sales. This is an anomaly that I sincerely hope will only
3 happen in this grant cycle. It's due to some different
4 interpretations of, of when the bond sales should occur and so
5 this is in a unique circumstance where \$1 million will be
6 available relatively quickly and then \$3 million will be
7 available in November.

8 OSTROVSKY: I have a little background noise here, but
9 temporary. So that, that influences, and as we grant the
10 money today, it means we have to plan that expenditures over
11 time. It is not all available quickly. Is that right?

12 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
13 Yes, that is indeed the case. There will be a million
14 available now and 3 million in November. For the record, this
15 is Rebecca Palmer as well. I -- depending on, on how the
16 economy continues or does not in the future, this may be a
17 more common occurrence.

18 STOLDAL: Chairman, I --

19 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

20 STOLDAL: -- I'm wondering whether or not it would
21 be appropriate as, as we go through each of these applicants
22 to simply ask them the question whether or not they're shovel
23 ready. I, I note that, for example, I think Fallon already
24 has bids in or he has a local contractor and they're just
25 waiting for the money, but I wasn't able to tell on the other

1 grants, whether or not they've got people just standing by.
2 I'm wondering if that would be appropriate to ask that
3 question. Thank you.

4 OSTROVSKY: That certainly would, and, and for those
5 folks listening in, we'll think about that because we'll be
6 asking that question as we go along and you'll understand why,
7 because we've got this little cash flow issue that we need to
8 make sure we manage properly.

9 PALMER: For, for the record, this is Rebecca
10 Palmer. Chair, I see Antoinette Kavanaugh's (phonetic) hand
11 raised.

12 OSTROVSKY: All right. Please, Commissioner.
13 Questions.

14 KAVANAUGH: For the record, this is Antoinette
15 Kavanaugh. Rebecca, I have a question. Well, I think I know
16 the answer because we had discussed this before, but I think
17 for the edification of those in attendance, it would be
18 valuable to explain why this is an anomaly this year.

19 OSTROVSKY: Rebecca, could you answer that --

20 KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible) why this, why this fund -- why
21 this funding is an anomaly this year.

22 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
23 The, the interpretation of parties at the Treasurer's Office
24 for many years was that there needed to be grant awards made
25 first and then bond sales to support the grant awards. That

1 is not a correct interpretation of statute. The statute very
2 clearly states that the Commission will determine how much it
3 wishes to award in an upcoming grant cycle request, that bond
4 sales in that amount be sold to the Board of Finance, and then
5 the grant cycle will begin. So for many years, the
6 interpretation was that the grant awards had to be made first
7 and -- however, that's been reinterpreted and now, the grant
8 award, as we did -- are we doing this cycle is occurring after
9 the Commission has decided to award \$4 million in -- or minus
10 administrative requirements. That's the reason for this
11 anomaly. Additionally, the Treasurer's Office usually only
12 has one bond sale per calendar year. In this particular
13 cycle, because of the needs of a different program, the
14 infrastructure bank, there are actually two bond sales in this
15 calendar year, one in the spring for the infrastructure bank
16 of which we were able to participate at \$1 million, and then
17 the normal bond sale in October, where we would normally
18 participate where \$3 million we -- the Commission will receive
19 in proceeds. The state statute very clearly says that the
20 Commission can receive no more than \$3 million in any fiscal
21 year, so we're receiving \$1 million in this fiscal year, FY22,
22 and we will receive the \$3 million in FY23, and so that's the
23 explanation for the anomalies.

24 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Rebecca. Any other questions?
25 Just let me double check that I've got coverage here. Any

1 other staff announcements? You all right, Rebecca?

2 PALMER: For the record, I have no other staff
3 announcements at this time.

4 OSTROVSKY: Only personal -- we will take a, a break
5 somewhere, you know, 10:30 or 11:00, and then, I would like to
6 squeeze in a lunch break around noon, somewhere around noon,
7 12:30, depending upon the way it goes, a 30-minute lunch
8 break. We do have a lot of work to do. I'd like to get it
9 done in a one-day hearing, which I believe is very possible to
10 do, but just so your planning purposes, lunch around noonish.
11 We'll just go kind of the flow of the meeting. The next
12 agenda item is item 5. That's approval of the minutes from
13 the previous meeting of November 3rd, 2021. They were
14 distributed and are available on the website. Does anyone
15 have any questions, comments, or other concerns about the
16 minutes?

17 STOLDAL: I do not. Would make a motion to approve
18 as they stand.

19 OSTROVSKY: Motion by Commissioner Stoldal. Anyone
20 like to second that motion?

21 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead, second.

22 OSTROVSKY: Commissioner Olmstead, second. Any
23 further discussion? And we'll call any members of the public
24 that have any comments about the minutes? Seeing and hearing
25 none, all those in favor of approval of the minutes, say aye.

1 MULTIPLE: Aye.

2 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chairman votes in favor, so
3 they are adopted and made officially part of the record. We
4 will now move on to item number 6, discussion of Commission
5 scoring method, grant review process, and review of statutory
6 responsibilities of the Commission. I'll go in reverse order
7 and ask Mr. Stoldal, who usually does this for us, to give us
8 a quick review of our statutory responsibilities.

9 STOLDAL: Sure. Thank you. Pulling out the, the
10 focus of today's activities, which is the, the granting of
11 funds, 5 -- NRS 383.500 through 520 includes the creation of
12 this Commission, but also has details regarding the program of
13 awarding financial assessment -- assistance, and the state law
14 provides the Commission with the authority to (1) award
15 financial assessment -- assistance to government entities and
16 nonprofit corporations formed for educational or charitable
17 purposes, including, but without limitation, the preservation
18 or promotion of cultural resources, (2) financial assistance
19 may only be awarded for the actual expense of preserving or
20 protecting historic buildings and here's the criteria on which
21 the proposed projects will be judged, according to state law.
22 The criteria must include, but is not limited to, a
23 consideration to the degree the proposed project (A) may be
24 moving -- may be able to move forward without the necessity of
25 future state financial support, (B) a project that will be

1 accessible to the community, (C) a project that will promote
2 tourism in the state, (D) a project that will promote or
3 preserve some historic or prehistoric feature of Nevada and
4 (E) will have multiple uses for many types of cultural
5 organizations, (F) the project will supplement training in the
6 classroom in the arts and humanities, and (G) incorporates
7 various disciplines directly associated with cultural
8 resources. Also a number 4 within the NRS 383.50, the
9 Commission will give priority to projects of statewide
10 historic, prehistoric, or cultural significance, which
11 demonstrates the ability to raise financial support from
12 sources other than the State of Nevada. The Commission will
13 give priority to those projects that have the ability to raise
14 and sustain support. That, however, must be weighed against
15 the relative means and abilities of the applicant and, Chair
16 Ostrovsky, the, the Commission in the past has also, as policy
17 given projects that are re -- actual emergencies, that are
18 really emergencies, we've given them top consideration, and
19 we've also looked at those projects that can be completed by
20 this -- the grant. So those are the, the details, both
21 operational policy and, and NRS that we operate under.

22 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mr. Stoldal. Now that we've
23 had that review, this section of the agenda, we'll talk about
24 scoring methods and grant review process and, and I think in,
25 in doing that, we need to talk generally about the, the

1 applications that we received. We have a, a very detailed
2 manual on, on how to submit an application and what's
3 required. We have staff, which has taken considerable amount
4 of time in the past and currently to work with applicants that
5 have questions, concerns, don't understand or, or make some
6 assistance in following the -- their guidelines that we've
7 outlined.

8 STOLDAL: Chairman Ostrovsky, I, I apologize. I --
9 where you're going is really important and, and I think we
10 need to do that, but I left out page 3 of, of my overview. If
11 I could -- you want to jump back or do you want to finish?

12 OSTROVSKY: No, go ahead.

13 STOLDAL: The, the Commission on Cultural Centers
14 and Historic Places has the authority to award a sum greater
15 than originally requested by the applicant if it is in the
16 best interest of the building and the overall project. The
17 CCHP also has the authority to fund and request the applicant
18 prepare studies from seismic to arch -- archeolog -- arche --
19 well, archeological, as well as agricultural -- not
20 agriculture -- architectural. Maybe an arch, arch --
21 agriculture would be, but, but this says architectural report
22 in preparation of specific suitable plans to be used for
23 estimating cost, biddings, and permitting the repair,
24 restoration, or rehabilitation but not limited to the
25 essential elements of the building, the structure, the

1 foundation, the walls, and the roof. The -- this Commission
2 has looked at those elements, the -- of the structure, the
3 foundation, the walls, and roof as well as asking for reports
4 on those elements before actual construction grants are made,
5 and the last one is the Commission has the authority to
6 request the applicant return to the Commission at a later date
7 with the requested documents to determine a final grant award.
8 Thank you.

9 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Bob 'cause all of those will
10 come into play today, almost every point that, that Bob made -
11 - that Commissioner Stoldal made. I'm sorry. So we need to
12 keep those in mind because if, if you go through these grant
13 applications and, and I have an opinion, and I know some other
14 commissioners may have an opinion about how those grants were
15 prepared and submitted in this cycle. I'll hold my comments
16 for just a minute and see if other commissioners want to make
17 any comments about the applications in general, not
18 specifically. We talk about specifics because we're going to
19 review each one eventually, but I think some statement needs
20 to be made about them. I know, Bob, you had some points and
21 I'll make some others.

22 STOLDAL: Chairman, I, --

23 OSTROVSKY: Right.

24 STOLDAL: -- I look at, at these grants when the,
25 the grant cycle really as a, as a, as a wonderful opportunity

1 to, to visit parts of the state and specific projects and
2 learn about the history, really deep dive into the history of,
3 of these projects and into the, into the communities. And
4 they're at different levels. Some, some applicants have made
5 applications before, so they've been through the process, so
6 they understand what the grant manual says. The grant
7 manuals, by the way, are very clear. The applications are
8 very clear. It's like a checklist. Fille this in, fill this
9 in, fill this in. This time around, this was a little bit --
10 while I still enjoyed visiting all parts of the, all parts of
11 the state vicariously through these grant applications, and
12 some of them, of course, are that thick and some of them have
13 accompanying reports, master plans, and, and all kinds of
14 helpful information. On the other hand, some of them just
15 weren't -- were totally incomplete. I mean, one, they, they
16 just -- they miss all of the key elements in order for this
17 Commission to understand what the project is and, and, and
18 what the, what the funding and, and, and how the, the funding
19 figures were arrived at along with critical things like who
20 owns the land, who owns that building. I mean, how can we
21 give money to, to where we don't -- because we require --
22 before the grants are, are -- actually the money is given out,
23 that they sign covenants, the owner sign covenants to, to, to
24 protect the, the properties. And, and then there's a question
25 of the, of the audits, and the audits are clearly required.

1 There's two or three or four places to where it says an audit.
2 And -- but then there's also some room where he's saying, If
3 you don't have an audit, tell us why. I mean, it's not, it's
4 not a, a, a capital offense not to have -- 'cause some of the
5 smaller nonprofits may not do an audit every year, but just --
6 tell, tell (Inaudible), tell the, the, the Commission why,
7 why, why, why there, why there's no audit. Explanations are
8 just really helpful within this application process. So this
9 time, there were lots of them that. It was just a struggle
10 to, to -- and, and, and I make a practice not to call the
11 applicants or communicate to -- directly in, in, in any way
12 and, and just use the application form. So, a lot of
13 questions today, so maybe you -- we ought to plan a dinner
14 break as well as lunch.

15 OSTROVSKY: This is Bob. Any, any other commissioners
16 have comments? Yeah, I, I have similar comments to Bob and,
17 and therefore I think you'll see, we may put some requirements
18 on some applicants that, that make it approval, but they're
19 going to be some requirements they provide certain
20 information. I, I was just sort of disappointed. After many
21 years on this Commission, I, I find it difficult that a number
22 of, of grant requests where, as Bob said, just had holes, just
23 missing information. Not saying, Hey, I, I couldn't get it or
24 I'll have it next month or we'll get an audit next spring or
25 we had one two years ago and just to, just to sort of pass

1 over it, was really not acceptable. Made it difficult for
2 staff, made it difficult for at least myself to make some
3 decisions about these, and we'll talk about decisions because
4 in one way they're more difficult, in another way, they're,
5 they're, they're easier. I just -- I, I urge those folks out
6 there who, who make -- who do these applications, spend some
7 time. Be careful about them. I -- and I've always
8 understood, there are people out there, local governments and
9 state governments, that have staff and, and they can put
10 together the 400-page application and submission. We've got
11 some groups out there that are relatively small, have very
12 limited resources, and I take -- take that into consideration
13 when I look at the application, but blank holes are not, not
14 acceptable. So you've got to, you've got to give us the
15 information. If you don't have it, you got to tell us why
16 not, or that you're going to get it. So we'll be going --
17 we'll talking about that today as we go, so just a point made
18 and, and, you know, staff has limited time and, and they're
19 trying to put it together the best they can, and we'd like
20 staff to be as productive as possible, so -- without having to
21 chase, chase after information that should have been submitted
22 in the first place. Let's talk for a moment about scoring. I
23 know, as in the past cycles, we've had to create budgets and
24 determine what portion of the funding we can achieve with
25 limited dollars. That scoring method will not be used in this

1 cycle. For, for fairly obvious reasons, the, the total bonded
2 amount is going to be \$4 million. We've got a \$200,000 set-
3 aside for administrative costs, so we have got \$3.8 million
4 available for grant awards. We only received \$3.3 million,
5 \$562,067 worth of request, so we actually have more funds than
6 we have requests, so getting back to Commissioner Stoldal's
7 review of the statute, our -- and, and our operating policies,
8 we can grant that amount. We can grant less if we think the
9 projects are not viable or we think there's some -- that, that
10 we can only fund a portion of them because that's all the, the
11 Commission wants to do, but we do have available funds to
12 grant all of this. We can also grant, as Mr. Stoldal
13 indicated, additional monies where we think it's required up
14 to that \$4 million number, actually \$3.8 million available for
15 distribution, so I will not be asking the commissioners to
16 establish a separate budget to submit, and, if you know, we
17 had that process of comparing all of our notes, but we will be
18 making decisions along the way. We may have to talk about
19 wanting to distribute extra dollars if necessary. We may also
20 want to talk about having some requirements before we'll allot
21 all the money, whether a study may be required, a seismic
22 study, an engineering study. I think some questions will
23 arise that this Commission will want some reassurance that
24 what the applicant wants to do is really a first step or a
25 second step, and if it's the second step, we need to talk

1 about, well, have you done the seismic work, for example, so
2 we will get, we will get to those as we go along. As a grant
3 review process, we will be calling each grant request to make
4 very short comments. I'm particularly focused on any changes
5 that have taken place since the grant request was made, were
6 there any factors we need to consider. We do not permit or
7 this Commission does not permit submission of new, new grant
8 projects, but we've had indications where some requesters have
9 received funds from another source, which have changed the
10 numbers that have received new bids, which have changed the
11 numbers or something, something has happened to the facility,
12 a, a roof problem, a window, water damage, that has arisen
13 since it's grant application was submitted, and we do take
14 those into consideration. So, does any other commissioner
15 have comment about that before we go on to calling the grants
16 forward? Again, when we call you forward, give us a very
17 brief overview of the project. I can assure you every one of
18 these commissioners have read these grants more than once, and
19 so they'll have questions of you. So if you could keep your
20 comments relatively short, introduce yourself, tell us a
21 little bit -- any changes to the grant, anything that you
22 think is absolutely significant that we know, and then give us
23 an opportunity to raise questions to you, that would be great.
24 So with that, I would move on to item 7, which is, in fact,
25 the review and testimony regarding these grants. These -- we

1 will take them in the order that they were received and the
2 first grant, which is identified as 2101, Storey County
3 Courthouse. Let everyone get their notes together. Is there
4 someone here who, online or otherwise, that's available to
5 address us on Storey County Courthouse?

6 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. One moment. I'll bring them
7 on.

8 OSTROVSKY: Thank you.

9 HITCHCOCK: Honey, you are on. You can unmute
10 yourself.

11 MENEFEE: Okay. Can you hear me?

12 HITCHCOCK: And I brought Lara Mather on as well in
13 case she needed to speak too.

14 MATHER: Are you, are you able to hear me?

15 UNIDENTIFIED: I can hear you.

16 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

17 MENEFEE: Good morning, Commissioners. Honey
18 Menefee, Storey County Community Relations for the record. We
19 have no changes at this time from our original application
20 that we submitted to you. I would just like to highlight a
21 few parts of our application and why we feel that our proposed
22 project is significant. The Storey County Courthouse in
23 Virginia City is the oldest continuously operating courthouse
24 in Nevada. Construction began on the building in 1876 after
25 the Great Fire of 1875, which destroyed a third of the town.

1 Virginia City at one time was considered the richest place on
2 earth and since then has gone through various periods of booms
3 and busts after the initial discovery of gold and silver in
4 the 1850s. Throughout the years of great economic success and
5 subsequent -- subsequent declines, the Storey County
6 Courthouse has remained in operation. Providing services for
7 all of Storey County, the courthouse is home to most of the
8 county government, including the District Court, Human
9 Resources, County Commissioners, Planning, Assessors,
10 Department of Motor Vehicles, Recorder, Clerk-Treasurer, and
11 the County Manager, and all of these offices may be accessed
12 by the public during business hours. Election voting also
13 takes place in the building such as today. Further, the
14 Slammer and Museum, which is free of charge, exhibits the
15 history of Storey County from its inception through today, and
16 it is to the public Monday through Friday. More than a
17 million tourists visit Virginia City annually, and tourism
18 plays a vital role in the economic success of the region, and
19 the Slammer and Museum is a popular attraction. Throughout
20 its 145 years, the Courthouse has undergone periodic
21 technological upgrades to allow for the continuous operations
22 of the county government. Much of the electrical wiring in
23 the courthouse remains in critical need of rehabilitation. In
24 the past, portions of the electrical wiring were upgraded in
25 phases with the most recent upgrades made possible by

1 Commission for Cultural Affairs grants and Historic
2 Preservation Fund Grants between 2010 and 2014. The remaining
3 wiring, which has not been upgraded, poses a fire hazard to
4 this historic building, its contents, and records. Our
5 proposed project is for the removal and replacement of the
6 hazardous outdated wiring, outlets, and other devices. This
7 includes tracing, rerouting, and relabeling the current
8 circuitry, which is necessary due to past upgrades, wherein
9 the outdated and unused wiring and outlets were left in place.
10 The old and unused wiring and outlets create confusion in
11 tracing current electrical issues when they occur. And that
12 is the end of my record. And I am available for questions.

13 OSTROVSKY: Thank you very much. Commissioners, it's
14 appropriate now to ask questions of the applicant.

15 STOLDAL: Chair, Stoldal for the record. I, I, I
16 don't have -- the, the application is, is complete. It's,
17 it's clear. I did have a question though for staff regarding
18 the, the dollar figure, the amount of money that, according to
19 the, uh, the, the bid that's in here is quoted at \$95 an hour,
20 but -- and, and that exceeds a, a figure of -- that we're
21 allowed to give, either the Commission is allowed to give,
22 SHPO, or the State of Nevada or all or one in the same.

23 OSTROVSKY: You have comment, Rebecca?

24 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
25 The maximum rate allowed by this Commission is \$82.57. The

1 estimate for -- from United Electrical Services has a code of
2 \$95 per hour. Any portion above the maximum cannot be
3 reimbursed by the Commission.

4 STOLDAL: Where, where -- how, how is that -- is
5 that a number that is a state number or something that the
6 Commission could change or how, how -- where do the -- is, is
7 that updated on a regular basis, the \$82.57?

8 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
9 The amount comes from our federal grant, which is -- that's
10 the allowed rate under our federal grant. However, there is -
11 - I would defer to Attorney Walsh if there's a, requirement in
12 state statutes. That, like I said, that number came from our
13 federal grant, but perhaps there is a limit in state law. If
14 not, then perhaps the Commission could raise that.

15 STOLDAL: Thank you.

16 WALSH: Thank you, Rebecca. This is Anthony Walsh
17 for the record. I'm not aware of any statutory provision that
18 would prevent that type of change discussed.

19 STOLDAL: I, I appreciate the, I appreciate source
20 of the number and, and the, the ability of, of this Commission
21 to, to potentially grant the full grant \$80, \$80,000, so thank
22 you, Mr. Chair.

23 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. I have a question. First,
24 Commissioner Kavanaugh? Your hand raised?

25 KAVANAUGH: Thank you. My question -- this is

1 Commission Kavanaugh for the record. My question would be, is
2 there an exception to the federal amount due to factors around
3 COVID costs? We've, we've seen such an increase in cost for
4 product as well as hourly professional costs. Is -- could
5 that be an exception?

6 OSTROVSKY: Well, I think this Commission could make
7 an exception if it decided it wanted to. My, my question for
8 Honey is this -- Honey, is this a Public Works project?

9 MENEFEE: This is not a Public Works project. You -
10 - this project will go out to bid. Most likely, United
11 Electrical Services will, will be putting in a bid to do the
12 work. They have done much of the electrical work in the past
13 on the courthouse and are very familiar with the courthouse's
14 needs. Public Works will be overseeing the project, but
15 United Electrical Services or another contractor that wins the
16 contract for bid will be taking care of the work.

17 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, Stoldal for the record. Did I
18 hear you correctly that you -- we wanted to take each of these
19 applications on a one-by-one basis rather than wait until the
20 end?

21 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

22 STOLDAL: Thank you. Now I just -- I would -- I
23 don't know whether we, we make a motion, but I just make a
24 motion to, to grant the, the full amount of \$80,418 to
25 Applicant 21-01 Storey County Courthouse Electrical

1 Renovation. I'm not, I'm not sure if that's --

2 KAVANAUGH: I'll second.

3 STOLDAL: -- the procedure you want to go for.

4 OSTROVSKY: That's fine. We can use that procedure.

5 We'll take them one at a time. That would be fine.

6 STOLDAL: Thank you.

7 OSTROVSKY: Seconded by whom? I'm sorry.

8 KAVANAUGH: Commissioner Kavanaugh for the record. I
9 second.

10 OSTROVSKY: Kavanaugh second. Any commissioners want
11 to further discuss 21-01? Anyone make public comment
12 regarding 21-01? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor
13 of approving 21-01 in the full amount of \$80,418, please say
14 aye.

15 MULTIPLE: Aye.

16 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chairman votes in favor.
17 It's unanimous. Thank you very much, and looking forward to,
18 to visiting the Storey County Courthouse. If you haven't been
19 there, you should make an attempt. Thank you very much. I'll
20 give you one second to clear your desk here and we'll get on
21 to two. All right. We, oh, application 21-02 is the Comstock
22 Cemetery Foundation for the Visitor Center Water Waste System.
23 Is there someone available to speak regarding the Comstock
24 Cemetery Foundation?

25 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I'll bring on Candace Wheeler.

1 candace, you're on. Go ahead and unmute.

2 WHEELER: Can you hear me?

3 OSTROVSKY: We can. Thank you for being here and
4 now's your opportunity.

5 WHEELER: Okay. I'm Candace Wheeler. I'm the
6 Executive Director for the Comstock Cemetery Foundation. Last
7 week, we invited contributors, volunteers, and county staff to
8 take a little peek of our visitor center in the making. We
9 had about 70 people during which we took an opportunity to
10 take a little survey to assess our process so far. One
11 hundred percent of the responders gave us a five and above for
12 our ability to share Comstock architectural history, the
13 potential to educate the public, and to make a contribution to
14 the community's visitors, and for our teacher's design
15 programming for fourth graders. The Center's purpose is not
16 just for public education, but also a research center largely
17 dedicated to genealogy, and according to the World's Tourism
18 Organization, genealogical tourism is the fastest growing
19 travel category for the next three to five years. To the best
20 of our knowledge, when we open, we will be the only historic
21 cemetery interpretive center in the State of Nevada. The work
22 to date brings us very close to opening. It's been largely
23 completed with local crafts people and over 40 volunteers.
24 Our current request is not quite the cherry on the top, but
25 it's definitely the whipped cream. We're looking for

1 plumbing, sewage, and a design for a public toilet. We are
2 lucky that water was brought to the cemetery in 1995. We're
3 lucky that we are only dealing with two toilets and three
4 sinks, and we're lucky to have local skilled people to
5 accomplish the work. We were not so lucky to discover that we
6 could not hook up to the town sewage system because it was
7 about a half a mile away through bedrock, required a pump, and
8 would be about a \$250,000 ticket item. However, Lady Luck
9 came in again and, given our location, we are prime candidates
10 to utilize a septic system. Besides the plumbing and the
11 sewer request, we also included a professional design for a
12 public toilet that would be adjacent to, but detached from,
13 our visitor center. Why? Well, because it services the
14 community and the public. We get an average of a hundred
15 visitors a day and the number two question after, is there
16 anyone famous buried there, is where can I pee? And that's
17 about a half a mile away. Also the VCTA will tell you a
18 number one visitor concern is the availability of public
19 toilets in Virginia City. We're lucky that most of our in --
20 in-house plans, we were able to do without seeking a lot of
21 expensive professional help. However, when it comes to a
22 public toilet, we want to make sure that it fits the
23 characteristics. It doesn't disrupt from the visual corridor,
24 and, of course, we have the ADA compliance. By allowing us to
25 determine that design now, it will really determine where we

1 go with the septic and the plumbing lines and the -- my last
2 four seconds, I just want to thank SHPO for all the help over
3 the past two years, and for Carla dealing with my mathematical
4 inabilities. That's it.

5 OSTROVSKY: Well, thank you very much and, we, we
6 noted we, we had to -- there was -- so little math problems.
7 We got those figured out. I'll ask the other commissioners,
8 but first, I mean, very quick. Could we talk about the
9 ownership of the property and we --

10 WHEELER: Yeah.

11 OSTROVSKY: -- we think Storey County owns some and
12 your foundation owns some. Could you give us just a quick
13 review of that?

14 WHEELER: Sure. It, it's a kind of a work in
15 process. Right now with the reporter, the Cemetery Foundation
16 has a 99-year lease from Virginia Consolidated Mining who owns
17 all the mining pa -- properties on the land and also included
18 with our grant was a letter given to us in 2015 by Storey
19 County Management that says clearly that we own the mining
20 cabin, and the reason it's kind of up right now is that for
21 insurance purposes, safety, and just resources, we're looking
22 at developing an MOU with the county and then asking Mr.
23 Marshall (phonetic) to convey that lease to the county. It
24 just makes better sense. It hasn't been accomplished yet but
25 that is our end goal.

1 OSTROVSKY: Could I ask staff whether that's adequate?

2 PALMER: This is Rebecca Palmer for the record.

3 The requirements of the IRS is that the property be owned by a
4 private nonprofit or a local government. The, the land
5 ownership in Virginia City is challenging because of the
6 numerous patented claims held. My understanding is that the
7 property would, would hopefully transfer to Storey County
8 within the life of this grant. However, it, you know, it is
9 not owned by a nonprofit or the parcel itself is not owned by
10 a nonprofit or a local government.

11 WHEELER: It is leased and we actually own the
12 building.

13 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. We, we understand, and, and it's
14 leased for a period longer than the covenant.

15 WHEELER: Ninety-nine years.

16 OSTROVSKY: Yes. I'll, I'll open it up to other
17 commissioners, so if you have questions, now would be the
18 appropriate time.

19 STOLDAL: Sure, I, I -- Stoldal off the record. I'm
20 still foggy on, on, on how we can go forward 'cause one of the
21 requirements is the owner has to sign the covenant and in
22 reading the application, it seemed like there were two and I
23 was, I was a bit -- if I understood it right, there's a mining
24 claim on the cemetery. The ceme -- how, how --

25 WHEELER: Rebecca, Rebecca summarized it pretty

1 well. The ownership in Virginia City is very challenging and
2 without going to court, one could say that a mining patent
3 owner has the surface and the mineral rights. One could also
4 say that the lots and blocks take precedence and so what we
5 have decided to do in partnership with the county is to work
6 with Mr. Marshall, who has the mining patents, but the county
7 also owns lots and blocks, so it depends who you're sitting in
8 front of to work with them so that we straighten this out, so
9 that at the end of the day, the lease for the land would be
10 given to Storey County, surface rights only. The House will
11 maintain ownership with the Comstock Cemetery Foundation, and
12 we will have an MOU which allows us to manage the property,
13 the land, all the events, and the house is going to remain in
14 our ownership.

15 STOLDAL: I, I, I think that you, you, you, you have
16 -- you, you realize what the challenges are and you're trying
17 to resolve those.

18 WHEELER: Yes.

19 STOLDAL: And it, it's my understanding also that
20 Storey County independently of whatever it's trying to do with
21 you is, is also trying to clean up the hundred -- well, we're
22 way past that, 150-year history of the, the, the ownerships of
23 land within Virginia City? This is --

24 WHEELER: That is exactly correct. They have their
25 hands full, but they're doing a good job.

1 STOLDAL: How, how close do you think that they are
2 in wrapping that up? That would give us some security, some
3 sense that (A) that Storey County is going to be -- clean up
4 or at least say, this is who owns what, and, and we're the
5 legal entity, and then the second part, when do you think you
6 would be able to get that MOU done?

7 WHEELER: Just talking about our thing, it was
8 actually put on the agenda for the last commissioner's meeting
9 and then we found a few little blips that Austin (phonetic)
10 and I wanted to straighten out, so I would say that we are
11 within two months of completing both of those activities.
12 Everybody's on board. Everybody wants it straightened out,
13 and, yes, they do have their hands full, but in relation to
14 us, I would say no more than two months and it would be pretty
15 clear.

16 STOLDAL: And, Chairman, would -- is, is, is -- if
17 they get that MOU from the mining guy, he gives it to the, to
18 the county, the Storey County, and county signs that MOU with
19 the foundation, Comstock, is, is that going to -- is that
20 satisfy our covenant issue?

21 OSTROVSKY: Well, from my perspective, it does because
22 the covenant runs, I think, 25 years --

23 WHEELER: Mm hmm.

24 OSTROVSKY: -- (Inaudible), is that right, Rebecca?

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

1 believe that to be correct. I can check the grant manual real
2 quick, but, but yeah, that's, that's --

3 OSTROVSKY: Clearly, 99 years would, would, would
4 cover our covenant responsibilities, so, if you want to make
5 this grant contingent upon them receiving the appropriate MOU,
6 that's fine. My concern is, and I'll ask the applicant,
7 what's the construction schedule for this project? You know,
8 I, I'm understanding Virginia City can be very tough in the
9 winter.

10 WHEELER: It, it's largely dependent on, on when we
11 get the funding, but we have, we have the resources and we
12 have the people that are going to do this already selected, so
13 we can go pretty much pretty soon, and honestly, the climate,
14 I've never seen that really stop anything. We're not digging
15 a huge basement or anything and, like I pointed out, we're
16 lucky enough that the Comstock Historic District Commission
17 already brought lines in, so we have a nice infrastructure set
18 up. I mean, for once, we were kind of lucky.

19 OSTROVSKY: Other commissioners have questions? Bob,
20 you want to make a motion? I think we know where we were
21 going.

22 STOLDAL: Well, I'd like to, to make a motion, 21-02
23 Comstock Cemetery Foundation Visitor Center Water Waste
24 System, pending the approval of the MOU between Storey County
25 and the Comstock Cemetery Foundation, awarding a grant of

1 \$55,400.

2 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second that
3 motion.

4 OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second.
5 Commissioners have any further comments? Any member of the
6 public like to make a comment? Seeing and hearing none, all
7 those in favor of approving 21-02 in the amount of \$55,400
8 with the requirement of a signed MOU, please say.

9 MULTIPLE: Aye.

10 OSTROVSKY: Anyone opposed? Chairman votes in favor.
11 Motion is carried. Thank you very much, and we'll look
12 forward to seeing the MOU and perhaps the county, knowing that
13 funding is out there, might help you get that done sooner.
14 Thank you very much.

15 WHEELER: Thank you.

16 OSTROVSKY: One minute. We'll move on to 21-03. 21-
17 03 is Douglas County Historical Society, Carson Valley Museum
18 and Cultural Center exterior rehabilitation. Is there someone
19 here from Douglas County Historical Society to speak?

20 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I have Janice Beerwinkle. I'll
21 bring her on.

22 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

23 HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, Janice. (Inaudible).

24 OSTROVSKY: Can't hear you yet, Janice. We still
25 trying to bring her on?

1 HITCHCOCK: Yeah. I just got a message in the chat
2 that Dennis Little is on. If you're on the computer with
3 Janice, you guys will need to unmute yourself. It says
4 there's no unmute. If you go down to the bottom of your
5 screen, there should be a, a whole line of options there and
6 one of them is to mute or unmute. Just move your cursor over
7 the bottom of your screen.

8 STOLDAL: It's on the left side?

9 HITCHCOCK: Yeah, on the left-hand side.

10 OSTROVSKY: You can also press the space bar to speak.
11 Not sure.

12 HITCHCOCK: Try the space bar?

13 STOLDAL: (Inaudible).

14 HITCHCOCK: I am not able to do the unmuting. All it
15 says is ask them to unmute, so I am not able to unmute them.

16 STOLDAL: Well, there was -- it was unmuted for a
17 second, whatever they did.

18 HITCHCOCK: Let's see.

19 STOLDAL: Are we able to contact them?

20 HITCHCOCK: One moment. Now, they've -- maybe they're
21 trying again. I don't even see Janice on any longer, so they
22 must have dropped off.

23 OSTROVSKY: Well, I'll tell you what, we'll move on to
24 number four --

25 STOLDAL: Right.

1 OSTROVSKY: -- and we'll come back to number three as
2 soon as we finish number four. Maybe that will give them an
3 opportunity to get, get it sorted out, but one way or the
4 other, we -- we'll get the -- so --

5 HITCHCOCK: Okay. It says Dennis is still here. I'm
6 just not -- hold on. Douglas -- Dennis?

7 LITTLE: Okay. Found it this time.

8 OSTROVSKY: Great. There you are. Thank you.

9 LITTLE: Thank you, commissioners. Each morning
10 before I start my computer, I write 'I love high tech' ten
11 times in cursive. Again, we'd like to thank the Commission
12 for entertaining our proposal. I like sharing with you and
13 the public that the Carson Valley Museum and Cultural Center
14 is far more than just a museum. We're pleased to be one of
15 the central iconic historic buildings that is still left in
16 the downtown corridor and I also enjoy sharing that we're more
17 than a museum. We house the Van Sickle Research Center, which
18 contains many of the diaries, ledgers, notes, and personal
19 effects of our pioneer families. We also, I'm very pleased to
20 say, we host a youth education program, highlighting the
21 history, the culture, our DCHS young Chautauqua program, all
22 the things which I view of great support to the community.
23 Our proposal on the restoration of the exterior fascia and
24 painting, the one thing I wanted to stress, it's a lot more
25 than just cosmetic. We're starting to see a lot of water

1 intrusion in some of the window frames leading to wood rot.
2 We've had two very, very interesting problems with the
3 deteriorating fascia where we've had a bat infestation, which
4 was a very, very interesting program to mitigate, and we also
5 have had a nice colony of bees who decided to live in our
6 attic. I won't say belfry, but bats into belfry, bees in the
7 attic, so we're far more than just cosmetic. I know most of
8 you are very familiar with our building and operations and
9 rather than belabor the aspects of it, the only thing I'd
10 close is we are shovel ready. We currently have a 60-day bid
11 from one of the contractors. We put out bids to six
12 contractors. In this day and age, five were unresponsive. We
13 did have one responsive licensed contractor, and I'd be
14 inclined just to take questions from this point.

15 OSTROVSKY: Yes, Dennis, I don't know if staff had a
16 chance -- we, we seem to have some minor discrepancies in, in
17 how the budget was prepared. Do staff want to comment or do
18 you want to comment on if the request of \$21,075 is correct or
19 whether it needs to be modified in any way?

20 LITTLE: Yes. The \$21,000-some odd dollars is the
21 correct request. We are always terrified that contractors
22 always find a way of adding 10% to the cost, so our request of
23 SHPO is the \$21,075.

24 OSTROVSKY: And you -- did they give you an itemized
25 breakdown? None, none was included.

1 LITTLE: (Inaudible). Oh.

2 UNIDENTIFIED: What's on the (Inaudible).

3 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I think that -- Stoldal for the
4 record. I think that there's -- the, the, the discrepancy is
5 not the \$21,075 actual, it's the -- whether or not there's a,
6 an \$1850 non-state share. The, the math doesn't seem to add
7 up. Is that, is that correct, staff?

8 UNIDENTIFIED: That's our contribution.

9 LITTLE: Yeah. We're contributing \$1850 towards
10 the project is -- which is what we have left in our building
11 maintenance fund as of the moment.

12 STOLDAL: So do we subtract the \$1850 from the \$21?

13 LITTLE: No, that's what we're adding in addition
14 to, that we are able to put in, in that much money.

15 OSTROVSKY: Staff, does that answer your question or,
16 or do we need more?

17 PALMER: This is Rebecca Palmer for the, for the
18 record. I believe that answers the question.

19 STOLDAL: Chair, I had two or three other smaller
20 questions.

21 OSTROVSKY: Yes, absolutely. Go ahead, Mr. Stoldal.

22 STOLDAL: Stoldal for the record. It says Douglas
23 County as far as your name. That's a great name, Mr. --
24 Douglas Museum. I didn't get your full name.

25 LITTLE: Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner. I'm Dennis

1 Little and I'm the Operational Director of the Douglas County
2 Historical Society, which operates the Carson Valley Museum
3 and Cultural Center.

4 STOLDAL: Great, and, and a great facility it, it,
5 it, it is as I'm a member of it. Let me ask you a question.
6 The photographs you sent, has a seismic study been produced
7 recently for this building and, and I'm talking also about the
8 column?

9 LITTLE: No, at the moment, we are operating under
10 the original 1991 seismic study and rules that were in place
11 when we undertook the restoration of the building, and at that
12 time, we were completely seismic compliant.

13 STOLDAL: All right. What's the overall condition
14 of the six columns?

15 LITTLE: They're showing significant drying,
16 cracking. What worries us, we're getting water intrusion
17 that's actually going into the columns and then going down to
18 the deck and finding its way into the museum, so that's one of
19 our concerns in getting the facia material and the columns put
20 back together as quick as possible.

21 STOLDAL: So, so, so part of this grant is, is going
22 to specifically go to repair the columns and, and the, and the
23 leaking issue.

24 LITTLE: Yes. Yes.

25 STOLDAL: And, and are -- will you manage this

1 project? Who's going to overall manage this project?

2 LITTLE: Basically, I am going to be the one out
3 there asking the -- or calling the contractor why they didn't
4 show up to work today. So basically, I will be the ramrod on
5 it and Janice Beerwinkle will be the financial aspect in
6 monitoring the project.

7 STOLDAL: Dennis, thank you very much. Mr. Chair,
8 thank you.

9 OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioners have questions?
10 Now, this is one where, just so the applicant knows, we, we
11 didn't get the complete resumes that, that we requested, so in
12 the future, please provide those as required, and, and any
13 breakdown of costs that specific that the staff can contract
14 would be appreciated. Any commissioner like to make a motion?

15 STOLDAL: I'll make a motion then, 21-03, Douglas
16 County Historical Society, the Carson Valley Museum and
17 Cultural Center Exterior Rehabilitation grant request of
18 \$21,075, I move to approve the grant request.

19 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'll
20 second.

21 OSTROVSKY: All right, thank you, commissioner. Any
22 further comments from the commission? Any comments from the
23 public? Hearing none, all those in favor of approving 21-03
24 in the amount of \$21,075, please say aye.

25 MULTIPLE: Aye.

1 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Motion carried with the
2 Chairman voting in favor. Thank you very much.

3 LITTLE: Thank you, commissioners.

4 OSTROVSKY: The next item is a Fourth Ward School with
5 the requested amount of \$504,648, I believe. A substantial
6 sum of money, substantial project. Is there someone here from
7 the Fourth Ward School available to speak to the commission?

8 UNIDENTIFIED: Yes, sir. One moment. I'll bring her on.

9 STEFU: Hello. Can you hear me?

10 OSTROVSKY: Yes. We can hear you clearly.

11 STEFU: Hello, my name's Nora Stefu and I'm the
12 Executive Director of the Fourth Ward School Museum for the
13 record. So good morning, commissioners and thank you for
14 giving me this opportunity to be here with all of you and
15 discuss the continuous rehabilitation of the Fourth Ward
16 School Museum. The Fourth Ward School is a historical
17 landmark in Virginia City community and holds an important
18 architectural essence representing the Victorian-American
19 architecture, architecture of 1876, which is the state-of-the-
20 art school building and innovation of its time that
21 accommodated and provided -- I'm sorry, that it was innovation
22 of its time and it was -- that accommodated students and
23 teachers, and this would, an 1876 structural building, is the
24 last of its kind in the State of Nevada and the United States.
25 The community for many decades have been an advocate to save

1 and rehabilitate the Fourth Ward building. Throughout the
2 years, success -- successfully, they have rehabilitated the
3 original structure of the building with the help of the Nevada
4 State Historic Preservation, Storey County, and donors.
5 Today, it is important to continue to maintain the integrity
6 of the building by restoring the exterior wood windows and the
7 roof surfaces and architecture elements from weather
8 deterioration, which continues to battle to prevent the
9 deterioration in sealing the wood surface of this 1876 wood
10 building from the Northern, from the Northern Nevada harsh
11 weather conditions. The building is a historical attraction
12 and a cultural center that provides historical information for
13 the Comstock community and the State of Nevada and, and
14 travelers who come and visit Virginia City. It is one of the
15 most popular attraction. We continue to have programs for
16 preservation inviting and, and educate the public of the
17 importance of the Comstock story. We have developed programs
18 educating the importance of the Nevada history for fourth and
19 seventh grade students by visiting the museum and also
20 providing digital program -- the -- programs that are produced
21 at the premises, and most important is archival center that
22 holds the historical artifacts and historical information of
23 our -- of, of the Comstock community. The rehabilitation
24 project is essential to secure the building exterior wall --
25 walls. If the wood walls fall, the building -- and the

1 building is not sealed and secured, we'll not have the safe
2 interior environment for the staff and the, and the public to
3 continue the programming of preserving the Comstock history.
4 At this president state, the Fourth Ward School, we were
5 fortunate to preserve and rehabilitate the building as last
6 year, we rehabilitated the west front elevation of the
7 building.

8 UNIDENTIFIED: Three minutes (Inaudible).

9 STEFU: At this point, we feel it's essential to
10 continue rebuilding the rest of the building, the south, east
11 and the north elevation. It's crucial to be restored,
12 especially we leave the south and east elevation of the wood,
13 it's deteriorating -- deteriorating. So we have granted a
14 Storey County building support to restore the south side and
15 we, we are ready to start in July. At this point, we feel
16 it's essential to start rehabilitating the east and north, and
17 even if the north side of the building is less deteriorated
18 due to not prominent sun and wind and weather exposure, we
19 believe the funds are available and we can -- if we believe
20 the funds are available, we can do all three sites by next
21 spring. Our contractors have been proven and they can finish
22 the project, and last year, we accomplished the entire west
23 (Inaudible) and the bell tower of the building in time. Also,
24 we have experienced that from the 2019 to 2020 grant cycle,
25 the cost of the construction has risen 20% more in the price,

1 so definitely, we believe if we have the funds where -- and
2 the funds are available, we can finish the project with the
3 secretary interior standards. Thank you so much.

4 OSTROVSKY: Thank, thank you. Just to comment, then
5 I'll go on to the commissioners. This, this, this facility
6 has received grants from, from this Commission and it's prior
7 Cultural Commission for a long time, but it still didn't
8 excuse the applicant from not providing us a printout of the
9 assessors website, which is required, and there's no audit
10 attached, so my question is -- one is just something that
11 needs to be done, the assessors printout. The other, though,
12 was the audit information. Do you know when the last audit
13 was or what the audit plans are for the foundation?

14 STEFU: From my understanding, Commissioner, we
15 were not required for an audit, a professional audit, because
16 our -- we don't meet the threshold to provide a professional
17 audit. However, though, every quarterly, our, our board --
18 the board pretty much sees our financial statements and we
19 hire professional -- I'm sorry, a professional --

20 OSTROVSKY: Accounting firm? Is that what --

21 STEFU: Accounting. Thank you. Accounting firm
22 for our IRS tax and for our IRS taxes.

23 OSTROVSKY: All right, thank you. Commissioners,
24 questions at this point.

25 STOLDAL: Oh, I appreciate the, the -- Stoldal for

1 the record. I appreciate the response, but this is not --
2 we're not the IRS. We're the Commission on Cultural Centers
3 and Historic Places, and we require, and it's clear within the
4 application in the grant manual, that we require an audit,
5 and, and I will tell you, quite frankly, surprises me that,
6 that there, there hasn't been an audit on any nonprofit that
7 has this kind of, of importance and, and this building and,
8 and what it stands for is very important. The money that this
9 Commission has invested in it has been substantial, so, this
10 is not a re -- re -- requirement of the IRS, but it's clear in
11 the -- in, in the grand application for the Commission on
12 Cultural Affairs and Historic Places that, that we require an
13 audit. Now, the, the little asterisk that's attached to that
14 is an explanation and, and I think that you have provided that
15 explanation, but that should have been part of the application
16 so, we would understand what the foundation does as far as
17 making sure that one and one adds up to two, and it's spent,
18 it's spent properly. The other question was who actually owns
19 the building and the land?

20 STEFU: Storey County, sir.

21 STOLDAL: Okay. And so you would be able to
22 provide, as the Chair asked, that, that list of the, of the AP
23 number and, and, and so they would -- Rebecca, would Storey
24 County sign the covenants?

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

1 Yes. The answer is yes. The property owner signs the
2 covenants.

3 STOLDAL: Great. Thank you.

4 PALMER: And in this case, Storey County would be
5 the, the signatory there. I -- it -- if I could beg the
6 Chair's indulgence for just one moment, staff heard something
7 that we felt that the Commission should be aware of. The
8 presenter for the Fourth Ward School stated that the county
9 had given money for the south elevation. If that's the case,
10 then the grant application or the -- yeah, the grant
11 application should reflect that money has come in for that
12 south elevation and therefore the award may need to be
13 reduced.

14 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Is the applicant -- can you tell us
15 what the county contributed?

16 STEFU: Well, I mean, we -- I know the Storey
17 County has passed in their budget to give -- to give us the
18 money for the southeast. I mean, I'm sorry for the south side
19 of the building, however, we haven't had the meeting to go in
20 -- we don't know exactly the process yet, so this is all in,
21 in the future tense that we will know all the requirements
22 that we need for -- to go and our request also, it doesn't
23 include the south side. Our request was for the east and
24 north side of the building on our grand report. E

25 STOLDAL: Chair, I'm, I'm, I'm, I'm still a bit

1 confused. It was my understanding that Storey County owns
2 this building and that a request was made by the foundation to
3 Storey County for \$160,000 and that that grant has been
4 approved and some paperwork needs to be done, and I thought
5 that was, in fact, for the south side.

6 STEFU: Correct.

7 STOLDAL: Is, is for the south side.

8 STEFU: Correct.

9 OSTROVSKY: And I'll note that the letter of
10 submission to the Commission says, 'rehabilitation and
11 restoration of the exterior south, east and north elevations'.
12 So I'm a little confused.

13 STEFU: Well, we, we explain what are the needs in
14 in our grant proposal. However, we believe that we explained
15 that we want -- we requested the east and the north from, from
16 SHPO grant money, but we wanted to explain how -- what we
17 requested for the Storey County as well. So just to see our,
18 you know, what was the -- what are requesting for -- to --
19 what we need to -- for the building to be fixed. So --

20 STOLDAL: Well, let me jump in. Stoldal for the
21 record. So if I read the, the figures correctly, you're
22 asking for the east side \$305,870, and for the north side,
23 \$198,778. Are, are those the figures we should be looking at?

24 STEFU: Absolutely.

25 STOLDAL: Then I'd like to ask you couple of quick,

1 Chair, questions. The Chair mentioned earlier that -- and,
2 and this Commission and this predecessor has given several
3 hundred thousand dollars, recognized the importance of the
4 Fourth Ward School. One of the last applications was -- and
5 grants was for \$228,633 for the -- that included the roof.
6 Can you -- I'm, I'm a bit confused because there are different
7 elements in the, in the phrase, the mansard roof. We're going
8 to fix one side. We're going to fix another. Part of it was
9 already fixed. What is the condition of the mansard roof
10 right now?

11 STEFU: The mansard re -- all the wood sh -- links
12 are deteriorated. So what we did, for example, from -- for
13 the west front that had pretty much the same similarity
14 problems, so we have the same problems on the south and east.
15 They're so -- some parts are deteriorating that they need to
16 be pulled out and sealed and repaint them.

17 STOLDAL: Mm-hmm. I, I guess what -- the, the --
18 where I was going at, it doesn't make sense to me, but then I,
19 I, I am not an architect or, or a contractor of construction.
20 We fixed one side of the roof. To me, we should have fixed
21 the whole roof. Why wasn't the roof itself not a major
22 project and we took care of that? What's the benefit of
23 fixing one side, then later, a couple years later, the, the,
24 the, the other side? How was that decision arrived at?

25 STEFU: Probably, from my understanding, because I

1 wasn't in all the restoration of the building, and from what
2 I've read, it's just money was the issue and years ago, I know
3 they restructured the main level of the roof, but the, the
4 (Inaudible) due to time weather, it needs all, you know, it
5 needs pretty much a lot of attention through years to seal
6 the, the shingles. The major part, for example, like, five
7 years, estimated if it's five years ago. I know they fixed
8 the west-north side of the building roof because they had
9 some, some major deteriorating elements, so they focused on
10 that side. On our end, because that also, a part of the roof,
11 for example, on the south side is -- we included on our, on
12 our grant estimate is because it needs -- the shingles were
13 not all finished back in that -- back five years ago. So they
14 need to be refreshed, painted, and sealed, but the major
15 construction of rehabilitating the south, the north-south side
16 of the roof was, was completed, but not all the shingles, from
17 my understanding, what I've read at the report.

18 STOLDAL: Well, my last question then is taking
19 consideration the mansard roof, the condition, if you had the
20 choice, and this is going to be asked to, to many of our
21 applicants, the choice between the east elevation or the north
22 elevation, which is the one that, that needs the attention
23 right now, the east or the north elevation?

24 STEFU: Did you say the roof, sir, or the whole
25 side of the building?

1 STOLDAL: Well, the, the mansard is, is, is not a
2 separate. It's, it's part of, it's part of each of the, the,
3 the east elevation or the north elevation. There's two
4 numbers in there, one for the east elevation and one for the
5 north elevation, and each of those numbers has the details of
6 what will be taken care of. For example, the east elevation
7 is at \$305,870. The north is at \$198,778. So forgetting the
8 dollar figure, which one needs the attention right now?

9 STEFU: The attention right now is the east. The
10 ma -- it needs a ma -- it needs a lot of work.

11 STOLDAL: Okay.

12 STEFU: So it is a prominent whether -- yeah. I
13 mean, at this point, we would really hope we can fix the east
14 side of the building.

15 STOLDAL: So you'd work on, on the east side and
16 then the south side, and then potentially later on ask for a
17 grant for the north side?

18 STEFU: Correct. We asked for Storey grant -- for
19 Storey County for the south side. So if we can, if -- and I
20 believe we granted the south side from Storey County. So if
21 we can continue fixing the east, it will be a great deal
22 because those two sites are very deteriorated.

23 STOLDAL: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you,
24 Applicant.

25 OSTROVSKY: Mr. Kavanaugh?

1 KAVANAUGH: My, my question has to do with previous
2 grant awards, when, when they were made, how was it determined
3 that they were eligible for funding if there was no audit
4 report attached to those applications? And if, if there was
5 no grant or if there was no audit report, what was the
6 justification for the grant award being made? I'm assuming
7 that there was some justification that rested well with
8 commissioners who made the previous grant awards and I just
9 want to know what the difference is, and maybe that's a
10 question for the staff.

11 OSTROVSKY: Well, just from the --

12 KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

13 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. From the Chairman's point
14 of view, we've always accepted their proposal based on, you
15 know, their accounting firm and their board, but I, I think it
16 looks to me that the feeling of the Commission is beginning to
17 change a bit more than it was in the past, and that we think,
18 particularly projects that -- of this size, which we've
19 invested more than hundreds of thousands, I think, more -- and
20 over a million dollars in this building, that we should
21 encourage their board of directors to spend the money, and
22 it's not cheap, but to spend the money to have an audit done
23 to reassure the public and us that these funds are all
24 expended appropriately. So I think, I think it's a change in
25 the Commission's attitude a bit. The asterisk has been

1 okayed. We had an explanation of why not, but I think this
2 board is beginning to ask more questions, particularly on the
3 larger projects, which have got funding available or resources
4 in, in order to, to, to achieve that. I don't know if the
5 staff has any further comments, Rebecca, on, on the audits.

6 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
7 Audits have always been required by the Commission. The
8 Commission can choose to, you know, waive the requirement or
9 the Commission can choose to seek an explanation for the lack
10 of an audit, and so I would be happy to do the research for
11 the prior grant cycles to determine what happened at the
12 various meetings, but staff has, has, has noted and will
13 continue to note where required elements are missing.

14 OSTROVSKY: Excuse me. Any further comments?

15 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I, I -- yes. I, I'm sorry. I
16 said no, but I meant yes. And, and to me, the audit is, is
17 not something that should be -- it's just really clear
18 throughout the application and this is an application to the
19 State of Nevada, not an application to the IRS, and, and to
20 just completely not acknowledge that by saying -- and I think
21 the applicant explained what every quarter there's a, an
22 auditing firm that comes in and, and makes sure one and one is
23 two. That should have been included in, in the application,
24 and, and I want to make sure, Rebecca, 'cause I don't think
25 that you can make it any clearer that -- staff could make it

1 any clear that audits are an important element of the
2 application, but maybe we just need to put it all in capital
3 letters, all in, in, in red ink and put it at the top or
4 something that -- to make sure that this is, this is, is, is
5 important. And I think the Chair also is, is correct.
6 Spending the money properly, whether it's \$10,000 or, or a
7 million dollars is, is important. This is taxpayer's money
8 and -- but, but the spotlight, the magnifying glass, gets a
9 little more focused when the, the, the money is a quarter
10 million dollars or more rather than \$10,000, so thank you, Mr.
11 Chair.

12 OSTROVSKY: Well, and we will get an opportunity at
13 our next meeting to establish the grant procedure application
14 procedure for the following year's grants and if we want to
15 tighten the language of -- around audits and be specific about
16 what the Commission requires and what are acceptable
17 exceptions to that requirement, we can do so at that time. So
18 I, I think we will add that to our agenda to make sure we, we
19 have that full discussion.

20 STOLDAL: I'd like to make a motion then.

21 OSTROVSKY: Mr. Stoldal, please.

22 STOLDAL: I'd like to make a motion for 21-04, the
23 Historic Fourth Ward School Foundation for the exterior
24 restoration of the east elevation at a grant fee of \$305,870.

25 OSTROVSKY: Is there a second to that motion?

1 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second that
2 motion.

3 OSTROVSKY: Any discussion? Any discussion from the
4 public? Rebecca, do you have a comment? Public, public --
5 member of the public have a comment? I see a, a hand raised.
6 That's the only reason why --

7 STEFU: It's me, sir. I'm so sorry. I just --

8 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

9 STEFU: Yes.

10 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Go ahead.

11 STEFU: I do apologize that the oversight of not
12 explaining about the audit on the grant cycle, but I guess it
13 was because of the previous years that I didn't see that it
14 was as important as I found out today, how important it is
15 and, and I can take it to our board in our July meeting and
16 put that in action for the next time to have a professional
17 audit for the Fourth Word School Museum.

18 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

19 STEFU: Today this was en -- en -- enlightening
20 for me and thank you so much for all that education that you
21 gave me.

22 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Any other comments? Hearing
23 none, all those in favor of the motion?

24 MULTIPLE: Aye.

25 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The motion carries with the

1 Chairman voting in favor. Thank you very much. I would, at
2 the discretion of the Chair, I'd like to take about a very
3 short break, about seven minutes. I've got it as -- we'd like
4 to come back in about seven minutes. That would be -- look at
5 my watch -- about 10:50, just a little restroom break, please.

6 STOLDAL: (Inaudible).

7 OSTROVSKY: We'll be right back. Is Commissioner
8 Olmstead back yet? Oh, there you are. Okay. Rebecca, are
9 you on the line? Is, is staff back? Carla, have you
10 returned?

11 HITCHCOCK: I am back, sir.

12 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Well, then we're going to proceed.
13 Is Rebecca -- Oh, there she is. All right. Very good. I
14 will call the meeting back to order from our short break, so
15 we can move on 21-05 Fallon Community Theater. Is someone
16 available to speak to us from the theater?

17 HITCHCOCK: One moment. Stu Richardson is on. Go
18 ahead.

19 RICHARDSON: Can you hear us okay?

20 OSTROVSKY: Yes, I can. Okay. Mike Berney will be
21 speaking for Fallon Community Theater, Inc., today and he's
22 ready.

23 BERNEY: Good morning. First, we'd like to thank
24 you guys through that last grant phase for the new roof. Wow.
25 I don't even know how to express how happy we are to have a

1 roof, so thank you very, very much. As you know, the Fallon
2 Theater just turning 102 this year and, and the Fallon Theater
3 is pretty much, I would say that it's not a cornerstone in the
4 way it sits, but it is, it is the draw of the downtown Fallon,
5 so it's a huge part of our communities. So, our current grant
6 that we're asking for or put in an application for basically
7 is to continue on with the second phase of our seismic
8 retrofit as, as recommended by Mel Green and Associates. So -
9 - and I've -- we've put that all out in there. If, if you
10 need me to go over that, I'd be more than happy to. We've
11 also asked about a new heating-cooling system for our lower
12 theater mainly because the unit that's in there, the cooling
13 unit, is just -- I, I think if you've seen the pictures, it's
14 just a huge unit that's probably, what do you think, Stu, from
15 19 --

16 RICHARDSON: Thirty?

17 BERNEY: -- 30s? Which basically is falling apart
18 and is probably more expensive to, to try to repair it as,
19 what the HVAC contractors have told us, than to just put in a
20 new, new unit. And also with that, we were looking for new
21 heating and cooling in the conference area and what was the
22 old apartment upstairs to provide better heating flow through
23 that unit, especially since all the plumbing's been redone in
24 there. And the last thing that we've asked for on, on this
25 was an electrical upgrade, which would be for our stage. We

1 have -- we've had a lot of bands. We have comedy shows. We
2 have lectures. We have all sorts of things going on on our
3 stage and that electrical, especially when we have bands, we
4 definitely need that upgraded and that would also go into the
5 sound booth, which we would take that electrical into there.
6 And that bid also covers the electrical that would be needed
7 for the HVAC installations, so that covers what basically we
8 were asking for in our grant. If you have any questions, we'd
9 be glad to answer them.

10 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mike. I, I'll turn it over to
11 the Commission in a moment to ask questions. I just -- please
12 take note that from prior discussions, how important the audit
13 or at least an explanation of a lack thereof is, is so, I
14 mean, you should follow up on with your board to make sure
15 that in future cycles, because it was not included in this
16 application. So just -- you're on notice from the prior
17 applicant that these are important to us, you know.
18 Commissioners have questions.

19 STOLDAL: Well, I'd, I'd like to hear from the
20 applicant as far as how they balance their books or who, who
21 sees and, and their understanding that an audit or some sort
22 of explanation of the process they arrive at to make sure
23 everything adds up and it's spent properly. Mike, can you
24 help, help us with that?

25 BERNEY: So probably the main problem for us with

1 an audit and, and I don't disagree with, with your asking for
2 an audit certainly. The, the problem for us has been, is it's
3 like \$10,000 to \$15,000 of money that really we haven't had as
4 a, as an organization to, to spend. Basically, what we do, we
5 have a treasurer who handles those -- our bills and, and, and
6 basically puts together the books for us. We look at those on
7 a monthly basis. We also have our accountant take a look at
8 that to make sure everything looks okay. I -- and again, I
9 know it's -- and I understand your guys' concern. I -- we are
10 a group of people that have known each other for many, many
11 years, so, I mean, it's -- we're pretty comfortable with
12 everybody doing what they need to do, but I don't disagree
13 with an audit. It's just been something that really has been
14 kind of just a little bit out of our reach to spend that kind
15 of money.

16 STOLDAL: And I think we all understand the
17 challenge of, of -- 'cause they, they, they generally will
18 run, as you say, somewhere between \$9000, \$12,000, no matter
19 how big the group is. It's just sort of a standard kind of
20 challenge for the small groups. But I think your, your
21 explanation, although I probably would leave out 'we all know
22 each other' as part of the --

23 BERNEY: That could be good or bad.

24 STOLDAL: Right. But I think the fact that you have
25 some process, I think that that should, that should be

1 included. A couple, couple of quick questions. Is, is this -
2 - it sounds like this one, if you get the approval and, and
3 the money flow is available, that you could start this right
4 away.

5 BERNEY: Actually I could, I could tell you that I
6 can probably start part of it right away. The rest of it's
7 going to be -- I'm sure the electrical can fit us in pretty
8 quick. The HVAC guys, the guys that did our seismic, they
9 have to work with the roofers and the roofing company is a D
10 and D Roofing out of Reno, so it, it just depends how they can
11 fit us in. But, but, yeah, all of that, I don't think is a
12 problem. They just got to be told that we're ready to roll
13 once we have those funds available, so --

14 STOLDAL: Right. One, one last question. It really
15 doesn't have to do specifically with your application, but is
16 there any organization of, of you, the Fallon? I know that
17 there's a, a movie theater in Pioche, the, the, the gym. We
18 have the Huntridge in, in Las Vegas, and I'm sure around the
19 state, there are others all facing a lot of the same
20 challenges. Do you have -- is there any sort of communication
21 between the various historic theaters around the state?

22 BERNEY: You know, I don't think I've heard from
23 anybody. I don't think you have, Stu, have you?

24 RICHARDSON: We've heard from other, other people that
25 -- doing some restoration work with, with the Commission on

1 maybe -- and I think Goldstill might have been one of them
2 that asked us maybe if a contractor that might be willing to
3 go down there, but, but, no, not, not between the theaters.
4 Probably be a good idea though.

5 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, thank you. Your mic?

6 OSTROVSKY: I, I asked were there any other comments?
7 I hear none. Therefore, I would accept the motion.

8 STOLDAL: Well, Mr. Chair, then I'd like to make a
9 motion to approve 21-05, Fallon Community Theater,
10 Incorporated, the renovation of the Historic Fallon Theater
11 for the amount of \$22 -- 233,120.

12 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

13 OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second. Any
14 further comment from commissioners? Any public comment?

15 BERNEY: Can I say something as the public?

16 OSTROVSKY: You may.

17 BERNEY: I just -- in case we got cut off, we just
18 want to tell you thank you and thank you guys for all you do.
19 So thank you.

20 OSTROVSKY: Seeing no other comment, we have a motion
21 and a second. All those in favor of the motion of approving
22 21-05 in the amount of \$233,120, please say aye.

23 MULTIPLE: Aye.

24 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Motion carries with the
25 Chairman voting in favor. Thank you very much. Good luck,

1 and it's a very active theater. I hope it stays that way for
2 many years.

3 BERNEY: Thank you.

4 OSTROVSKY: The next applicant is Galena Creek
5 Schoolhouse. This is the Washoe County Park Department. Is
6 there someone from the department or from the schoolhouse who
7 would like to make a presentation?

8 HITCHCOCK: If there is someone on the line, could you
9 please raise your hand so I can identify you? Excellent.
10 Joanne? Go ahead, Joanne.

11 LOWDEN: Okay, perfect. Can you guys hear me?

12 OSTROVSKY: Yes, I can.

13 LOWDEN: Great. So good morning. I'm Joanne
14 Lowden. I'm the Natural Resource Planner with Washoe County
15 Regional Parks and Open Space. So our project today is the
16 Galena Creek Schoolhouse. If you're not familiar with it, the
17 schoolhouse is located in Washoe County. It's immediately
18 adjacent to our Phillip and Annie Callahan Park. It's also
19 near the Callahan Family Cemetery, which is known as
20 Whispering Pines. So our schoolhouse building has a really
21 interesting history. Excuse me. It was constructed in 1940
22 by the Works Progress Association and it was used as a rural
23 schoolhouse until around 1959. It is strongly associated with
24 the Callahan Ranch and the Callahan family. It was also owned
25 by local Reno poet, Joanne De Longchamps from about 1971 to

1 1982 and supposedly inspired some of her famous schoolhouse
2 poems that were published in 1975. This building was listed
3 on the National Register of Historic Places in 2011. So a
4 little history on this. Washoe County purchased the property
5 in 2006. We had an initial report completed to document the
6 history and condition of the schoolhouse. That was done in
7 2009. We were also working on completing an updated master
8 plan for Callahan Park, which was finished in 2011. As part
9 of that master planning process, we had an assessment done on
10 the schoolhouse and they included some recommendations for
11 restoration. It also included some improvements for the
12 surrounding area that would help tie the building into the
13 bigger park, so as part of that process, the county did
14 solicit and incorporate community feedback as far as what
15 they'd like to see done with that site, and it was decided
16 that the best way to proceed was to turn the Galena
17 Schoolhouse into a reservable public facility. So that kind
18 of brings us to our project goals. We'd really like to
19 stabilize and restore the schoolhouse basically to create a
20 public reservable facility that would become part of Phillip
21 and Annie Callahan Park. We've split the work into three
22 phases. Phase 1, which is really the subject of this grant
23 application, would include the initial design work that would
24 include structural retrofitting and stabilization, removal of
25 modern additions and abatement of hazardous conditions. Phase

1 2 would really be focused on interior and exterior finishers
2 to restore historic character, again, to when the building was
3 used as a schoolhouse and then also additional amenities to
4 make the building suitable as a reservable facility. Once the
5 improvements to the building are complete, then we'd be
6 focusing on Phase 3, which would be improvements to the
7 surrounding areas shown in our master plan. Those include an
8 outdoor classroom, some additional parking, some pathways,
9 seating, interpretive signage, and landscaping. And so really
10 our goals for this facility, again, turn it into a public
11 reservable facility and what that means for us is a space
12 that's available for the public to reserve for things like
13 small meetings, special events, interpretive education. It's
14 also a space that can be used by park ranger staff and our
15 partners to host educational, interpretive, and entertainment
16 programming similar to, to what we do with many of our other
17 sites like Bartley Ranch and Bowers Mansion, and it also would
18 just serve as a park attraction, which would include exterior
19 interpretive signage. So just another way to kind of bring
20 people into the park and, and have another amenity available.
21 So that's what I have. We're pretty much starting from square
22 one with this restoration, and if you guys have any questions,
23 please let me know.

24 OSTROVSKY: Yes, thank you. This would be the
25 appropriate time for questions. Mr. Stoldal first.

1 STOLDAL: First of all, this doesn't sound like this
2 is a shovel-ready project. Is that correct?

3 LOWDEN: That's correct. All right, we wanted to
4 bring in a consultant to actually put together the
5 construction plans.

6 STOLDAL: Gotcha.

7 LOWDEN: And --

8 STOLDAL: So I, I, I, I look at that. One of the
9 concerns I have, and, and despite that fact, I enjoy reading
10 them in the (Inaudible) report and the documents that are used
11 as, as backup, the master plans and so forth, they're more
12 than a decade old. They're back in 2011, and I'm sure things
13 have changed between now and, and -- between then and, and,
14 and now, so I have, I have -- I'm a little concerned about
15 that, so I'm, I'm a little more excited about getting a fresh,
16 a fresh report in funding, a, a, a, a fresh report. What some
17 of it does say is you're going to take out all of that
18 interior, all those modern things, and, and get rid of all
19 the, the stove and, and, and it, it, it looks like a small
20 apartment, but do I also understand that you're going to
21 maintain plumbing and electrical once this project is done?
22 'Cause it says you're going to take that out, but I assume if
23 you're going to use it for meetings, you're going to put that
24 in down the line?

25 LOWDEN: Yes, that's correct. And we would put in

1 just enough to make it suitable as a reservable facility, so
2 normally, that's some lighting, heating, and then occasionally
3 toilet facilities.

4 STOLDAL: All right. Mr. Chair, those are my
5 questions.

6 OSTROVSKY: All right. Any other members have
7 questions? There was a question regarding permitting fees.
8 Would the -- does the city have to pay -- excuse me -- the
9 county have to pay those permitting fees?

10 LOWDEN: Yes, we, we do, both to ourselves and also
11 typically to city of Reno or whoever has jurisdiction in that
12 area.

13 STOLDAL: But I don't think you need to pay the one
14 to state lands, I'm -- if I'm not mistaken.

15 LOWDEN: I believe we do, yes.

16 STOLDAL: Is that --

17 OSTROVSKY: Any comment? Rebecca?

18 PALMER: Yes. For the record, this is Rebecca
19 Palmer. I inquired, with State Lands who share the floor with
20 me here in the Bryan Building. They indicated to me that, no,
21 State Lands would not need to issue a permit and therefore,
22 the, the \$5000 permit identified as Nevada Division of State
23 Lands would not be necessary in this case.

24 OSTROVSKY: Well, we'll take a \$5000 savings where we
25 can get it. That would bring the grant request to \$345,050.

1 STOLDAL: This is -- I'm -- I -- Stoldal for the
2 record. I, I -- we, we need an updated plan and, and I, I'm
3 ready to make a, a motion to approve Phase 1 for a \$110,607
4 to, to really get an updated plan for construction and
5 understanding what this building is like now. E -- even with
6 that, though, it sounds like, according to the, the document,
7 we wouldn't get that plan until, if I read it right, until
8 early next year at the, at the earliest that we would get the
9 results of that. So, I, I, I think the best thing to do would
10 be to support a detail plan on, on how to move forward with
11 this project e -- even though that plan won't be ready until,
12 I think, June of next year, if I'm not -- if I read the, the
13 process that the, the county has to go through in order to get
14 -- put it out for bid, so to speak, and, and review all the
15 applications, so I'm ready to make a motion if you're ready
16 for, for that.

17 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Go ahead and make your motion.
18 I'll raise it.

19 LOWDEN: Could I make one quick comment? Would
20 that be okay?

21 STOLDAL: Sure.

22 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, go ahead, please.

23 LOWDEN: Okay. Yeah. So I just wanted to make the
24 comment that, you know, the building was assessed back in
25 2011, again, part -- as part of that master planning process,

1 and they did make some recommendations. And as part of that,
2 you know, they really did. They looked at seismic. They
3 looked at a lot of other things, and so we really have a
4 pretty comprehensive list of what the needs are and really
5 what we're looking for is that specific design work where we
6 bring in a, you know, historical architect, have them
7 specifically identify material, and put together a detailed
8 construction plan. And that's what we use to go out to bid
9 with, and that's pretty standard for what we do with most of
10 our projects such as Bowers Mansion, so I, I just want to make
11 sure that, you know, you realize we are a little further down
12 the road, I think, that I'm hearing. That we just, you know,
13 again, we really had those initial assessments already done
14 and really nothing has changed in that time 'cause that
15 building has really just sat there for the last 10 years, you
16 know, in the same condition that it was. So I just wanted to
17 make sure that that was understood.

18 STOLDAL: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I'm reading from the
19 narration supplied by the, the applicant and on page 1, it
20 says, 'Phase 1 will focus on assessment and design work,
21 structural retrofitting, and stabilization and initial
22 demolition work to remove modern additions and abate any
23 hazardous material or conditions encountered'. And for that,
24 I used their numbers and I added that up and it came to
25 \$110,607. So my, my motion would be that we approve 21-06,

1 Washoe County Regional Parks and Open Space for the
2 schoolhouse restoration for the sum of \$110,607.

3 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Is there a second to that motion?
4 Well, I hear no second. Let me, let me ask staff, if we were
5 to approve the \$110,000 and change, would, would there be time
6 in this grant cycle, if we set aside the remaining portion,
7 for them to come back to the Commission for us to con -- if
8 they had a better cost estimate based on the new study, would
9 there be time for this Commission to act under this grant
10 cycle?

11 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
12 There might be. At this point, we are identifying May the
13 1st, 2024 as the termination date for most of the funding
14 agreements. So as, as far as I can see from, from what's
15 required, there are really a couple of alternatives that could
16 be chosen, and I make this broader statement because I think
17 you're going to begin addressing that as we move through the
18 grant, the applications. The Commission can either say that
19 when the information available for, for clearly identifying
20 the requests is a -- is -- then you can meet and review that
21 additional information. So it could be you get, you know, an
22 award of a certain amount and then when that documentation is
23 available, the Commission will meet to review the other phases
24 of the grant request. Alternatively, the Commission could
25 decide that in some circumstances, the documentation can be

1 reviewed by staff who can provide that information to the
2 commissioners and they can decide that it is, it is sufficient
3 for the needs of the, of the building and for this agreed
4 funding. This is very confusing. So you could condition the
5 receipt of the original grant upon a future meeting or you can
6 condition it upon receipt of the documents by staff and review
7 by staff. I guess those are the two alternatives. Does that
8 make sense? I'm, I'm really struggling here. My apologies.

9 OSTROVSKY: Yes. Yeah. The alternative here is to,
10 is to authorize the full amount with, with requirements. One,
11 staff review appropriateness or, two, Commission review. That
12 would allow them to expend \$110,607 now, and then would take
13 further approval either from staff or from the Commission to
14 expend further funds of that grant.

15 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, that's -- I really didn't
16 explain.

17 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

18 STOLDAL: This is an important building, so there's
19 just no question about that. The challenge that I have is
20 the, the, the assessment and the documentation is, is 10 years
21 old. What the county is asking for is \$110,000 now to get a
22 fresh plan. Let's, let's, let's get something that we can
23 really be an, an actionable item.

24 OSTROVSKY: Right.

25 STOLDAL: So, so I think we need to approve that.

1 My concern then is the, the lateness of when this applic --
2 when this -- if the county's able to go through their normal
3 process, fund the, the consultant report. The consultant has
4 time to, to present it to the county. The county then has
5 time to analyze it and then the county may say, you know what?
6 We want to do this phase first, and it's going to cost
7 \$110,000. We want to do this phase second, \$120,000. I'm not
8 ready to grant numbers that are a little foggy. The one
9 number that's not foggy is the request for the, the study, a
10 construction plan. And again, reading the presentation, it
11 doesn't sound like that's going to be ready until June of next
12 year. I think reading minds here, I think that Storey County
13 is going to get that document, look at it, and say, well, the
14 clock's ticking, it's now close. We only have less than a
15 year before the, the funding of, of May 1st 2024 gets done.
16 We can only get this much done in that period of time. We're
17 going to ask the CCHP for another \$125,000 to do this. I
18 suggest we get this study done and Storey County figures out a
19 way to, to jack the speed up and, and get that work done as
20 quickly as, as possible and, and then come back with as much
21 time as still is available for, for the bond money. The
22 quicker it gets done, the more time that they're going to have
23 time to get the construction work done. The less time they
24 get that report and then decide to come back with whatever
25 number it's going to be, they're going to have less time, so

1 that's where I was going with the initial thought on \$110,000.

2 OSTROVSKY: Well, let me ask a question of staff.

3 Remaining, it will have a balance of funds at the completion

4 of this meeting, I'm assuming. So this Commission will have

5 to allocate that balance or return it to this treasurer's

6 office at some future date, so what, what, what the

7 Commissioner Stoldal is proposing is that they come back to us

8 when the plan is done and tell us what they can actually

9 achieve and the cost of that within the timeframe allocated.

10 Is that something we can do?

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

12 Yes, that's one of the available alternatives is to, is to

13 fund a portion of the, of the application at this point with

14 the provision that the grantee would return to the Commission

15 to seek the additional funding for whatever phase they, they

16 felt was feasible in the remaining time.

17 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

18 PALMER: My advice would be that the meeting be

19 held sometime in -- following the, the close of the

20 legislative session in 2023 for two reasons. The Commission

21 will have to establish a new grant cycle if there is funding

22 in the executive budget -- lege-approved executive budget for

23 the next grant cycle. So there will be a need for a meeting

24 anyway, and, if, in June, the county, Washoe County, is aware

25 of what next phase they might want to tackle in the remaining

1 time, yes, you could then obligate that additional funding at
2 that point. The funding agreement would only be executed for
3 the amount the Commission granted today.

4 OSTROVSKY: I understand. Does, does that explanation
5 bring any comfort to members of this Commission? Mr.
6 Kavanaugh, your hand up?

7 KAVANAUGH: Yes. Thank you. Thank you for that
8 explanation, Rebecca. I, I have a desire to go ahead and
9 approve the grant amount for \$345,000 or \$4 -- 340,050 minus
10 the \$500 or the \$5000 for the permitting For this reason. The
11 grant application itself meets the requirements of the
12 application process. I understand my fellow commissioner's
13 concern about not having the exact scope of work lined out in
14 each phase. However, I believe that it is helpful to any
15 organization to know that if they get an estimate of probable
16 cost based on a phased-plan document, they know the scope of
17 which they can get that work done in a given time. I think we
18 have a very capable staff and I think they can oversee this
19 project. That's, that's my comment regarding this
20 application. I am, I respect -- with all due respect, I think
21 it's smart to go ahead and just fund the master plan
22 development, but I also think this gives them an opportunity
23 to move forward with maybe Phase 2, Phase 3 of their project
24 and I think our staff is fully capable of oversight without us
25 having to come back and, and approving the phase -- next phase

1 or the, or the subsequent phase of this project.

2 STOLDAL: Chair, I, I -- Stoldal for the record. I
3 don't, I don't, disagree a hundred percent with that and, and
4 I, and I think I'm suggesting almost the same thing with the
5 one exception is when I did the math, I, I'm left over with a
6 considerable amount of change, and, and for me, this project -
7 - I had put money aside for, for Phase 2 and Phase 3, so I've
8 got two lists. One is -- will be what I call the first round
9 that we're all sort of working on, and that's going to be left
10 over with, with some money, and there may be some projects
11 that, that the, the commissioners will likely give more or
12 less money as, as we, as we go through. But in either case,
13 it's likely we're going to wind up with a, with a considerable
14 amount of change, and, and part of my concern is, is getting
15 this report back from the consultants for the county. The way
16 the -- the process outlined in detail in, in, in, in, in this
17 report, which is many pages long, says that that's not like --
18 they're not likely to get that until June of next year.
19 That's not going to give them time to finish Phase 2 and 3.
20 They just won't have enough time to, to, to, to get that,
21 assuming that they're going to have somebody ready to go out.
22 Once they get the report back, they're going to have to go out
23 to bid and that's going to take another period of time. So I
24 don't want to lose the money, but I, I, I think that, that we
25 need to keep the money for this project in reserve, so if

1 they're able to speed the process up and, and, and they think
2 they can get Phases 2 or 3 or whatever phase they come back
3 with, if they can get that done, then we'll have some money
4 to, to, to fund it. It's an important project. I just -- I,
5 I want to make sure that we, we don't -- that, you know, we've
6 got several projects that are not getting done on time and,
7 and these are all good people and, and, and Washoe County
8 clearly knows what they're doing. And, and, and I'm not
9 saying I wouldn't vote in favor of the whole thing, but I'd
10 just like to get a, a, a planning document and see if they can
11 speed that process up and get it done. June of next year?
12 That's a year to get this whole -- to get a report back. It's
13 a whole year that. That, that's a long time. Seems to me we
14 could -- they could speed that process up if they want to come
15 back and ask us for a quarter million dollars. Thank you, Mr.
16 Chair.

17 OSTROVSKY: Mr. Kavanaugh, would you -- could you
18 accept some kind of a motion that allotted the \$110,000 and
19 set aside of reserve of \$234,000 for this project to be, to be
20 made available on, on the completion of the study?

21 KAVANAUGH: I absolutely would. And I, I think we can
22 lead that to our staff to send us a notice stating that
23 they've met the, the project plan. They've done phase, you
24 know, that first phase and, and they're ready to move forward.
25 If we set, if we set that money, I know that we'll have

1 additional funds available based on the current applications
2 we have on the, on doc or on deck. I think we can certainly
3 consider perhaps a set-aside, so if we did the \$110,000 right
4 now as an approval and set aside the balance, I think, of,
5 say, of \$335,050 or whatever the difference is, that would
6 motivate them to get this project done within the timeframe.
7 And I, and I think it helps organizations when they're
8 planning forward and they know that they have a funding set
9 aside to get their projects done. They're in a better
10 position to move those projects faster. If it's contingent
11 upon us getting back together, I think we -- I think that
12 could cause some delays and, and, and in my business, I'm a
13 business owner, and we're doing some construction renovation
14 right now. If there's a two-week delay, that could cost me
15 \$20,000. We don't want these projects to cost more. We want
16 them to be able to get out there, get them done, get their
17 plan reviews approved, get the construction, have them go out
18 to bid as quickly as possible, and get the projects completed
19 in align -- in, in, in compliance with what our office
20 requires. So --

21 OSTROVSKY: So you --

22 KAVANAUGH: -- I'm of the mind that, I'm of the mind
23 that we go ahead and, and keep that at the forefront of our
24 minds as we go forward with these grant awards because we have
25 had this problem in the last year with some of our applicants

1 not being able to complete their projects because of the
2 impact of COVID and supply-chain issues.

3 OSTROVSKY: So I'm -- what I'm hearing, you would
4 support a motion of \$110,607 with a set-aside of \$234,443 that
5 -- subject to the approval of staff and the notification to
6 this Commission.

7 KAVANAUGH: That's what I would -- that's, that's what
8 I would support.

9 OSTROVSKY: Would you make that, would you make that
10 in a form of a motion?

11 KAVANAUGH: So moved.

12 OSTROVSKY: Is there a second for that motion?

13 OLMSTEAD: Commission Olmstead. I second.

14 OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second.

15 Commissioners comments on that motion. Any public comment --

16 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I'm just -- I'm, I'm a little
17 bit nervous about shifting this Commission's responsibility of
18 a quarter million dollars to a maybe. This Commission is able
19 to meet if, if the county said we've got the report back. We
20 know what we're going to ask. This Commission can be set up
21 within a week, so this Commission is not a delaying factor,
22 and I'm a little bit nervous about -- hesitant about shifting
23 our responsibility over to somebody else. That's what we're
24 charged with is, is looking at -- if this was \$5000 or
25 \$10,000, okay. But a quarter million dollars, I'm a little

1 bit nervous about, about that. That's my comment. Thank you.

2 OSTROVSKY: Well, let, let me ask the, the -- with the
3 understanding you'd have a snap meeting or very quick meeting,
4 would, would the maker of the motion agree to change her
5 motion to preclude -- to include Commission approval?

6 KAVANAUGH: I will amend by motion to include the
7 conven -- convening a Commission meeting to make approval for
8 the rest of the funding on this particular grant.

9 OSTROVSKY: And does the seconder accept that change?

10 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I accept.

11 OSTROVSKY: And does the Attorney General's office
12 believe that's -- that the motion would be appropriate now
13 that both the maker and the seconder have approved that
14 change?

15 WALSH: Yeah, sure. I agree with that.

16 OSTROVSKY: All right. Any further discussion? Any
17 comments from the public? Everyone's good? All right. All
18 those in favor of the motion to approve 21-06 in the amount of
19 \$110,607 with a set-aside of an additional -- if I find my
20 numbers again here. Had them a second ago. We did set-aside
21 of \$234,443 subject to Commission -- to future Commission
22 approval. All those in favor, say aye.

23 MULTIPLE: Aye.

24 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The motion carries with the
25 affirmative vote of the Chair. Thank you very much. And that

1 discussion is important because it may come back. I mean, we,
2 we may face this again. Thank you very much. That was 06.
3 I'm looking for 07. Hang on. 07 is a Tonopah Mining Park in
4 the amount of \$348,773. Is the applicant available?

5 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. One moment.

6 CARPENTER: Hi. Can you all hear me? It's Ann
7 Carpenter.

8 OSTROVSKY: Yes, Ann, I hear you clearly.

9 CARPENTER: All right. Thank you very much. Very
10 much appreciate this opportunity to come before you. I also
11 have Joe Westerlund with the town, Jeff, Jeff Martin who's --
12 heads up the park and, I believe, Nathan Robeson (phonetic) is
13 also on. He's the engineer who's been helping us for probably
14 a good decade out at the park. So if, if they raise their
15 hand to want to offer additional information, that'd be great.
16 Thank you for the opportunity to present in front of you.
17 We've been making great advancements. I am the Chair of the
18 Tonopah Historic Mining Park Foundation. The Foundation is --
19 works in partnership with the, with the town. We raise money
20 from visitors who donate, board members who donate, local and
21 regional businesses, and folks living in the region, the
22 mining industry, local, statewide, and affiliated support
23 industries to the mining industry have helped to support this
24 -- our efforts up at the park, and we have been laser focused
25 lately on the head frame restoration. So we've been able to

1 advance a number of great projects with SHPO's help for which
2 we are greatly appreciative. It is an outdoor -- the, the
3 park is an outdoor museum open to the public. The Foundation,
4 again, working closely with the town of Pono -- Tonopah, is
5 regularly making repairs and improving exhibits to ensure the
6 history of mining, and Tonopah remains preserved and ace --
7 accessible to the public. The Foundation has successfully
8 completed many projects in partnership with the town as well
9 as industry partners over the years since its inception to
10 preserve and protect the property. The -- a grant award will
11 -- this grant award will open -- reopen two buildings on the
12 Tonopah Historic Mining Park property, the Silver Top Hoist
13 House in Grizzly, and continue work to allow accessibility to
14 the third iconic feature at the park, the Desert Queen
15 Complex. This will allow visitors to more fully immerse
16 themselves in the history of mining in Tonopah and in Nevada,
17 especially focused on central Nevada, creating a better
18 visitor experience and fuller understanding of the historic
19 significance of mining of the park and of Nevada.
20 Stabilization, arrested decay and preservation of the
21 features. These are the -- these all create long-term access
22 to and by the public. Historic significance of the Silver Top
23 Grizzly, one of the only complete historic mine complexes in
24 the State of Nevada. It has a head frame which SHPO helped us
25 with restoring that, which was a major feature because it was

1 beginning to fall over. It -- again, so it has a head frame,
2 a hoist house, an ore house, which is called a grizzly and the
3 Tonopah Goldfield Railroad Bed that goes underneath.
4 Currently, it's lim -- there's limited access due to animal
5 infestation and some additional stabilization work that needs
6 to be completed. Can only be cleaned -- the town lacks
7 personnel and funds to, to clean and restore consistently, so
8 the Grizzly must remain closed to the public until we complete
9 the restoration and the, the, the work that we are proposing.
10 The Silver Top Complex, exor -- again, the significance.
11 It's, it's one of the only complete historic mine complexes in
12 the State of Nevada. Head frame, hoist house, ore house,
13 grizzly, and the Tonopah Goldfield Road Bed. So we are
14 rehabil -- we want to rehabilitate -- well, we rehabilitated
15 and save from collapse the head frame a couple of years back
16 and then we, we additionally built trestles last year that we
17 were able to complete so that we could re-illustrate to the
18 public what that mind complex looked like. We want to
19 reinstall the ore tracks on top of the trestle, install
20 lighting in the mine shaft to allow for public viewing like we
21 have down at the, at the Mizpah, inst -- reinstall the
22 elevator, and reinstall the cable bell and guide cable. Final
23 completion of the full Silver Top Complex, including the
24 grizzly, will allow increased public access and increased
25 experience. The Desert Queen. The Town of Tonopah has

1 initiated some of the stabilization work while we focused our
2 attention on -- in the years past focused our attention on the
3 Silver Top. It is part of the original claims on the, on the
4 historic Tonopah -- historic mining park property. It was
5 used as a rescue shaft during the Belmont fire of 1911.
6 Stabilization work on the Desert Queen initiated again by the
7 town. We need additional help to complete that work on the
8 hoist house, the head frame, and the attached grizzly. Full
9 completion of the -- final completion of the full Desert Queen
10 area will allow public access and from that, a better learning
11 experience from the, the historic mine projects. I want to
12 emphasize that we have an incredible team that keeps coming
13 back to do this work, and that includes Nathan Robison and
14 Robison Engineering and Simerson Construction. When we were
15 awarded the, the last grant for the rebuilding of the trestles
16 and the stabilization of the existing tre -- trestles, we had
17 to -- Simonson came to me and said, Now that we have the
18 money, the price of, of lumber has gone through the roof, and
19 he went out under his own initiative and, and, and developed
20 his own sawmill so that he could keep the price of lumber down
21 and bring it back into check so that we could complete what we
22 had started. The, you know, the grant process was at least a
23 year delay and the, and the price of lumber had gone through
24 the roof. So I want to emphasize that this team, between
25 Nathan Robison and the Simson Group, they really act very

1 nimbly and create great fixes for the park to, to last a long
2 time. I thank you for your consideration, and I'm, I'm open
3 to questions.

4 OSTROVSKY: Two, two things from the Chair and one,
5 again, it lacks an audit. Could you tell us about your money?
6 How you handle your books?

7 CARPENTER: Absolutely. We are a board structured of
8 nine of us now. Unfortunately, we lost one of our members.
9 he passed away recently and he was a, a wonderful supporter of
10 the park and, and regional history, and we are structured
11 through an executive committee. So we have nine members.
12 There is a Chair. I'm the Chair, a Vice Chair, a Treasurer,
13 and a Secretary. We meet quarterly and we review our
14 financials through our Executive Assistant and Treasurer. We
15 utilize Dan MacArthur (phonetic). We've been using him for
16 decades as the town has. That's the town's a -- accountant
17 and is our accountant and most importantly, we provide very
18 detailed accounting back to SHPO in the form of a final
19 report, and we account for all of the expenditures, the fees,
20 the, the supplies that were purchased right down to the
21 details. So although it isn't a formal audit, we are
22 structured very formally as a board and operate as such.

23 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Last question that I had,
24 what, what was the year that the park originally opened? Do
25 you recall?

1 CARPENTER: You know, I'm going to punt that one over
2 to, to Jeff, if -- Jeff and Joe. I'm, I'm not sure. I've
3 been serving on the board with pleasure for at least 12 years
4 and I, I'm going to say it's been open for 20 years, but if,
5 if Jeff or Joe have raised their hand, it would, it would be
6 coming from the town of Tonopah office.

7 OSTROVSKY: Well, it's really a personal --

8 MARTIN: Yeah, we're on. My name is Jeff Martin
9 and I'm the Park Host of Tonopah Historic Mining Park. The
10 park was started in '92 as a, as a gift from Echo Bay, the
11 mining company out of Canada. It was several years in the
12 making, probably a good 10 years and officially opened in 2000
13 and started with just weekend tours, went to five days a week,
14 and now we are seven days a week, only closed on state and
15 federal holidays, and we provide self-guided and guided
16 walking tours.

17 OSTROVSKY: I appreciate the --

18 MARTIN: I believe the --

19 OSTROVSKY: It was a kind of --

20 MARTIN: Yeah.

21 OSTROVSKY: -- self-interest question. I, I, I was
22 there the day the park opened. I just couldn't remember when
23 it was. Quite a big -- a long time ago. Twenty-two years.

24 MARTIN: Yes, it was. Yup.

25 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Go ahead. Commissioners,

1 questions please. I don't see any. Would someone like to
2 make a motion?

3 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'll make
4 a motion for the Tonopah Historic Mining Park Foundation to
5 award the \$263,380 as requested.

6 OSTROVSKY: No, I, I think --

7 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry. I wasn't plugged
8 in. I did have a couple of questions.

9 OSTROVSKY: Oh, I'm sorry. Go -- we'll come back --

10 STOLDAL: No --

11 OSTROVSKY: -- to your motion. I'm sorry.

12 STOLDAL: No, no, it was, it was -- I was, I was not
13 plugged in. I, I, I think that they've satisfactorily -- my
14 biggest question was on the audit. I think they
15 satisfactorily answered that question. On all these projects,
16 I look at roof, walls, and foundation as sort of the
17 stabilization and to begin with. On the Silver Top project,
18 there's, there's a question in there, if I understand
19 correctly, that you plan to open it with a, with a spread mat
20 while the proposal from the Desert Queen, you're talking about
21 a, a piers that, that are going to be the, the stabilization
22 point. What are the safety issues between having a spread
23 stabilization and, and, and sort of a piers, if I'm, if I'm
24 asking that engineering correctly?

25 CARPENTER: if, if Nathan's on the call, let him -- he

1 can raise his hand. I, I thought I saw him a little bit
2 earlier. I'll take a whack at it. The piers are for the
3 structural stabilization of the head frame posts, and then the
4 buildings themselves that need to be stabilized. The Desert
5 Queen is on flatter ground, so it's, it's easier to -- I think
6 that's where the piers may come in, and whereas the, the, the
7 grizzly of the Silver Top is, is, is up on very high stilts,
8 if you will, big thick timber that probably came out of the
9 Sierras and that, that allowed the trains to come under
10 (Inaudible). But if Nathan's on the phone, he might be able
11 to provide a bit more detail.

12 STOLDAL: And kind of my question is really, is, is
13 this a safety issue? One, one is safer than the other, and
14 are we funding the safest or is it -- it's just a geology
15 issue?

16 CARPENTER: I think it's an engineering issue and it's
17 -- they're both safe. One has to do with the structure of one
18 sort of building and its dynamics, and the other is very
19 particular to that building, but it is -- all the engineering
20 that we've done with -- is with safety first in mind.

21 STOLDAL: Great. Okay. Chair, I have -- that was,
22 that was my question other than the traditional question. If
23 you have to choose between the Silver Top and the, and the
24 other one, which would you do?

25 CARPENTER: If, if -- I think I'm, I'm still on.

1 Yeah, thanks. We would s -- I'm -- would lean towards
2 finishing the Silver Top and focusing on that if we had to
3 choose between the two and then delay the work on the Desert
4 Queen.

5 STOLDAL: Okay. I'm not suggesting you have to do
6 that, but that's just a, a (Inaudible). Mr. Chair, thank you.

7 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. Commissioner Kavanaugh, would you
8 like to make your motion again? And the proper amount is
9 \$348,773.

10 KAVANAUGH: I'm sorry. I -- my, my audio went out for
11 a second.

12 OSTROVSKY: That's okay. I'm saying I'm prepared for
13 your motion. You're still on mute. There you are.

14 KAVANAUGH: Okay. So we are on, on 20 -- 21-07,
15 Tonopah Historic Mining Foundation, Desert Queen head frame,
16 grizzly, and Silver Top rehabilitation for the amount of
17 \$263,380.

18 OSTROVSKY: I have \$348 (Inaudible).

19 KAVANAUGH: \$348?

20 OSTROVSKY: I show \$348,773.50. Is that?

21 CARPENTER: That's correct.

22 UNIDENTIFIED: That is correct.

23 KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible). I'm sorry. I have the wrong
24 amount on my, on my --

25 OSTROVSKY: That's okay.

1 KAVANAUGH: -- document.

2 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
3 Commissioner Kavanaugh, that was staff's mistake. We put the
4 incorrect amount on staff notes. The correct amount is on the
5 table identified as Appendix 7.

6 KAVANAUGH: Okay. I have it here. So I'm
7 recommending that we approve the Tonopah Historic Mining Park,
8 Desert Queen frame, grizzly rehabilitation and Silver Top
9 Complex grizzly rehabilitation in the amount of \$348,773.50.

10 OSTROVSKY: Is there a second to that motion?

11 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

12 OSTROVSKY: Olmstead second. Any commissioners have
13 any further comments? Any member of the public have any
14 comments? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor of the
15 motion, say aye.

16 MULTIPLE: Aye.

17 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The motion carries with the
18 Chair's affirmative vote. It's unanimous. Thank you very
19 much of those in attendance. Thank you very much.

20 CARPENTER: Thank you so much.

21 OSTROVSKY: I will make it a point to get out there
22 again 22 years later to have a look. I, I -- just for
23 everyone's information, if we could get through the first 10
24 applications and then take a lunch break, that would give us
25 10 more, about approximately 10 more to do after lunch. So

1 we're looking at 08, which is the Reno First Methodist Church.
2 They have a request of amount of \$54,267. Is there someone
3 from the group?

4 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I'll bring on Ron Applegate.

5 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

6 HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, Ron. You'll have to unmute.

7 APPLGATE: Okay. Thank you. I'm Ron Applegate here
8 with Reno First United Methodist Church and along with me here
9 is Jim Gerbel (phonetic) and John Helmrick (phonetic) and
10 Jennifer Smith, who does work with us. So anyway, first of
11 all, what I wanted say is I want to thank the Commission and
12 the staff, you know, the staff with Rebecca, Carla, and
13 Kristen for all the support they've given us, that you folks
14 have given us over the last couple cycles and fortunately or
15 in good nature is the fact is that we got the roof on before
16 that big deluge of rain. We got come in. Got that just in
17 time as we was trying to protect the building and so that
18 brings us to the other point, how do we continue to protect
19 the building -- building more and that is with the rain gutter
20 systems that, you know, we have here. They're pretty well
21 rotten out. They're corroded out and they need to be rebuilt,
22 saved where we can, and rebuild what we can't and so with the
23 scuffers and the downspouts and the gutters and that, so
24 that's one phase of it there. And then the other, the other
25 phase that we're looking at is the -- on the electrical

1 switch. Over the years, you know, actually here in a couple
2 years, it'll be a hundred years since this church was built,
3 this building and the way to turn the lights on in the
4 sanctuary was -- has always been to open up the breaker box
5 and start flipping breakers and that's not very safe. That's
6 something we can't be doing. So we've approached some
7 contractors about bringing out control switches outside the
8 breaker box so people aren't opening up that breaker box, you
9 know, in an unsafe deal there to get that done. And then the
10 final one is these doors we have here, the, the trifold doors
11 between the parlor and the sanctuary pretty well wearing out.
12 The tracks are wearing out and need to be rebuilt, and so
13 that's, that's what we're asking for help on that. You know,
14 you've been talking about audits, you know. Our last audit
15 was done in 2019. It had been prepared to start, but then
16 COVID hit us and that shut us down for a while. And about two
17 months ago, we started with another audit, so that is coming
18 up on the, on the line here pretty quick. You know, I'm, I'm
19 going to be right up front. Everybody has never said much
20 about this, but, you know, we, we're asking for \$54,267 to
21 cover a total project number of \$62,105. These numbers we
22 got, you know, we're trying to hold true with our contractors.
23 They're pretty iffy right now and I'm thinking that, you know,
24 the prices have probably went up for materials probably 15% up
25 to 20%. And so, that's what we're doing. We're just going on

1 faith that we can make this happen. So, I don't know what
2 else to do, but say -- ask you for your comments, your
3 questions, and see what we can do. Thank you.

4 OSTROVSKY: Any questions of the members of the
5 Commission?

6 STOLDAL: Well, I think -- Stoldal for the record --
7 I think that the applicant is, is correct for every one of
8 these applications. The price fluctuation, the ability, for
9 example, in Goldfield weather, to get a contractor, all kinds
10 of issues, but I don't think we should start adding 10 or 15%
11 to, to, to these, these grants. We need solid figures. If
12 there's a real problem, I do understand the applicant's issue
13 'cause we all face that when we drive down the street, so I --
14 it just -- I, I just want to say we appreciate it, I think,
15 the, the, the, the challenge, but I think we need to stick
16 with at least using that phrase that costs have gone up to
17 change it. I, I don't think we should do that at, at this
18 point, but I, I, I would be happy just to, to make a motion
19 to, to approve a 21-08 Reno First United Methodist Church
20 restoration, repair of gutters, electric panels, inside
21 trifold, sanctuary doors for \$54,262 if I have the math right.
22 Or is it \$61?

23 APPLGATE: \$67.

24 OSTROVSKY: \$67.

25 STOLDAL: Well, I think there's a \$6 mistake in

1 there from staff and so I think the figure is \$54,261.

2 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

3 KAVANAUGH: I'll second.

4 OSTROVSKY: If you --

5 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.

6 OSTROVSKY: I'm sorry. Is there a second?

7 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'll

8 second the motion.

9 OSTROVSKY: Any further (Inaudible) --

10 KAVANAUGH: (Inaudible) Mr. Stoldal.

11 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. And any further comments from
12 the commissioners? Any comments from the public?

13 APPELEGATE: just to -- we are shovel ready to, to
14 begin. We've talked to contractors. We've -- they're all
15 ready to roll. Probably, you know, by the time we get the
16 paperwork and all the grant work done, we're talking 45 d --
17 days, at least probably and they're ready to roll.

18 STOLDAL: Well, I'd call them right now and lock the
19 price in.

20 APPELEGATE: You know what? We've been, we've been
21 hounding them, believe me. I, I work with developers building
22 homes and we're a -- we know what that situation's like.
23 Thank you very much though for your support throughout the
24 years.

25 OSTROVSKY: You've all heard the motion. All those in

1 favor of approving grant number 21-08, please say aye.

2 MULTIPLE: Aye.

3 OSTROVSKY: Chair votes in favor. It's unanimous of
4 those present. Thank you very much. Good luck.

5 APPLGATE: Thank that.

6 OSTROVSKY: That takes us to 21-09, which is Art
7 Center in Carson City. Is someone from Brewery Arts with us
8 today?

9 HITCHCOCK: Yes, I'll be bringing Mike on. One
10 moment. Mikey, you're on.

11 WIENCEK: Good morning. This is Mikey Wiencek with
12 the Brewery Arts Center. Can you all hear me?

13 OSTROVSKY: I certainly can. Go ahead.

14 WIENCEK: Awesome. Well, good morning,
15 commissioners and staff. And I just want to start off by
16 thanking you for the last round of grant funding we received.
17 As I was putting together the final reporting and going
18 through all the different things that we've done over the past
19 year, it has made a huge impact on our campus, our staff, and
20 our visitors. So thank you for everything that you do and for
21 helping us do what we do. So we're talking about the Carson
22 Brewing Company today, the Brewery Art Center. We are the
23 original home of Carson Brewing Company. The building was
24 built 1860 and it was Nevada's oldest business, not Nevada's
25 oldest profession, that's different, but later, we were the

1 home of the Nevada Appeal until the early seventies and we're
2 three blocks, blocks west of the capitol dome, so we're right
3 here in the historic district and this is our last major
4 project needed on the campus. We've been operating as a art
5 center here for 47 years and we do hundreds of events a year.
6 We're about ready to start our big concert series. We're the
7 home of multiple nonprofits that call the BAC home. We've got
8 theater, ballet. We had the symphony here Sunday nights.
9 They got winded out of the Capitol. I'm looking out our
10 window right now and there's people showing up for Rotary and
11 we've got a Division of Mining meeting going on. School of
12 Rock is performing across the street and we just had the
13 Snoopy and the Red Baron exhibit here for three months and
14 we've got a local artist exhibit in that space right now. And
15 we're hoping that we're going to have an exhibit from the Rock
16 and Roll Hall of Fame coming up very soon. So the request
17 that we have before you today is to finish the restoration of
18 the brick on our building. About 12, 12 or 13 years ago,
19 Abstract Masonry did the Division Street side, the east side,
20 of the building, and completely restored that brick, but there
21 was no funding available to do the rest and now we want to
22 restore the rest as the brick is in pretty bad shape.
23 Available for questions.

24 OSTROVSKY: Well, I just want to point out as we go
25 along that staff has a number of questions relative to the

1 details of the restoration work, which I'm sure you're used to
2 working with staff in the past --

3 WIENCEK: Indeed.

4 OSTROVSKY: -- (Inaudible) examples and types of
5 materials and making sure that it all meets the standard.
6 Just, just to let you know, there are, there are numerous
7 questions, all of which I think you can work out with staff.
8 You've always been able to do that in the past, but I will
9 open it up for commissioner's questions at this time. Mr.
10 Stoldal.

11 STOLDAL: Couple of questions. First, the double
12 asterisk note from the contractor, help me understand that.
13 This proposal is for \$537,431 of which \$200,000, nearly half,
14 is for wastewater disposal and you're going to absorb that?

15 WIENCEK: No, sir. What it is, is we received a
16 grant from the Brownfield's program, from the State EPA where
17 they've approved us up to \$200,000 to handle the wastewater
18 removal. My understanding is, is when the brick was restored
19 last time, the city allowed them to just let the wastewater go
20 down the drains, but then upon further testing, they realized
21 the lead content was too high --

22 STOLDAL: Right.

23 WIENCEK: -- and they would not let them do that
24 again. So then the State EPA said that they would fund the
25 removal and treatment of the wastewater that comes off from

1 the steam process, removing the lead paint.

2 STOLDAL: And could you clear up a second question
3 that comes from the contract proposal? It, it says that the,
4 the quote includes "repoint 100% of all mortar joints", but
5 then point 14 says, This proposal specifically includes
6 reappointing.

7 WIENCEK: Um --

8 OSTROVSKY: I mean, excludes reappointing is, I think,
9 is what it says.

10 STOLDAL: Yeah.

11 WIENCEK: Yeah. Excludes masonry repair. I think
12 they're talking about --

13 STOLDAL: And appointing.

14 WIENCEK: Yeah. I th -- I don't know if that's --
15 I, I'd have to double check with the contractor on that point,
16 but I don't know if that just means the concrete work that's
17 around the building, that they wouldn't be repairing that
18 where it meets the brick, but I'm not that sure.

19 STOLDAL: Well, I think you need to clear that, that
20 point up because both of them use the word reappointing and,
21 and there's probably some logical explanation on, on, on that
22 and then just really kind of a minor question. Once these
23 bricks are all done and they're beautiful and, and so forth,
24 is there -- do you have a -- does the board or, or the
25 foundation have a policy of what you can put up on those

1 walls? Glue signs on? Paint things on? I presume we're
2 going to leave these walls once they're all fixed, the bricks
3 are all as pristine as possible without hanging stuff on them
4 or paint or (Inaudible).

5 WIENCEK: Oh, indeed. Indeed. We have zero plans
6 to ever do anything to the brick or mount anything to it.
7 There's -- yeah. It's -- there's no signage mounted to the
8 brick. The only thing that's mounted to the brick are
9 handrails, and then there's some existing hooks from previous
10 years and seismic things that have been attached and light
11 fixtures.

12 STOLDAL: Okay. And my last question then is, is,
13 as I've asked a couple of other applicants, if this has to be
14 financially phased in, which set of walls do you recommend?
15 West and south or west and north walls?

16 WIENCEK: I would say the west and the north walls
17 are the most important. The, the south wall is the smallest
18 section and it seems to be fairly well intact. It only seems
19 to have just a couple of (Inaudible) on it, and it doesn't
20 seem -- it doesn't appear to have the same erosion damage that
21 the other two sides have suffered.

22 STOLDAL: So you would say the west and north?

23 WIENCEK: Yes, sir. And the plan for this is, we're
24 aiming for next spring, but the contractor wouldn't get into
25 any kind of dates until we had funding secured and then they

1 would schedule us. But the understanding is, is that we were
2 aiming for spring of 2023.

3 STOLDAL: And how long would it take to get done?

4 WIENCEK: They are -- they weren't able to provide
5 me with that information exactly.

6 STOLDAL: I mean, within a year though?

7 WIENCEK: Oh, yes, sir. Definitely.

8 STOLDAL: Okay. All right.

9 WIENCEK: Yeah. Once, 'cause they're coming from
10 Utah, they would be set up, put up scaffold, do it, and it --
11 I think it took a little over a month that -- when they did
12 the other side of the building.

13 STOLDAL: Okay. Again, you're thinking west wall
14 and north wall, and, and if it's between the west and north,
15 which one?

16 WIENCEK: Personally, the ugliest side to me is the
17 west wall, but the north wall, it has a lot of windows on it
18 and I'm, I'm concerned about the structure of the brick.

19 STOLDAL: Okay. All right. Thank you very much.

20 WIENCEK: Thank you, sir.

21 OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioners have questions?
22 Would any commissioner care to make a motion?

23 STOLDAL: Chair, I'll make the -- make a motion for
24 the 21-09 Brewery Art Center, the Brewery Building brick
25 restoration. I move that we fund the, the, the total amount

1 of \$302,452.

2 OSTROVSKY: Is there a second?

3 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'll
4 second.

5 OSTROVSKY: I have a motion and a second. Are there
6 any other comments or questions from commissioners? Any
7 questions or comments --

8 KAVANAUGH: I just --

9 OSTROVSKY: I'm sorry, go ahead.

10 KAVANAUGH: I just wanted to say -- this is
11 Commissioner Kavanaugh for the record. I just want to say
12 thank you for working to get mitigation of the, of the lead
13 water during the renovation. I think that's really important
14 for our environment. So thank you for finding resources to do
15 that for this project.

16 OSTROVSKY: Any other comment? Any comments from the
17 public? Hearing and seeing none, all those in favor, say aye.

18 MULTIPLE: Aye.

19 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Motion carries unanimous of
20 those in attendance with the Chair's affirmative vote. Thank
21 you very much.

22 WIENCEK: Thank you, all.

23 OSTROVSKY: We're going to take one more and then take
24 a lunch break. We'll do number 10, which is the White Pine
25 County Community Choir Association. Is there someone

1 available from the association?

2 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I have Mary Eldridge. I'll
3 bring her on.

4 OSTROVSKY: All right.

5 ELDRIDGE: This is Mary Eldridge. Can you hear me?

6 OSTROVSKY: Oh, yes, we can, Mary. Very clearly.

7 Thank you.

8 ELDRIDGE: Thank you. I am the Grants Director for
9 the White Pine Community Choir Association, and we have
10 applied for funding to re -- continue the restoration of the
11 Centennial Fine Arts Center. The building was constructed as
12 a first stake tabernacle for the Church of Jesus Christ of
13 Latter Day Saints in White Pine County. The building erected
14 in 1927 was designed by Brigham Young's grandson, Joseph Van
15 Carlos Young and is an integral part of Ely's downtown
16 landscape. The center is a beautiful example of colonial
17 revival architecture with unique features, including
18 outstanding acoustics in the sanctuary, a performance stage in
19 the activity hall and a Yankee gutter drainage system. Over
20 the years, the center has housed community choir concerts,
21 recitals, art shows, quilt shows, and visiting musicians. The
22 choir has undertaken the restoration to continue and build on
23 those opportunities for events. There are no venues of our --
24 of this size in our area. Current facilities in Ely are
25 suitable for large events at the convention center or school

1 gymnasiums or small events in individual conference rooms.
2 The restoration of the building creates a venue for groups
3 currently having no other options. The choir has community
4 support in planning and completing the projects. Dozens of
5 residents participated in a charette identifying over 200
6 potential users for the building. The choir board meets
7 monthly and has captured the participation of people
8 interested in preserving this historic site. Funding has also
9 come from the Great Basin Heritage Area, the White Pine
10 Tourism and Recreation Board, local businesses, community
11 residents, and private foundations. The Environmental
12 Protection Agency's Brownfields program has funded a
13 concurrent project of abating the asbestos shingles and
14 replacing the roof. The proposal before you today requests
15 \$83,200 to stabilize the subsidence in the foundation in the
16 Southwest corner of the building. We have sought the
17 expertise of a structural engineer with experience in
18 foundation restoration to develop the plan and budget. This
19 includes the necessary excavation and placement of helical
20 spears to relevel the corner and prevent further
21 deterioration. This project aligns well with the Commission's
22 efforts to ensure historic buildings are structurally sound
23 and safe to be enjoyed by many more generations of Nevadans.
24 We hope you'll find this project worthy of funding. I want to
25 close by emphasizing the commitment of many people involved in

1 restoring the center and our desire to preserve and protect
2 this community to landmark for generations to come. Thank
3 you.

4 OSTROVSKY: I'm sorry. Thank you very much for
5 presentation. Let me, let me start with the first question.
6 I'll turn it over to commissioners. We -- we're a little
7 unclear about how you arrived at the \$83,200 and whether or
8 not you have the firm bids and so on. We didn't quite see
9 enough detail. Could you explain to us how you arrived at
10 that number?

11 ELDRIDGE: We do not have firm bids, but we did talk
12 with the, the structural engineer who was recommended to us
13 that has found -- experience in restoring foundations, and
14 these are the figures that he gave us, the steps in the
15 process and the, the figures that he gave us for the work to
16 be completed.

17 OSTROVSKY: So they came from an engineer that you
18 worked with before or is someone recommended?

19 ELDRIDGE: Someone recommended. They were
20 recommended by an architect that we have worked with
21 previously.

22 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank you. Other commissioners,
23 time is appropriate for questions. Mr. Stoldal?

24 STOLDAL: Rebecca, are you still on the line? I'm
25 sure you are somewhere. I thought my notes here a little

1 scribbly, but at the beginning of this meeting, you mentioned
2 a building in Ely that was closed?

3 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
4 The -- no, I was referring to a building in Virginia City.

5 STOLDAL: Okay. All right. Great. Thank you. So
6 Chairman, my challenge is that there are almost a dozen things
7 missing from this application, and, and there's no firm bid.
8 There's -- the dollar figures are, are, are really a
9 guesstimate. I -- while on the face of it, I think this is,
10 is, is clearly based on working, I think, in past years, this,
11 this building has all the elements of, of -- to fit a funding
12 request, but we don't know who the engineering company is. We
13 don't know who the stabilization plan is and whether a full
14 seismic, is it just one part of the building or are we doing
15 patchwork? Has there been a, an examination of, of the, the,
16 the foundation, the structure that's on, so we're not just
17 going around and, and patching stuff, stuff up? I -- my, my
18 notes here, and I don't have a specific plan, my notes are to,
19 to delay funding on this and put some reserve money in so this
20 applicant could come back with, with more details and, and
21 again, 11 pieces, critical pieces, are missing from this
22 application, and I, I don't quite understand that, but I think
23 that the project, based on, on previous grant application, has
24 value to both the state and, and, and the community, but I'm
25 not ready to, to, to give money just based on this

1 application.

2 OSTROVSKY: Other commissioners have comments?

3 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I, I echo
4 the same concerns of my colleague, Mr. Stoldal. We have a
5 number of required missing components for the application to
6 receive approval and so in order to meet our requirements of
7 being accountable for state funds, we -- I think we need to
8 have those, those in -- those pieces of -- those elements --
9 those pieces of the grant application in the application, so
10 that it is -- it meets the threshold of accountability that we
11 have to uphold.

12 STOLDAL: Chair, I --

13 KAVANAUGH: I would recommend --

14 STOLDAL: I'm sorry, go ahead.

15 KAVANAUGH: That being said, I would recommend that
16 the staff work with the White Pine Community Choir Association
17 to make this grant whole, but only to the extent that they get
18 a list of the things that are required for this application.
19 I would be amenable to setting aside, as suggested by my
20 colleague, Mr. Stoldal, to set aside some funds for them if,
21 if they are compliant -- become compliant with all grant
22 application requirements.

23 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, a question for the Attorney
24 General's office.

25 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, go ahead, Bob.

1 STOLDAL: Anthony, the question -- what I'd like to
2 make a motion is to delay a vote on this matter without
3 prejudice, so that the applicant could work with staff to come
4 up with a complete application and, and, Chair, do you have a
5 sense of when this Chair -- this board may meet again? Within
6 90 days? Before the end of the year?

7 OSTROVSKY: Well, c -- certainly before the end of the
8 year. I think there are things we need to do. I think you're
9 looking at probably a meeting no later than, than September
10 1st.

11 STOLDAL: So that, that's what I'd like include in,
12 in, in the, in the motion, that we hold these funds -- we
13 delay a vote on this matter on until the, the, the next board
14 meeting, no later than September of this year.

15 WALSH: Thank you, Chair, Vice Chair. I am
16 comfortable with that motion. I don't see any prohibitions on
17 essentially continuing a vote and that doesn't bother me
18 slightly at all.

19 STOLDAL: Commissioner Kavanaugh, is that kind of
20 what you were saying as well?

21 KAVANAUGH: Yes.

22 STOLDAL: Okay. Well, that would be my motion.

23 WALSH: Fantastic. And to the extent that that is
24 agendized properly, and I think maybe we could note on the
25 record next meeting that it had been continued from the

1 previous meeting, and that would be the action item that I
2 feel is appropriate.

3 STOLDAL: Right. Thank you.

4 OSTROVSKY: We have a motion. Do we have a second?

5 KAVANAUGH: Second it. This is Commissioner
6 Kavanaugh.

7 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. And that -- then -- my -- we have a
8 motion and a second. My first comment is, is staff, this is a
9 question for staff. Are you comfortable providing them a list
10 of the missing items from their application and indicating, or
11 this commission is indicating, that they need to get quotes,
12 firm quotes, for the foundation engineering work. Whatever
13 items they need, they need to get those into us so we can then
14 take action? Is that something you can do and are willing to
15 do, Rebecca?

16 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
17 My apologies. The video doesn't seem to want to come on, but,
18 yes, we, we would certainly be willing to work with the
19 applicant to assist them to review the available checklist and
20 ensure that they have a, a quote that's, you know, that that's
21 reliable that the Commission can then review at a subsequent
22 meeting.

23 STOLDAL: And, and, Rebecca, I would also, if you --
24 I, I need to understand that, that we're not piecemealing
25 this, and I don't know whether a complete structural

1 foundation of seismic and if somewhere in the, in the process
2 of working with them, if, if that question can be asked or we
3 can find a way to get that answer. Thank you.

4 OSTROVSKY: Well, we have a motion and a second. Any
5 further commissioner comments? Any comments from the public?

6 ELDRIDGE: This is Mary Eldridge. I, I just wanted -
7 - we, we are more than willing to do whatever requirements are
8 necessary to answer your questions and I, I will say that we
9 are basing this repair off of a 2018 building assessment that
10 identified only the southwest corner where the subsidence had
11 been -- wa -- was of a concern.

12 STOLDAL: Thank you.

13 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Well, it gives you an opportunity
14 to, to get the rest of it together, and we assure you, we will
15 give it your due consideration at our next meeting. We have
16 a, a motion and a second before us. All those in favor, say
17 aye.

18 MULTIPLE: Aye.

19 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair voting in favor,
20 unanimous of the commissioners that are present. Thank you
21 very much. I intend now to take a 30-minute break. It is a
22 quarter after 12:00-. If we could get back together at a
23 quarter to 1:00, exactly 30 minutes from now. We've got about
24 10 more to do, take a couple more hours of work. I appreciate
25 all your time and effort this morning, and we'll try to move

1 it along.

2 WALSH: And Chair Ostrovsky, before we do adjourn
3 for lunch, I would like to notice --- have this notice on the
4 record. Ms. Carpenter's statement in the chat, sometimes the
5 chat function does not show up on the record, so, I think it'd
6 be appropriate if one of the commissioners or staff members
7 read Ms. Carpenter's statement into the record. I do feel
8 that that is a kind of a substantive comment, so, if that
9 could just be read off of the chat function, I think that
10 would be completing -- complete for the record.

11 OSTROVSKY: Rebecca, could you read that into the
12 record, please?

13 PALMER: I certainly can. From Ann Carpenter, Ann
14 Carpenter here for the Tonopah Historic Mining Park -- Mining
15 Park Foundation. We very much appreciate your continued
16 support and efforts, and thanks for your approval of our grant
17 request. We are shovel ready and begin work relatively
18 quickly as all of the engineering work has been completed. I
19 wanted you to know that -- this, as I forgot to mention this
20 detail in my presentation, thank you again.

21 OSTROVSKY: All right, fine. Read into the record.
22 Appreciate that. That was from the chat. And, so now I think
23 it's appropriate to take our break. Thirty minutes. See you
24 back here, quarter to 1:00. Thank you very much.

25 STOLDAL: And we're going to stop recording? Audio?

1 KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

2 WALSH: Yeah, that would be fine in recess.

3 OSTROVSKY: I can pause it?

4 (Break)

5 OSTROVSKY: I'm waiting for Commissioner Olmstead. I
6 don't see her back yet.

7 STOLDAL: Chair, I'm wondering if maybe staff could,
8 at the end, before we end the meeting or at some point give us
9 a total. I'm, I'm keeping a running total, but then my math
10 is not always the best, but --

11 OSTROVSKY: I, I agree. I agree, Bob.

12 STOLDAL: Okay.

13 OSTROVSKY: We'll have to --

14 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. Yes, sir. I do have a
15 spreadsheet that I'm filling out as we go.

16 STOLDAL: Okay. Thank you.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Me, too.

18 STOLDAL: Where are you right now by the way? Just
19 so I can double check.

20 OSTROVSKY: Who's that?

21 STOLDAL: What's your total right now that we've
22 allocated?

23 OSTROVSKY: I don't, I don't have a total. I'm just
24 trying keep track of what we didn't spend (Inaudible) what we
25 did.

1 HITCHCOCK: I can give you a total here in a second
2 and just so you know, we just moved Patricia over, so she's
3 here.

4 OSTROVSKY: Oh, okay.

5 OLMSTEAD: Thank you.

6 OSTROVSKY: All right.

7 HITCHCOCK: And --

8 OSTROVSKY: This is Chairman of the Commission. I'd
9 like to call the meeting back to order after our lunch break.
10 Glad to see everyone back. I think we maintained the same
11 quorum that we had before.

12 STOLDAL: Chairman, have we started the recording?

13 OSTROVSKY: We have.

14 STOLDAL: Okay.

15 OSTROVSKY: The meeting is currently being recorded.
16 Just prior to coming onto the break, we wanted to make sure
17 that staff was keeping track, a running total of what we've
18 granted and what we've saved and so on, and staff assures us
19 that they'll be able to provide that at the end of the meeting
20 of the grant process that we know exactly where we have with
21 our financials.

22 WALSH: And, Chair Ostrovsky, if I may interrupt
23 for just a brief moment. While we were on break, it does look
24 like we received a question in the chat as well that may need
25 to be read in the record. This is Candace W.

1 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

2 PALMER: Okay. This is Rebecca Palmer, sir. If
3 you'd like me to read that, I would be happy to do that.

4 OSTROVSKY: Do that, please. Thank you.

5 PALMER: Oops. Hold on a second. Go back, close
6 that. Okay. It says, I'm not sure about procedure here.
7 Perhaps I should wait until the ending public comment section.
8 I have a clarifying question. The CCF currently has the 99-
9 year lease on the Silver Terrace Surface Rights and currently
10 the CCF, Comstock Cemetery Foundation, is the only owner of
11 the Visitor Center. At the end of our work with the county,
12 the lease will be conveyed to the county for the surface
13 rights, and an MOU will exist between the county and this and
14 the Comstock Cemetery Foundation to handle develop of land and
15 full property management, not unlike the Fourth Ward and St.
16 Mary's Art Center. However, the Visitor Center for now will
17 remain in Comstock Cemetery Foundation ownership. As the
18 majority of the grant is for work on the Visitor Center, who
19 would sign the covenants? Thanks, Candace W.

20 OSTROVSKY: Staff want to respond to that question at
21 all?

22 PALMER: Yes. For the record, this is Rebecca
23 Palmer. When we executed the covenants for the FY19 grant
24 cycle, included with those covenants was a quick claim deed
25 from the property owner to the Comstock Cemetery Foundation.

1 Those are usually when a property owner wants to release a
2 claim on a property, and so with that quick claim deed, we had
3 the Comstock Cemetery Foundation sign the covenant agreement.

4 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

5 PALMER: I would assume that once the MOU is
6 executed and Storey County is the underlying surface owner of
7 the property, it would be Storey County who would sign the
8 covenants just as we would do with the Fourth Ward School and,
9 and St. Mary's Art Center.

10 STOLDAL: There seems to be two issues here. One is
11 the, the applicant is making a difference between the
12 ownership of the building and the ownership of, of the land.
13 Do our covenants cover both those elements or are we assuming
14 that whoever owns and controls the land also controls the
15 structure?

16 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
17 Our -- my understanding and perhaps Attorney -- Deputy
18 Attorney General Walsh will, will assist, the covenants are
19 written on the parcel in question, the land and the property
20 on top. We have not exe -- the Commission has not executed
21 covenants on the property, the building alone, in the past.

22 STOLDAL: Okay. I don't know if that's ever a
23 situation where somebody just owns the building and somebody
24 else owns the land.

25 OSTROVSKY: Well, just to keep things moving, I would

1 ask staff if there are concerns about that and if you could
2 make a formal request. I, I think it's very hard for the
3 Attorney General's office to make an off-the-cuff opinion on a
4 subject as detailed as that unless they can do that.

5 WALSH: Well, realistically, Chair, ideally, the
6 covenants would apply to both, you know, the building and the
7 land. Sometimes, there is not privity of ownership between a
8 party that could own, own land and a building. I think we
9 have seen that before where, I guess, a locality owned the
10 land and a different individual owned a building, and that
11 needed to get sorted out. Essentially, the landowner would've
12 had to acquiesce to those, to those covenants as well, which
13 sometimes municipalities, if they're the parties, don't
14 usually want to do that or are prohibited by statute from
15 doing that. So to the extent that there is prohibitive
16 ownership between the building owner and the landowner, if
17 they're the same entity, then I think there isn't a
18 complicated issue there.

19 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Well that, that'll have to suffice
20 for the moment, I think, Bob, if we're going to -- if there
21 are other issues, we'll let staff work it out with the
22 Attorney General's office to see (Inaudible) covenants
23 properly in place.

24 WALSH: Sure.

25 STOLDAL: And just for clarification, ownership is,

1 is -- doesn't mean own. It could also mean lease as in a
2 long-term lease that covers the point of the covenant, I
3 think, the Chair pointed out, so (Inaudible).

4 WALSH: Correct. A pro -- protected property
5 interest, yes.

6 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. All right. I would like to move
7 on. I'd like to move on to -- get my proper pages here. The
8 next applicant is 0 -- is 21-11, St. Mary's Art Center,
9 requesting looks like a hundred thousand dollars is the
10 request. Is there someone from St Mary's Art Center
11 available?

12 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I'll bring on Arika Perry.

13 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

14 HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, Arika.

15 PERRY: Thank you. Can everyone hear me?

16 OSTROVSKY: Yes, we hear you fine.

17 PERRY: Great. Thank you, commissioners. On
18 behalf of our board, staff, and visitors, we just want to
19 thank you for the previous grant award. That project has made
20 a tremendous difference in preserving the integrity of the
21 property as well as its functionality and ability to generate
22 revenue. St. Mary's Art Center is located in former 1876 St.
23 Marie Louise's Hospital located in Virginia City, and it was
24 originally operated by the Daughters of Charity and then later
25 as Storey County Hospital until 1942. This property is a

1 cornerstone of Virginia City's deep history and pioneering
2 mining and inventions as well as art and culture, and our
3 building is -- was one of the first to include indoor plumbing
4 and gas lighting in its interiors and it was well known for
5 offering exceptional medical care and the best chances for
6 recovery. Today, it remains an important hub for the
7 community, now specifically focused on art, culture, history,
8 and serving the community in tourism. We are proudly the
9 longest operating nonprofit in Storey County and have been of
10 service since 1964. Our programming includes six art
11 galleries, three art creation spaces as well as a theater,
12 library, 16 guestrooms, kitchens, and other supportive spaces.
13 We host art and historical exhibitions and tours, receptions,
14 professional artist retreats where the artists will come in
15 for a week at a time often and learn and create together. We
16 also host community adult and children's art classes and
17 workshops and are a venue for special events that showcase
18 art, music, and holidays such as the Holiday Fair Easter Egg
19 Hunt on the lawn, as well as business meetings, weddings, and
20 other private retreats. So the work that was previously --
21 this work that we're applying for was previously approved for
22 funding by the Commission in the previous grant cycle.
23 However, due to the extreme increase in construction pricing,
24 we had to remove the window scope of work and -- in order to
25 fully fund the critical leaking front porch, print room, and

1 chimney repointing work. So with that, it is now our top
2 priority in this grant cycle to focus on the rehabilitation of
3 18 windows on the east facade, specifically the second and
4 third floors. These windows really are in the state of severe
5 deterioration and beginning to rapidly increase in decay due
6 to the weather and sun exposure. So this is making the window
7 operations increasingly difficult for guests and staff, and is
8 impairing the appearance of the property, but even more
9 importantly, it's allowing the elements and drafts to
10 infiltrate, infiltrate our interior, and it's making it very
11 difficult for our guests to open the windows, which is the
12 primary source of fresh air and breeze, particularly in the
13 warmer months, since we do not have air conditioning, and our
14 work will follow the methodology found in the National Park
15 Service Preservation Brief Number 9, and we have a
16 construction quote from Simerson Construction, who is
17 currently completing the work for the porch, print room, and
18 chimney, and that includes some lead paint mitigation, which
19 will be required since that has been identified on the
20 framing, and then we would also respectfully request that if
21 additional funds are available, there are six other windows on
22 the fourth floor on that east elevation that would benefit
23 from repairs as well as other windows on other elevations,
24 which we could proactively address. So with that, I would
25 just say that our property really is a con -- a critical

1 contributor to the community and it's a hub for creativity and
2 its history as an 1876 property and providing exposure of
3 regional professional artist works and creative spaces to the
4 community and tourists. And with that, I will open it up for
5 questions that you may have of me.

6 OSTROVSKY: This is the Chair. Question, you
7 mentioned other windows. Do you have an estimate on the cost
8 of a -- of per-window basis or average cost of a window
9 repair?

10 PERRY: No, we could, we could create one based on
11 the 18 windows and the \$100,000 cost. There is a small
12 contingency included within that for potential surprises, but
13 we had not focused on the other elevations until we had
14 learned that you may have surplus funding available, but the
15 four windows that abo -- on the fourth floor on that same east
16 facade would benefit from being addressed. They are not in
17 quite as severe decay, so the contractor was hoping that they
18 may be able to fit that into the current pricing, but they
19 will not commit to that until they see the, the extent of
20 damage to the others that they've already taken a look at, and
21 as I said, they're continuing to decay even from the last time
22 that they gave us an updated quote, which was earlier this
23 spring.

24 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank you.

25 PERRY: Mm-hmm. Other commissioners, please.

1 STOLDAL: Chair, I had -- I went along the same
2 lines and so I did some rough math and, and so I'm going to be
3 making a motion to increase the funding to \$127,597 based on
4 this, based on the details and the application and the quote
5 it's likely there are some 18 windows on the east side that
6 will require more work than others, but the average cost for
7 those 18 windows per window is \$5400. And the application
8 mentions there are six other windows on the east side that
9 would "benefit from repairs", but are not as damaged as the 18
10 that are in the dire need of repairs. So taking the \$5400 for
11 the 18 and using an estimate then of \$5000 for the ones that
12 are less repaired or less damaged for the other six and the
13 contingency cost, so I've, I've -- the, the really damaged one
14 \$5400, the increase in prices and, and less damaged windows
15 and all that I put in \$5000 per window and that's how I came
16 up with \$127,597 to increase the award to that amount. That
17 was the math that I arrived at, however ludicrous that was.

18 OSTROVSKY: Is that the form of a motion?

19 STOLDAL: Well, I, I would be happy to make a motion
20 for 21-11 St. Mary's Art Center, east facade window
21 restoration and other restorations in the application for a
22 total amount of \$127,597.

23 OSTROVSKY: Is there a second?

24 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

25 OSTROVSKY: Okay. We have a motion and a second. Now

1 would be appropriate time if other commissioners have comments
2 or questions. I don't see any. Is there any public comment?
3 Seeing or hearing none, we have a motion before us. All those
4 in favor, say aye.

5 MULTIPLE: Aye.

6 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair votes in favor.

7 Unanimous of the commissioners present. Thank you very much,
8 and hopefully, that will help with those other windows. It's
9 a beautiful building and needs consistent long-term
10 investment.

11 PERRY: Thank you so much.

12 OSTROVSKY: Mm-hmm. The next application is 21-12,
13 City of Boulder City, the water filtration plant. Someone
14 from the city available?

15 HITCHCOCK: Yes, I have Mr. Michael Mays. One moment.
16 Go ahead, Michael. You can unmute yourself.

17 MAYS: Good afternoon, everybody. Can you hear
18 me?

19 OSTROVSKY: I hear you fine. Thank you. Go ahead.

20 MAYS: All right. Good afternoon, commissioners.

21 Michael Mays, Boulder City Community Development Director for
22 the record. As part of the Boulder Canyon Project, which
23 included the construction of Hoover Dam, it was determined by
24 the Bureau of Reclamation that housing was needed near the
25 project to house construction workers. The name, Boulder

1 City, the new government-owned town would require utilities,
2 streets, and a water treatment plant. The completed water
3 filtration plant in 1932 brought treated Colorado River water
4 to the new Boulder City homes. The filtration plant continued
5 to serve the city until its decommission in the early 1980s.
6 Unfortunately, the building's lack of use over the past 40
7 years has resulted in needed rehabilitation efforts to help
8 preserve this important piece of Nevada history. The
9 filtration plant is a contributing resource to Boulder City
10 Historic District, as determined by North Wind Resource
11 Consulting. Further, North Wind believes the filtration plant
12 is eligible for individual listing under the National Register
13 of Historic Places under Criterion A, Engineering and
14 Community Planning and Development. Boulder City Council
15 approved \$125,000 to hire a consultant to prepare a historic
16 structure and assessment report for the filtration plant. The
17 city selected LGA Architecture and North Wind Resource
18 Consulting to do the report. Based on the report's
19 recommendations contained in your packet, they recommend the
20 city focus on lead paint and asbestos mitigation, window
21 rehabilitation, and tuck pointing to allow the building to be
22 more accessible to the public. A detailed cost estimate of
23 the LGA re -- recommended improvements is provided on page 267
24 of your application. (Inaudible) in their report, these
25 recommended improvements stabilize and protect the cortical

1 original building. Boulder City Council also approved as part
2 of the Fiscal Year '22 capital improvement plan \$300,000 for
3 building restoration with the hope that approximately an
4 additional \$200,000 could be provided through a CCCHP grant.
5 It is anticipated that with these improvements, it will become
6 a key feature for a future local cultural center that includes
7 an existing community garden and sculpture park. It will
8 allow the city to better tell the role the building played in
9 the early construction of Boulder City and Hoover Dam.
10 Commission consideration of contributing to this project
11 augments the city council's prior financial commitments to
12 preserving this important part of Nevada's history and the
13 city appreciates the Commission's consideration.

14 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Michael. Questions of the
15 commissioners, please.

16 STOLDAL: Yeah. Quick -- Stoldal for the record.
17 Mr. Mays, the -- you mentioned a page number, 200 and
18 something. Was, was that in the LGA report?

19 MAYS: It was, yes, 267 of the packet. It was at
20 the very end of their structural assessment report, which
21 included the cost estimates for the proposal.

22 STOLDAL: So that would -- that was Section 2 of
23 structural report and at the end of that?

24 MAYS: Correct.

25 STOLDAL: Okay. Yeah, each report is, is numbered

1 separately, not as the -- so -- all right, so my -- the, the,
2 the -- put that off for, for a second. Let, let me, let me
3 sort of jump to the end. This building has been in -- under
4 consideration by the city. At one point, there was an effort
5 to make it go private and turn it into a saloon, a saloon, I
6 mean, in the most contemporary terms and what do you see the
7 end state for the public usage? When all said is done, what
8 is -- what's going to be the cultural function of this
9 building?

10 MAYS: Part of what we have been engaging with
11 the council, and the priority has been with preservation first
12 and building upon the existing activities that have occurred
13 there. So for example, each year, the Historic Preservation
14 Committee has a tour of the facility. It is limited because
15 of the condition and accessibility of the building. It is
16 utilized in the past for plays that have occurred outside.
17 It's adjacent to a sculpture park and the community garden.
18 The ultimate use, we believe, for this building will be to
19 help promote the history of the community and be able to have
20 a more functional building that can be more accessible to the
21 public to help promote that history.

22 STOLDAL: I, I hope you understand the question.
23 It, it, it -- the question is based on the title of this
24 organization, which is the Commission on Cultural Centers and
25 Historic Places, and, and its function is to not just restore

1 buildings, historic buildings, but bring life back into them
2 and extend, and extend their life, so as, as we move forward,
3 that, that's going to be a key question for how is this
4 building going to be used? What, what sort of -- and when
5 you're restoring it inside, what sort of plumbing facilities
6 and those kinds of things will be important to this Commission
7 as we move forward, and, and by the way, you, you clearly have
8 employed some of the, the, the, the top organizations, whether
9 it's LGA or, or, or North Wind, which gives me confidence in
10 reading these reports, so thank you.

11 OSTROVSKY: Thank you.

12 KAVANAUGH: Michael, this is Commissioner Kavanaugh.
13 I have a question for you. Do you have a, an estimate of
14 probable cost from a contractor or is this your estimate of
15 probable cost based on the additional funds that you'll
16 receive for mitigation of, of assistance for mitigation of the
17 asbestos?

18 MAYS: Thank you for the question. Again,
19 Michael Mays for the record. What we have is the cost
20 estimate that was included in the report. Based on that cost
21 estimate and if we're successful obtaining the grant funds, we
22 would have approximately a half million to move forward with
23 going out to bid for this project. We believe that we could
24 complete the project, including the bidding process within 11
25 months.

1 KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

2 STOLDAL: Chair, I'd like to make a motion.

3 OSTROVSKY: Yes, go ahead, Bob.

4 STOLDAL: I'd like to make a motion for 21-12, City
5 of Boulder City, the Boulder City Water Filtration Plant. The
6 applicant is requesting \$199,880. I move to approve that
7 amount.

8 OSTROVSKY: Do we have a second?

9 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'll
10 second.

11 OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioner have any questions
12 or comments? Is there any public comment? I see none. We
13 have a motion in front of us. All those in favor of approving
14 21-12, the amount of \$199,880, please say aye.

15 MULTIPLE: Aye.

16 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair votes in favor. It's
17 unanimous of those present. Thank you very much.

18 MAYS: Thank you.

19 OSTROVSKY: The next project is City of Ely, Ely City
20 Hall. Is there someone from the City of Ely available?

21 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I have Nathan Robertson. One
22 moment.

23 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

24 HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, sir.

25 ROBERTSON: Good afternoon, commissioners. Can you

1 hear me okay?

2 OSTROVSKY: Can hear you just fine. Go ahead, Nathan.

3 Thank you.

4 ROBERTSON; Wonderful. Thank you. I appreciate this
5 opportunity to talk a little bit about the project. Ely City
6 Hall was built in 1929. As I brought up to this, to this
7 board before, there's only two city halls left in the State of
8 Nevada built before -- in the early part of the 20th Century
9 that are still in use by their communities. That'd be us and
10 Fallon. That being the case, it makes the Ely City Hall kind
11 of a rare creature. In our, in our last, almost a hundred
12 years now, the city -- Ely City Hall's been used for a number
13 of things in addition to being the center of city government.
14 It's been used as the public library. It's been used for
15 educational purposes, office space for community nonprofits.
16 It's been used to display art. It's really been a center for
17 a lot of things in our community and, and the, the city of Ely
18 is committed to making sure that it continues as that for the
19 next hundred years, and, and over the last 10 years, we've
20 addressed a number of the issues facing the building,
21 including weatherization projects, maintenance, of course,
22 making sure the building has been adequately studied, listed
23 on state and national historic registers. As I said, we
24 completed a historic structures report. Our next step in
25 this, really now that the building has been kind of stabilized

1 and, and, of course, it's still in use, is, is to have a
2 comprehensive plan completed and that's what we're asking for
3 in this grant application are funds to hire architects and
4 engineers, do the community scoping that needs to be done as
5 well as interviews and scoping with the various city
6 departments and other entities that use the building to make
7 sure the project not only meets the needs of the community,
8 but that we can assemble a project that meets the budget of
9 the community, and, of course, stands up to the historical
10 standards that a project like this will need to meet.

11 Planning is always a hard sell in rural areas. It, it
12 generally takes, and, and the, the, the standard estimate for
13 engineering on a project should be between 10 and 15% of the
14 total project cost. From our historic structures report and
15 from other architects we've had down to look at the project,
16 we're looking in the \$4 million range to complete this
17 project, so consequently, we're looking for a portion of that,
18 this \$300,000 in conjunction with other grants we've received
19 in the meantime as well as contributed monies from the City of
20 Ely to be able to complete this. A well-planned project is
21 going to cost the community and any of the participating
22 agencies that are giving us money, less money, in the long run
23 and, and like I said, we'll make sure that the project meets
24 the highest possible standards and, and hopefully keep our
25 city hall around for another hundred years at least. With

1 that, I'll open up for questions.

2 OSTROVSKY: This is the Chair. Nathan, I guess that
3 you, you, you've begun to address one of my issues, which is
4 how we arrived at the \$300,000. This, this is your best
5 estimate based on prior history for engineering and, and
6 project design?

7 ROBERTSON: Industry standards for project design,
8 like I said, is, is between 10 and 15. I, I have no doubt
9 that this is going to kind of err towards the higher side of
10 that just because of the unique nature of a restoration
11 project versus like a new construction type project. With a,
12 with a possible project cost, what we're looking at, like I
13 said, in the \$4 million range. That would put engineering
14 around \$500,000. Hopefully, we can get it done for less.
15 Like I said, there's other contributing entities and grants
16 into this factor. If, if the board has extra money they'd
17 like to throw at this, we would certainly take it. We did,
18 since I made the application, get another \$15,000 grant from
19 Great Basin Heritage Area. The city has tentatively committed
20 \$50,000 of their general fund monies towards this phase of the
21 project as well. There may be some extra money there that we
22 could use if project -- if, if this phase starts to go a
23 little bit more expensive than that, but it's, it's, it's,
24 it's the best industry standard that we could use coming up
25 with that cost.

1 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Go ahead, commissioners.
2 Questions, please.

3 STOLDAL: Chair, my question really along the same
4 lines. I just -- it, it was just a series of, of six
5 questions but they're all basically the same question. How
6 did you get to this point? How did you get to this number?
7 And this is -- I'm not sure what the proper adjective is, but
8 this is kind of an awkward situation in the sense that we
9 normally have, here's the project, here's the bid, here's the
10 dollar figure, and, and then the board is able to -- this
11 Commission is able to say, okay, yes or no, or we don't --
12 can't pay for that or that's too much or we're going to do it
13 in phases, but this is requesting we sort of throw \$300,000
14 into the pot of something that's going to cost, we, we don't
15 know, but -- and I, I -- clearly everything that the applicant
16 just said is correct. I mean, it, it's, it's, it's a
17 challenge these days on any number of levels. Plus, this
18 Commission has already funded elements of the, of the city
19 hall and we know how important it is and, and we know the,
20 the, the type of, of work that the applicant and the city does
21 and, and, and how much Ely, the city of Ely and, and White
22 Pine is, is doing to preserve its history and, and, and
23 promote it. I mean, so I lean towards granting this, but I'm
24 just worried about setting some sort of a precedent or just
25 putting money into a, into a pot. We don't know exactly what

1 the deliverable is.

2 MAYS: Well, Mr. -- Commissioner Stoldal, if I
3 might address that. Nathan Robertson for the record. So,
4 like I said, this -- one of the things that the Commission
5 funded previously was a historic structures report. As part
6 of that report, the, the engineers involved came up with an
7 engineer's estimate of what it might take to address the
8 issues with the building and, and make the necessary
9 adjustments to continue serving the community, and at that
10 time, and this was several years ago at this point, the
11 estimate came in below \$400,000. It was around \$3.5 million,
12 so we started with that basis of a cost. With that, we had
13 other architects come in in the meantime, look at it, give us
14 some, some cost estimates. Like I said, that, that brought us
15 to around, of course, with material cost going up in
16 inflation, certainly around \$4 million. Based on that, which
17 we felt we had a pretty good ballpark estimate on, we used the
18 industry standards and, and if I, if I might add, I'm, I have
19 a degree in construction management and probably 15 years now
20 in project management. The industry standard for these kind
21 of projects, like I said, is, is right between 10 and 15% of
22 your project cost for engineering and architecture. That
23 being the case, that, that's how we arrived at that number and
24 I, I certainly see the issue where we're just asking to throw
25 money into a pot to help us complete this phase. Be that as

1 it may, that, that's why we asked what we asked. The, the
2 \$300,000 wasn't the entire amount. We're looking to make up
3 the rest of that with some other grants and other funding
4 opportunities, but we know it will cost at least that much.

5 STOLDAL: Nathan, what if, what if we said, okay,
6 fine, but we're, we're going to hold \$300,000 or \$400,000 in
7 reserve, but please come back with a specific piece of the
8 action that, that this Commission could put its arms around
9 and say, this is where the taxpayer money's going to go. It's
10 going to go to restore the third floor or it's going to re --
11 take care of the roof or the, or, or the foundation. Is any
12 of that in a timeframe that would make sense to this project
13 that you could come back to this Commission with?

14 ROBERTSON: Well, Commissioner Stoldal, this,
15 this application is specifically for hiring the architecture
16 and engineers and, and getting this planning portion done.
17 None of it is, is considered in the construction cost at this
18 time, because we need this tool to be able to budget and phase
19 this project down the road. With -- without a comprehensive
20 plan, without, like, has been talked about earlier in this
21 meeting, the seismic -- being able to address the seismic
22 issues, being able to address utilities and all that, we'd
23 just be making shots in the dark, so to be able to come up
24 with a plan that's doable for the community, we have to have
25 this, this planning phase first, and, and that will present us

1 with -- the, the deliverable at the end of this is a set of
2 construction drawings.

3 STOLDAL: Well, I, I, I -- yeah.

4 ROBERTSON: We can --

5 STOLDAL: I, I think, I think that the work done and
6 the, and the, and the credibility that's your, your
7 organization, the city, has, has done with the past projects,
8 I'm leaning towards supporting the funding, but I'd, I'd like
9 to hear from the other commissioners.

10 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh for the
11 record. Mr. Robertson, my understanding is that you have
12 estimated that the probable cost for an engineer and architect
13 to come up with the plans for construction is going to be
14 \$300,000, and that's what you're asking us to cover.

15 ROBERTSON: No, what, what we are estimating is it
16 will probably be more between \$400,000 and \$500,000 based on
17 the estimated project costs. We're asking the Commission to
18 fund \$300,000 of that.

19 KAVANAUGH: Of, of the engineer and architect amount
20 for this project, correct?

21 ROBERTSON: Yeah. That is correct.

22 KAVANAUGH: Okay. I just wanted to get clarification
23 on that.

24 ROBERTSON: Right.

25 KAVANAUGH: And I, I un -- for the record, I'm sorry.

1 I forgot to say that earlier. This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.
2 I understand the need for your draw -- your plans to be drawn
3 up, be able to go through plan review, and must have
4 architectural approval by the engineer in that process of
5 project design and, and all of that. So thank you for the
6 clarification, Mr. Robertson.

7 ROBERTSON: Thank you.

8 OSTROVSKY: This is Chair Ostrovsky. I, I could also
9 support it, but I -- with the understanding that we, we do not
10 throw \$300,000 in a pot. We will, we will reimburse you
11 actual costs from contracts from the qualified engineers and
12 architects and so on that you submit for reimbursement. So --

13 ROBERTSON: I understand.

14 OSTROVSKY: It, it, it, it -- we will reimburse you
15 for actual costs, which have to be submitted to the office
16 with the appropriate contracts and documents, and I'm assuming
17 that would be acceptable to you.

18 ROBERTSON: It, it would. We, we have experience
19 working with the Commission before and, and we have no problem
20 with that.

21 STOLDAL: All right, Chair. I'd like to make a
22 motion --

23 KAVANAUGH: Mr. Chairman --

24 STOLDAL: Oh, I'm sorry, go ahead.

25 OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible). Go ahead.

1 KAVANAUGH: Mr. Chair, this is Commissioner Kavanaugh.
2 I would like to make a motion.

3 OSTROVSKY: All right.

4 KAVANAUGH: I would like to move that we approve the
5 Project Number 21-13, City of Ely, Ely City Hall Project
6 Design architecture and engineering costs for up to \$300,000
7 reimbursement once those costs have been submitted to us and
8 when I mean us, to our office staff, and then for presentation
9 of action by the commissioners at their next meeting.

10 OSTROVSKY: Well, this is just a comment on the
11 motion. We can do -- that's not normal. Nor -- normally
12 staff would, would match the, the approved amount to the
13 actual billings that they receive and would not come back to
14 this Commission unless you really think you want them to.
15 It's up to you. It's your motion.

16 KAVANAUGH: Well, I -- so this is Commissioner
17 Kavanaugh. I say that with the understanding that they're
18 requesting \$300,000, but the project is an estimate of \$4, \$4
19 million. And typically, engineering and architect costs can
20 go anywhere from between 10 to 20% on any given project, so
21 given that they've requested \$300,000, I'm, I'm of the mind to
22 respect that request. If this project in the future requires
23 more, more funding for project development or anything of that
24 nature, I think it's an opportunity to apply for additional
25 funding by Ely's, for Ely's city hall. So, if it, if it is

1 only supposed to go to the staff, then I can make a motion. I
2 can amend my motion. I don't even have to amend it at this
3 point. I can just restate it, but, I'm open for further
4 discussion before I give it a second go.

5 OSTROVSKY: That's why I think you're on the right
6 track.

7 STOLDAL: Listen, Chair. I think, I think that --
8 I, I think I understand. What, what we're looking at here is,
9 is that if we approve this and, and it's spent, the cost may
10 be more than the \$300,000, and that potentially this applicant
11 could come back and ask for more money to, to finish out the
12 construction costs. So I would ask Rebecca, if we approve
13 the, the \$300,000 right now, would they be -- would the City
14 of Ely be able to come back? 'Cause it's likely we're going
15 to have a pot of money left, left over. Would they be able to
16 come back and ask for an additional dip into the bucket?

17 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
18 And again, my apologies. My camera is doesn't appear to be
19 working. The answer is yes. The Commission -- there's no
20 prohibition on the Commission awarding more than was requested
21 by the applicant and they can do so at any point in the life
22 of the grant cycle.

23 STOLDAL: So Commissioner Kavanaugh's motion that we
24 go the \$300,000 does not prohibit them from coming back again?

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

1 That is correct.

2 STOLDAL: Okay.

3 OSTROVSKY: So Commissioner Kavanaugh, would you like
4 to try again?

5 KAVANAUGH: I, I sure would. So in review of -- or in
6 -- with respect to the additional information provided by
7 staff, I would like to offer a motion to approve pro -- the
8 funded request of \$300,000 to the City of Ely, Grant Number
9 21-13 for the Ely City Hall project design architectural and
10 engineering costs with the understanding that they may come
11 back during this funding round for additional funding
12 requests.

13 OSTROVSKY: Fine.

14 STOLDAL: I'll second that.

15 OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible). You seconded the motion?

16 STOLDAL: Yes.

17 OSTROVSKY: Any further discussion? Any public
18 comment? We have a motion and a second. All those in favor
19 of granting to 21-13, \$300,000, City of Ely say aye.

20 MULTIPLE: Aye.

21 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Hearing none. The Chairman
22 votes aye. It's unanimous of those commissioners present.

23 Okay. Thank you very much. Good luck. It's a big project, a
24 lot, lot to do.

25 ROBERTSON: Thank you. Thank you for your assistance.

1 OSTROVSKY: The next one is Old Glory Theater Company
2 requesting an amount of \$227,237.50. I would like to open
3 this discussion by asking staff to advise us on the, on the
4 applicant's eligibility for grant as a, as a nonprofit.
5 Rebecca, any comment? We don't hear you, Rebecca.

6 PALMER: Oh, my sincere apologies.

7 OSTROVSKY: Here you are. Okay.

8 PALMER: We have no, we have no additional
9 information since the staff notes were prepared. We have not
10 received the articles of incorporation.

11 OSTROVSKY: So staff had a question of, of the
12 eligibility whether they were properly organized under the IRS
13 code. Is that correct?

14 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
15 Yes, that is correct, and we requested, as we note in our, in
16 our staff notes, articles of incorporation at -- and we have
17 not received those to date.

18 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Is there someone from Old Glory
19 Theater Company available?

20 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I have Kansas Bowling. I'll
21 bring her on.

22 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

23 HITCHCOCK: Kansas, go ahead. You'll have to unmute.

24 BOWLING: Hello?

25 OSTROVSKY: Kansas, we hear you.

1 BOWLING: You do? Okay, great.

2 OSTROVSKY: Tell us about your project and about our
3 question.

4 BOWLING: yeah, so it, it has been properly amended.
5 I have the document. I, I actually only received the amended
6 document this morning, so I'm really sorry about the delay in
7 that, but I can send that over.

8 OSTROVSKY: All right, fine. Thank you. That would
9 comfort us that whatever action we take, it will obviously be
10 on consent -- contingent upon us receiving the appropriate
11 documents to make sure you're eligible. With that --

12 STOLDAL: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chair, I, I, I -- there,
13 there was a deadline, a couple of deadlines, to get this done,
14 and as those deadlines were not met, I -- and until the
15 Attorney General's office rules at this application is --
16 covers all the bases that we have, I, I'm not sure that I
17 would be comfortable in, in even taking any action on, on, on
18 this other than delaying it without prejudice to, to, to a
19 later date. This -- there was a deadline, I think, of May
20 22nd. That deadline was passed. Now, I know things take
21 time, but, but having it before this Commission without the
22 AG's office getting a, a stamp of approval, I'm, I'm, I, I --
23 again, I don't want to say this is not a good project, but I,
24 I, I'm not ready -- I wouldn't be ready to vote on it at this
25 point without a, a firm stamp of approval from the AG's

1 office. Thank you.

2 OSTROVSKY: Well, what I'm hearing from you, Bob, is
3 that your preference here is to set it aside without
4 prejudice, wait for all the documents to be received and
5 cleared from the Attorney General's office to be sure that its
6 eligibility is there and take it up at our next meeting. Is
7 that correct?

8 STOLDAL: That, that's correct.

9 BOWLING: And when would the next meeting be?

10 OSTROVSKY: Well, probably before September 1st.

11 BOWLING: Okay. I do have everything together now.
12 I really apologize for the delay. I had to send it in a few
13 times and then their system was down last week, so it actually
14 randomly got to me this morning. Everything is in order
15 currently. If you would like to discuss other things right
16 now, I am ready to, but if you would like to wait, I'm fine
17 with that as well.

18 STOLDAL: Chair, I would suggest that also taking a,
19 a, a look at the needed other elements of the application from
20 the audit to, to the insurance forms. There are other pieces
21 of the application that were not up to -- all the things were
22 checked off, so I would just recommend that, that the
23 applicant take the time between now and the next meeting to
24 work with staff to make sure that the elements of the
25 application as well as the nonprofit status are all cleared up

1 and we can, we can look at this application. Attorney
2 General, is that all right?

3 WALSH: Thank you, Vice Chair. Yes, I completely
4 agree with that. Again, my legal advice is limited toward the
5 Commission and I cannot provide Old, Old Glory any legal
6 advice. However, reviewing that document to see if it's
7 compliant with the guidelines as well as NRS is appropriate.
8 I can do that. So, and based on the previous work that we've
9 done on it, that should be a rather quick review.

10 OSTROVSKY: Well then would you like to make a motion,
11 Bob?

12 STOLDAL: I'd like to make a motion that we hold 21-
13 14, Old Glory Theater, Old Glory Theater request for funding
14 of up to \$227,237.50, delay this without prejudice until the
15 next meeting of the Commission of Cultural Affairs and
16 Historic Places, so that the application, the status -- non
17 status -- nonprofit status can be verified by the Attorney
18 General, as well as the applicant completing the proper
19 application of areas that are -- haven't been filled out,
20 including insurance and audit and so forth. Thank you.

21 OSTROVSKY: Is there a to that motion?

22 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

23 OSTROVSKY: We have a motion and a second. Any
24 further comment or questions from the Commission? Any
25 comments from the public? Hearing none, all those in favor of

1 the motion, say aye.

2 MULTIPLE: Aye.

3 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? The Chair votes in favor.
4 It's unanimous of those commissioners present. Thank you very
5 much. We look forward to seeing your application in the near
6 future.

7 BOWLING: All right. Thank you so much for working
8 with me. This is a brand-new nonprofit, so, you know, kind of
9 working things out. I very much appreciate it and thank you,
10 Kristen, for letting me know about this grant.

11 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Thank you.

12 BROWN:: This is Kristen. You're most welcome.

13 OSTROVSKY: The next application is 21-16, White Pine
14 County for the New Ruth Club Museum. Someone from White Pine
15 that want to address this for Commission.

16 HITCHCOCK: I have Taba -- Tabatha Hamilton. One
17 moment. Go ahead, Tabatha.

18 HAMILTON: Can you guys hear me okay?

19 OSTROVSKY: I certainly can.

20 HAMILTON: Okay, perfect. My name is Tabatha
21 Hamilton. I'm with White Pine County, and I'll be presenting
22 the New Ruth Club project. \$80,000 is requested to complete a
23 preliminary engineering report on the building to accurately
24 understand what it will take to restore the building in a way
25 that will be historically accurate while also meeting current

1 health and safety standards. The end goal of the New Ruth
2 Club is to have the building restored in order to be used as a
3 museum and a local food pantry. This report will also help us
4 understand what it will cost to do this. Old Ruth began as a
5 settlement for workers of the White Pine County Copper
6 Company. Ruth ceased to be, be a company town in 1955.
7 Around this time, the community was moved two miles north to
8 make way for the expansion of the Deep Ruth Mine. This new
9 location is now known as New Ruth. The Ruth Club was
10 originally built in Old Ruth in 1920. It was one of the three
11 saloons that were known to operate within the town. Those
12 saloons were not permitted. It is believed that the company
13 knew about these saloons, but simply just ignored them.
14 Around 1953, the Old Ruth Club was split and moved to New
15 Ruth. These two now separate buildings were set on
16 foundations and the exterior was bricked in New Ruth. These
17 buildings are two of the few remaining historical buildings
18 still standing in Ruth. They were known as the New Ruth Club
19 and the Commercial Club. The New Ruth Club has since gone
20 through a handful of private owners before finally being
21 deeded to the county through tax delinquency in February 2022.
22 The preservation of such an -- such original history is vital
23 to the protection of the culture of White Pine County, and not
24 to mention, the town of Ruth. White Pine County Comprehensive
25 Economic Development Strategy has one of Ruth's goals as

1 working toward expanding and diversifying the economic -- the
2 economy, including, but not limited to, attracting a small
3 grocery store, minimart, and/or gas station, or in this case,
4 a food pantry that will provide the immediate needs of
5 citizens without having to travel to Ely. It also mentions
6 working to correct blighted properties and, in this case, we
7 are correcting the blighted New Ruth Club to make Ruth more
8 attractive to visit and to live it. Finally, it discusses
9 developing a Ruth Park to celebrate the history of Ruth by
10 obtaining donations of mining equipment. In this case, we are
11 creating an expansion of the Ruth Mining Memorial Park that is
12 located directly across the street from the New Ruth Club.
13 This project also enhances historical tourism within the area.
14 The location is significant because it is located at the base
15 of the Ruth Robinson Mine, which is -- which will highlight
16 the building significance as the mine's previous company town.
17 Again, it is also located across the street from the Ruth
18 Mining Memorial Park, which is currently being remodeled to
19 show off the historical significance of the area and to
20 memorialize those who have passed away in, in relation to
21 local mine. And finally, I want to thank you guys for your
22 consideration of our project.

23 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Tabatha. I'll open it to the
24 commissioners for questions. INAUDIBLE off the bat --

25 STOLDAL: (Inaudible).

1 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner --

2 OSTROVSKY: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead. Commissioner
3 Kavanaugh.

4 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. This is -
5 - Tabatha, questions for Tabatha. With regard to your budget,
6 can you tell me how you came up with your estimate of \$80,000?

7 BOWLING: This estimate is based off of a few of our
8 most recent preliminary engineering studies. They've all had
9 different scopes, but they've all been around the \$75,000
10 range, and then with anticipated inflation is how we ended up
11 coming up with each of the numbers.

12 KAVANAUGH: Was -- this is Commissioner Kavanaugh
13 again. Was your estimate of probable cost rendered from
14 professional engineering groups?

15 BOWLING: Yes. I apologize. These would've been
16 the bid prices for some of our recent preliminary engineering
17 estimates and the individual tasks with them.

18 KAVANAUGH: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

19 STOLDAL: Chair? Stoldal for the record. The
20 couple, three questions. The -- fir -- first of all, just a,
21 a statement. Very happy to see work being done on New Ruth.
22 Ruth is, is such an important historical piece of our state's
23 history and it's nice to see that significant dollars are
24 being spent on the park. I think significant dollars as, as
25 well as just the energy to create the, the, the record of, of,

1 of Ruth, so the photograph that you included in the building,
2 my question is the building was, was divided and part of it is
3 a commercial. Is the other saloon down -- is that -- down the
4 street. Which part of the sign or which part of the building
5 says New Ruth Club? Was the -- is from the original. On one
6 -- on the left side of the photograph, that was a clothing
7 store and on the right side, it was a barber shop. Which,
8 which part of what is now the New Ruth Club, which part of the
9 building is that, do you know?

10 BOWLING: I don't. I actually was not aware that,
11 that that was the uses of the Old Ruth Club and I definitely
12 have not dove into that much of the history, so I'm not
13 positive which portion of the Old Ruth Club that this b --
14 this building is specifically.

15 STOLDAL: Yeah, the old -- the, the, the original
16 New Ruth Club is a very long building with the center being
17 the Ruth Club and then on, on the left side is the -- near the
18 hotel is the, I believe, the sort of haberdashery clothing on
19 the right side. It would just be nice as, as we, as we move
20 forward. The other part of it is you reference in the, in the
21 narrative about a potential of connecting -- reconnecting Ruth
22 with the Northern Nevada Railway. Are you -- do you have a
23 sense of, of what tracks are still available between --
24 looking at Google Earth, it looks like there are some tracks,
25 but then there's some others that are missing. Is there any

1 study done on, on the tracks between New Ruth and Ely?

2 BOWLING: It's my understanding that the -- that
3 there is a set of tracks that still operates between Ely and
4 Ruth, and it's my understanding that they do, like, the
5 Halloween Ghost Train and they follow those tracks up to the
6 Ruth Depot and then back into Ely.

7 STOLDAL: So there's a, there's a train? The
8 Northern Nevada runs a, a train up to New Ruth? Where, where
9 is the depot? I couldn't find that on the, on the Google
10 Earth.

11 BOWLING: I'm not positive. I apologize. I don't
12 know a whole lot about that portion of the Nevada Northern
13 Railway, but I, I've just seen, like, local advertisements and
14 such, so I'm not exactly sure where the Ruth Depot would be.

15 STOLDAL: Well, we've -- I think the gentleman from
16 the Northern Nevada Railway will be here later, so maybe we,
17 we, we can ask him. Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a motion to,
18 to approve this 21-16, White Pine County New Ruth Club Museum
19 for \$80,000.

20 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

21 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Commissioners, have any
22 further questions, comments? Any comments from the public?

23 BOWLING: I just would like to make a comment. I
24 know that Nathan Robertson was on the call earlier, and he
25 might be able to answer your question about the railroad, as I

1 know that he's pretty involved. I don't know for sure that he
2 could answer it, but it's possible.

3 OSTROVSKY: Well, it -- yeah, just without belaboring
4 that, Tabatha, I think there, there's a lot going on in Ruth,
5 McGill, and in the Northern Nevada Railroad and other
6 projects. I think what Bob is getting at is, is how do you
7 tie this all together and how do you create to tell the real
8 story of the railroad of Ruth, of McGill, all, all that played
9 out, so I would encourage you at the county to dig into the
10 history, 'cause we're very interested in that. Researchers
11 are, and, and we hope to attract tourism, which will also be
12 educating them on, on how this Central Nevada developed and,
13 and, and why it became so important to, to the state. Thank
14 you. Any other comments? Hearing none --

15 STOLDAL: Other, other, other than it's New Ruth,
16 because there was an Old Ruth and, and the Old Ruth got, got
17 gobbled up by the, by the pit, so to speak --

18 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

19 STOLDAL: -- and, and I -- it's just an exciting
20 history of, of, of, of White Pine County.

21 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. We have a motion before us. All
22 those in favor?

23 MULTIPLE Aye.

24 OSTROVSKY: Any oppose? Chairman votes in favor and
25 it's unanimous of those commissioners present. Thank you.

1 And again, I encourage you to work on the history because it
2 all ties together with a real story to be told. Thank you.

3 BOWLING: Thank you.

4 OSTROVSKY: Next project is the City of Wells, the El
5 Rancho Revitalization. Someone with the City of Wells with us
6 today?

7 HITCHCOCK: Yes. I have Jordan Tilley. I'll bring
8 him on.

9 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

10 HITCHCOCK: Go ahead, Jordan.

11 TILLEY: Thank you. So we're here talking about
12 the El Rancho Hotel and Casino. Some quick history. It was
13 constructed in 19 -- began in 1948. Prior to receiving
14 significant damage from an earthquake in 2008, the El Rancho
15 was a cornerstone of activity throughout in the downtown area
16 of Wells. There was gaming, fine dining, bar, brought
17 sportsmen and cowboys into its doors. I heard once Dennis
18 Quaid played the piano there, so that was a big deal. He
19 broke down somewhere here near outside of town. Murals,
20 vintage, front and back bar, knotty pine dining area. It
21 serves as a reminder of those days gone by, but as we re --
22 revitalize this building, it also provide not only that
23 glimpse into the past, but a modern up-to-date community
24 center. As a result of the 2000 earthquake here in Wells, we
25 lost an entire front street along our railroad historical

1 buildings. We don't have many more of those left in town, so
2 to get the El Rancho back open will be a significant morale
3 booster here in town and increase our community pride. I
4 touched on this briefly, the building will continue to
5 utilized in town by -- and, and become that entertaining Mecca
6 it once was. We'll have annual events, classes, meetings,
7 weddings, quinceaneras and other large gathering events will
8 take place there. There's also a plan to have some space for
9 some new and emerging businesses to use as type of incubator
10 space there as they get their feet under them. You know, as a
11 city here, our, our goal and our aim is to help our residents
12 and businesses succeed, and this is really one way that we can
13 facilitate that objective is providing that chance for, for
14 those residents. Additionally, you know, there's a farmer's
15 market takes place across the street from the El Rancho, and
16 they've approached the city about opportunities for indoor
17 access. The El Rancho, up to this point, they haven't been
18 able to use because there's no power in the building.
19 Completing this electrical will be a significant step towards
20 allowing that public to once again occupy and enjoy that El
21 Rancho Hotel and Casino. Addition, so the City of Wells and
22 our local main street program are both heavily invested in the
23 project. Our public works employees have spent upwards of
24 1400 hours working on the building or moving drywall,
25 stabilizing the roof and the walls after the earthquake.

1 They've done what's called pinning the framing to the brick of
2 the outer structure to help stabilize and earthquake-proof as
3 much as we can here with the building, and the main street has
4 spent over \$10,000 to have the two old neon signs refurbished.
5 Plans, hopefully, in the next few months to get those back and
6 restore that little area back to its original glow.

7 Additionally, the building's been nominated for the historical
8 status and that's what we're still working through now, but
9 that will ensure its presence now and far into the future.

10 Just a side note that I discovered through my research after
11 submitting the application is the El Rancho is the first
12 building in town here designed to be illuminated by
13 electricity, so that was interesting as we're working on the
14 electrical again. That was the first building here. Prior to
15 that, it was kerosene lamps and whatnot. We've also completed
16 a design for all of the electrical, so we're ready to go. We
17 have received one preliminary quote. We'll just wait on those
18 -- on two other quotes and then whichever's the lowest, we're
19 ready to go. We don't have to go through the whole bidding
20 process as we're under that a hundred thousand dollars
21 threshold there, and if there's any necessary extra funds
22 there, we have budgeted out of our capital outlay to cover if
23 it's a little bit higher, and that's just based on everything
24 going on with, with pricing right now. By 4:00 today, it
25 might go up, you know, a hundred dollar -- a hundred bucks,

1 but -- so we have some money set aside to cover any additional
2 there, and I know a lot of questions have been asked about the
3 audit. As we were putting this application together, we had a
4 lot of turnover here at the city, and I think we missed adding
5 that in, but we complete an audit every year through Eide
6 Bailey, and if necessary, we can supply that. And, and that's
7 where we're at.

8 OSTROVSKY: Thank you very much, Jordan. I'll open it
9 to the Commission for questions.

10 STOLDAL: Just a question on the -- it seems that
11 we're talking about not fully completing the electrical work,
12 but getting a, a really a good start. I wrote down here
13 changing this number to -- from \$50,000 to \$75,000 to get the
14 -- all the electrical work done. Is that an appropriate
15 number?

16 TILLEY: Yeah, yeah. Excuse me. Now I'm losing my
17 voice. Based on the electrical that we have had back, you
18 know, one of the rough quotes was around \$40,000, but that's
19 not the complete. I think it would be a little bit more
20 accurate to finish out the whole project in that \$75 range.

21 STOLDAL: Well, it's just exciting to see all the
22 work done that's being done in Wells and, and a lot of the
23 community could just have folded up after that earthquake and,
24 and just, and just sort of moved on, but that wasn't the
25 decision. The decision was to bring life back into Wells, so

1 -- and this is a particularly important building, so thank you
2 for your work. Thanks, Chair.

3 TILLEY: Thank you.

4 KAVANAUGH: Mr. Tilley, this is Antoinette Kavanaugh,
5 Commissioner Kavanaugh. I keep forgetting to say
6 Commissioner. I keep wanting to say my first name, so just
7 have to bear with me, my fellow commissioners. I am really
8 thankful for the work that you are doing to restore the El
9 Rancho. I saw that building the day -- the afternoon of that
10 earthquake, and that was hard to see. I'm, I'm appreciative
11 of the fact that you guys are taking -- the City of Wells is
12 taking a purposeful proactive step towards revitalizing that
13 key piece to Northern Nevada's history. So thank you for the
14 work on getting that done, and I -- if, if my co-chair, Mr.
15 Stoldal, puts forth that motion to increase the amount, I, I
16 would, I would support that. So good luck on your project.

17 TILLEY: Thank you so much.

18 KAVANAUGH: And, oh, one other comment. One other
19 comment, I would recommend that at your earliest convenience,
20 submit that audit to our staff so that we have it on record,
21 so that we're in compliance with the laws that, that we are
22 supposed to follow. Thank you.

23 OSTROVSKY: Mr. Stoldal, would you like to make a
24 motion now?

25 STOLDAL: Yes. I'd like to make a motion for 21-17,

1 City of Wells EL Rancho Revitalization for the amount of
2 \$75,000.

3 OSTROVSKY: Any other --

4 KAVANAUGH: And I --

5 OSTROVSKY: -- comments or questions from the
6 Commission?

7 KAVANAUGH: Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'd like to --
8 Commissioner Kavanaugh. I'd like to second that motion.

9 OSTROVSKY: I have motion second. Thank you. Any
10 other comments from commissioners? Is there any public
11 comment? Hearing none, all those in favor of the motion to
12 approve 21-17, City of Wells for \$75,000, say aye.

13 MULTIPLE: Aye.

14 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair votes in favor,
15 unanimous of those commissioners present. Thank you very
16 much. Good luck.

17 TILLEY: Thank you so much. And we'll get that
18 audit sent over today.

19 OSTROVSKY: Thank you.

20 WALSH: At this moment, I'd like to interrupt
21 briefly with another item from the chats for, for the record.

22 OSTROVSKY: In keeping with past standards, can staff
23 read that chat to us, please?

24 WALSH: This is --

25 PALMER: For the record, this --

1 WALSH; (Inaudible).

2 PALMER: For the record -- okay. For the record,
3 this is Rebecca Palmer. This is from Honey Menefee, Storey
4 County. Due to the availability of excess funding, would it
5 be possible to ask the Commission for an increased amount --
6 award amount for the Storey County Courthouse? On our
7 submitted bid from United Electrical Services for \$80,418,
8 there is a section of work that was excluded from pricing. If
9 I obtain the cost of the excluded items, permits, fees,
10 drywall, carpet, and other surface repair, concrete work,
11 cutting, removing, patching, trenching, and backfill, and
12 payment and performance bond, would I be able to present an
13 updated bid estimate to the Commission for increased award
14 funding consideration? Thank you.

15 OSTROVSKY: This is Bob Ostrovsky. Thanks for
16 entering that into the record. The Commission later in this
17 meeting will talk about how to move forward from here. We
18 will have excess funds. We will be able to award additional
19 funds to projects which have been approved in this cycle at a
20 future meeting, so I would certainly encourage her to, to be
21 prepared to make that application when we decide they should
22 become available.

23 STOLDAL: Chairman, if, if there's a dollar figure,
24 I don't -- didn't see a dollar figure in there. It would help
25 with -- looks like they're potentially a dollar or they could

1 come up with one, but thank you.

2 OSTROVSKY: Well, I hate, I hate to do them just off
3 the fly, so I'd rather have them do their homework and bring
4 it to us, because we know we're going to have another, at
5 least, small cycle of rounds here coming.

6 WALSH: Thank you, Chair.

7 OSTROVSKY: That leads us to project number -- we're
8 up to 18, I believe.

9 STOLDAL: Yup.

10 KAVANAUGH: Mr. Chair, I have a --

11 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

12 KAVANAUGH: -- question. This is Commissioner
13 Kavanaugh.

14 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

15 KAVANAUGH: Did we do 21-15?

16 OSTROVSKY: No. 21-15 was deleted.

17 KAVANAUGH: Okay. Thank you.

18 OSTROVSKY: Not under consideration. And, and --

19 KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

20 OSTROVSKY: -- (Inaudible) that were deleted, they
21 were deleted conversation between staff and I, because it --
22 they didn't qualify for the grant pro -- they didn't meet the
23 minimum qualification. For example, they were not a nonprofit
24 or they were not a governmental agency, so if it's privately
25 owned property, we can't put bond money in there, so we advise

1 them at what, what -- to the extent we could to seek out and
2 develop a nonprofit so that they would become eligible in
3 future cycles.

4 KAVANAUGH: Okay. I just -- this is Commissioner
5 Kavanaugh. I just wanted to get clarification for the record
6 that they did submit an application, but it was not
7 entertained for that reason.

8 OSTROVSKY: That's correct.

9 KAVANAUGH: Thank you.

10 OSTROVSKY: Next one is 18, 21-18. This would be the
11 City of Carlin, Old Church on Main. Someone from the City of
12 Carlin available?

13 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. Go ahead, Madison.

14 MAHON: Thank you, and thank you, commissioners.
15 In front of you today is an application and architectural
16 engineering study application for the amount of \$20,000 for
17 our Old Church on Main project. The project is for an old
18 Catholic church that was built in 1910, and it's located on
19 the east end of our Main Street and faces the 10th Street
20 railroad crossings. This old historical building on Main
21 Street has been part of the visual landscape of Carlin and
22 it's probably the single most recognized historical structure
23 in our community. It remained in private ownership until 2019
24 when it was seized by the County of Elko for unpaid property
25 taxes. The city council voted unanimously to request the

1 building be sold to the City of Carlin for the unpaid taxes.
2 So in 2019, we were able to obtain the property. As I
3 mentioned before, the structure is over a hundred years old.
4 The building stands; however, preservation and rehabilitation
5 measures need to be taken as soon as possible. This
6 architectural and engineering study needs to be completed
7 prior to moving forward with any construction projects. The
8 roof is our primary concern right now. It's been temporarily
9 tarped in order to prevent any further damage to the structure
10 and to the building. We hope that upon completion of the
11 architectural study, we can rehabilitate the building so that
12 it can be used as a community and event center enjoyed by
13 visitors and our citizens. We do have a current quote from a
14 local architectural firm, R6 Studio, and that is where our,
15 our budget number did come from. We anticipate the
16 architectural study to take between two and four months. The
17 firm has actually stated it can be done within 30 days. Upon
18 completion, we hope that the church can be used as a community
19 and performing arts center. We currently do not have a space
20 that acts as a community and performing arts center, so the
21 building will be managed by the City of Carlin, but its
22 programs and activities will be managed by a Parks and
23 Recreation board that already exists within the city structure
24 and hopefully down the road, a private nonprofit organization
25 to fully manage the building. Again, the church is probably

1 the most recognizable historical building in our community,
2 and it's going to help, you know, further develop tourism in
3 our area. It'll be the starting point for preservation,
4 rehabilitation, and restoration of the building. We've had
5 several contractors provide bids for the roof to stabilize the
6 building though we don't feel comfortable moving forward until
7 we have more information on the integrity of the building. So
8 this architectural and engineering study will help us move
9 forward with what needs to be done to stabilize the building.
10 So right now, as I mentioned before, the tarp was installed
11 through our -- through community help and through help of our
12 local co-op, Wells Rural Electric Company. If you open, open
13 it up to any question, I'm happy to answer any questions that
14 the Commission or the public has.

15 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Madison. Any questions from
16 the commissioners?

17 STOLDAL: Chair, first of all, thank you for the --
18 including the brand-new master and it is brand new. I think
19 it's March of this year, master plan for the, for the City of
20 Carlin, and, and I read the note in there that says there was
21 not a vision, objectives, or action steps on historic, or
22 cultural resources in the master plan, but there is one in,
23 in, in this, and that's great to see with, with such an
24 important community like Carlin. I also wrote down here, is
25 there any way to get this study done in 30 days? And I think

1 you just answered that, that, that it's possible to, to get
2 that. I'm, I'm nervous about the roof and, and, and the
3 structure. Are, are, are you going to be able to get all of
4 the, all of the necessary seismic and structural stuff done?
5 'Cause I wrote down an additional figure of, of \$10,000 as a
6 potential change from the, from the \$20,000 that you're asking
7 to, to, to \$30,000. The question is, can you get this all
8 done in 30 days in time to come back by our September meeting
9 to actually request specific funding for the foundation, the
10 walls, the roof, I guess, which is now just a tarp? Can you
11 update that a little bit for us?

12 MAHON: Yes. I believe we would be able to -- I
13 would hope that we could come back before our, our -- the
14 September meeting. If not, we would have to wait until the
15 next cycle.

16 STOLDAL: Oh, that makes me nervous 'cause that's
17 going to be two -- probably the next cycle after September is
18 going to be two years. I'm not sure that that building, the
19 way it's described here, could take another two years with a
20 tarp. So I -- those are my thoughts. Thank you, Chair.

21 OSTROVSKY: Yeah. The question that the tarp was
22 installed by the city?

23 MAHON: Correct. With the help of the public
24 works department, Wells Rural Electric, and volunteers, we had
25 tarp, tarping measures and then the, the Wells Rural Electric

1 Company was able to lend materials and lifts in order to tarp
2 the roof itself. Before the tarp was on, the building was in
3 the, you know, in much more dire shape. We had immediate
4 weather concerns. Now that the roof has been tarped, we
5 believe, you know, things are a little bit more steady and we
6 believe we've bought ourselves more time to take a look at the
7 architectural and engineering side of the building.

8 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, I guess what, as Mr. Stoldal pointed
9 out, the word tarp kind of scares me with winter and water and
10 snow and, and all kinds of wind, but I, I don't know if
11 there's much, you know, adding a new roof will cost a lot of
12 money and a lot of engineering. You really have to know what
13 it would cost more before we could move forward. Bob, you
14 were indicating you wanted add money. You think that \$20,000
15 is inadequate for, for a study? It's a little low compared to
16 what other studies cost.

17 STOLDAL: Ex -- exactly, and, and especially
18 throwing in a, a seismic study, arch -- architectural, and
19 engineering study. With the focus on, on the key structures,
20 the foundation, there's no sense in putting a roof if the
21 foundation needs to be repaired. So -- and, and I'm also
22 asking that if we can add some money to it, if that can speed
23 up the process, and I really think important, based again on
24 the application, that something comes back to Carlin come --
25 City of Carlin comes back before this Commission at its

1 September meeting with a, with a report and, and a potential
2 request for, for funds for you, the foundation, or, or, or the
3 roof or whatever the report says is, is the essential next
4 step. Thank you. So I was going to make a motion to -- for
5 21-18, City of Carlin, Old Church on the Main for an
6 engineering study, full study, architectural, engineering is
7 for \$30,000.

8 OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioner want to second that
9 motion?

10 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I will second the
11 motion.

12 OSTROVSKY: Does the Commission have any other
13 questions or comments? Questions, or comments --

14 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.

15 OSTROVSKY: Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Kavanaugh.

16 KAVANAUGH: I have a, I have a comment. My comment is
17 that I would recommend that if they can speedily get those
18 reviews done and have a plan for maybe a Phase 1 project and
19 get that back to us before our next meeting for consideration,
20 that would be my only, my only addition or comment.

21 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, goes without saying, but we can add
22 it to that if it's okay with you, Mr. Stoldal.

23 STOLDAL: Yes. And that's a, that's a (Inaudible).

24 OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible) bring forward their plan to
25 us, and I'm assuming that's all right with the seconder? Ms.

1 Olmstead? Yes, it is. Right. We have a motion. Any, any
2 further comments? Any comments from the public? Hearing and
3 seeing none, all those in favor of approving City of Carlin's
4 request, project number 21-18 for \$30,000 say, aye.

5 MULTIPLE: Aye.

6 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chair votes in favor. It's
7 unanimous of those commissioners present. Thank you very
8 much, and we look forward to seeing you back very soon.

9 MAHON: Thank you, commissioners. I will engage
10 today and hopefully have a, a favorable report next meeting.
11 Thank you so much.

12 OSTROVSKY: We've got a couple more and we're done
13 with this portion of the agenda. Northern Nevada Railroad.
14 This is for the engine house/machine shop building. Is
15 someone with us from the railroad?

16 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. Mr. Mark Bassett. One moment.
17 Go ahead, Mark.

18 BASSETT: Good afternoon, commissioners.

19 OSTROVSKY: Welcome, Mark.

20 BASSETT: Thank you for this opportunity to present
21 today. Previous grants from the Commission have allowed us to
22 stabilize the engine house/machine shop building, including a
23 seismic stabilization. The engine house/machine shop building
24 was built in 1907 to repair the locomotives and railroad cars
25 of the (Inaudible). For the past hundred and 15 years, it has

1 served as the heart of the railroad in the heart of our
2 national historic landmark. It's very popular with our
3 visitors. All of the repair work on the railroad's
4 locomotives and cars have been done inside the building. In
5 1940, the, the railroad remodeled the building. The building
6 received a new roof, windows, and roof drainage. Now 82 years
7 later, those improvements are failing. The roof has multiple
8 water leaks that have been addressed in a band-aid manner. In
9 a recent heavy rainstorm, water leaked into the machine shop
10 and engine house in various locations, and saying the water
11 leaked in is an understatement. In places, the water poured
12 in. The water soaked of the steam locomotives being restored.
13 There were leaks over the historic machine tools and lathes,
14 and they had to be tarped to protect them. These machines
15 cannot be moved because they're bolted to the concrete floor.
16 If that wasn't bad enough, the leaks also followed -- caused a
17 few exciting electric shows. The leaks ran onto high-voltage
18 wires, causing them to spark and short out. Needless to say,
19 the situation is very hazardous to the employees, volunteers,
20 and visitors. The engine house/machine shop building does not
21 have a single roof. Rather, it has 14 different roof levels
22 with a mixture of roofing surfaces. These different roof
23 levels make this, a challenging project, even more complicated
24 and this will increase the cost of the overall project. In
25 addition to repairing the roof itself, some of the parapet

1 walls are crumbling and need repairing too. As part of the
2 roof structure, there are smoke jacks. The purpose of the
3 smoke jack is to allow the smoke from the steam locomotive to
4 exit through the roof of the engine house. It takes four to
5 six hours from once the fire is lit to move the steam
6 locomotive out the door. During this time, the steam
7 locomotive is producing smoke that is vented through the smoke
8 jack. Furthermore, when the steam locomotive comes back to
9 the engine house, if it's going to be used the next day, the
10 fire in the steam locomotive is banked. That means the fire
11 has smothered and smokes overnight. Unfortunately, not all of
12 the smoke jacks are operational. This forces us to use only
13 two of the 12 possible railroad tracks that are in the engine
14 house leading to the possibility of trapping a steam
15 locomotive in the engine house. Repairing additional smoke
16 jacks will give us the flexibility to use additional engine
17 house tracks when issuing hap -- when an issue happens with
18 one of the existing doors or tracks. In addition to roof
19 repairs, we need to address the weatherization of the engine
20 house/machine shop windows. Most of these windows face south
21 and west. These windows are industrial design, rather simple
22 metal frames, holding the individual panes. The windows do
23 open for ventilation, allowing the smoke out. After 80 years,
24 the weather seals around the windows and on the panes that are
25 open are pretty much gone. The engine house/machine shop

1 building is our largest building on the complex. The roof
2 area covers approximately 36,000 square feet. Incorporated in
3 the roof drain -- roof structure are drains to remove the
4 water from the roof. These drains are positioned around the
5 building and flow into a storm sewer system that is failing.
6 Repairing the roof will divert more water into the failing
7 storm sewer system. As part of this project, it's imperative
8 to repair the storm sewer system across the east wall of the
9 engine house. This grant is to completely repair the 1940
10 roof -- 1940 roof on the 1907 engine house/machine shop
11 building, including the crumbling parapet walls, repair the
12 roof drains, improve -- repair the storm sewer system, and
13 also renew the engine house/machine shop windows and replace
14 the roof. And if there are any questions, I'd be happy to
15 answer them.

16 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mark. Commissioners,
17 questions, please. Bob, do you have a question? Commissioner
18 Stoldal, he's got a problem with his mic. Hang on just a
19 minute.

20 STOLDAL: How about now?

21 OSTROVSKY: I can hear you fine.

22 STOLDAL: All right. Mark, if I could just deviate
23 and, and, and, and for the, the Commission, just 10 seconds,
24 if you can answer this. Previously, we had an applicant from
25 Ruth, Nevada. Are the tracks between the Northern Nevada,

1 between Ely and Ruth, and is there a depot at the other end at
2 Ruth?

3 BASSETT: For the record, Mark Bassett.
4 Unfortunately, the tracks no longer go to New Ruth, and the
5 depot in Ruth was in Old Ruth, and when New Ruth became
6 created, the depot went away. Passenger service ended in
7 1941, so the -- there was no reason to build the depot when
8 the Town of Ruth was made. We are working with the mine to
9 open up the railroad to the mine. I, I have no prediction on
10 when that would happen.

11 STOLDAL: Okay.

12 BASSETT: If that were to happen, our tracks do go
13 right -- Well, actually, at that particular point, the tracks
14 belong to the mine and they do go right past Ruth.

15 STOLDAL: Okay, great. Thank you. I didn't think
16 there was -- the depot was, was -- it just kept being referred
17 to as the Ruth Depot, but I didn't think it -- so let me,
18 Mark, let me ask you. I'm concerned about why the application
19 page was altered.

20 BASSETT: The application page was altered?

21 STOLDAL: Yeah, . The, the port -- the part that
22 says, who owns the, the, the property. That was, that was cut
23 out. The property owner name and address, I mean, right
24 across the top, Mark, and I know you, you've seen this a
25 thousand times. It says this unaltered form must be

1 submitted, but yet somehow, you or the staff or somebody at
2 your end took out property owner name and, and address from
3 the application form.

4 BASSETT: That would've been me. The -- what I did
5 is I recreate the, the form be -- to fill it in and that was
6 an oversight on my part. I thought I checked and double
7 checked it to make sure that information was identical to the
8 form submitted from the Commission. In answer to your
9 question there, that property is owned by the Nevada Northern
10 Railway Foundation and the City of Ely.

11 STOLDAL: Yeah, I -- and I found that in, in your
12 narrative. You, you clearly explained that, so that wasn't,
13 wasn't -- I'm just wondering why --

14 BASSETT: Yeah.

15 STOLDAL: -- it was -- that, that that was taken
16 from the app -- application page. So the application for work
17 on the engine house/machine shop building details of
18 challenges, and you just did that for, for, for the structure.
19 The weather seals around the -- and there are just hundreds of
20 large and small windowpanes. The seals are -- you used phrase
21 -- are substantially nonexistent, causing leaks in the
22 interior walls. The walls are crumbling. As you pointed out,
23 there are 14 different roof levels. Where I'm going with all
24 of that, what's this dollar -- has there been -- is there a
25 seismic study been done on this building? Has somebody come

1 in and said, Mark, you need to fix this and here's a
2 construction because where I'm going with this, I think that
3 what needs to be done first is we fund you enough money to do
4 a study on, on what should be done first, second, and third,
5 whether it's the roof fixed, the crumbling walls, fix the
6 windows. What, what, what are you using as, as a basis of,
7 all right, we've got \$275,000, now go do this first.

8 BASSETT: Actually to address your, your comments --
9 Mark Bassett for the record -- the, the Commission, the
10 previous Commission has actually funded the study that was
11 done, I want to say, 2008, 2009, and we actually implemented
12 the results of that study and had a structural engineer, so we
13 seismically retrofitted the building. It would've been 2008,
14 2007, thereabouts. I, I can check exactly and let you know
15 when, so --

16 STOLDAL: Okay.

17 BASSETT: -- we're in the -- when I say the, the
18 crumbling, it, it's a crumbling parapets on the actual roof
19 itself. We actually have addressed all of the building walls
20 structural deficiencies in previous CCA and CCCHP grants.

21 STOLDAL: So let me re -- let me state what you just
22 said to me. So the walls right now are not structurally
23 crumbling.

24 BASSETT: Correct.

25 STOLDAL: But the windows are still leaking into

1 those walls.

2 BASSETT: Well, no. The, the windows are actually
3 leaking inside the building. These are ver -- these are
4 industrial metal windows that open, and so they have a, a
5 weather seal that goes around the window openings --

6 STOLDAL: Right.

7 BASSETT: -- and it's these weather seals that have
8 failed.

9 STOLDAL: Yeah. I guess where I'm going with that,
10 where, where is that, where is the seals failing, leaking
11 into, into what? Just on the inside of the building or --

12 BASSETT: Just on -- yes, just on the inside of the
13 building. When we get heavy rains being blown by a west or
14 south wind, the water comes in and then leaks down the
15 interior of the wall.

16 STOLDAL: So the \$275,000 is, is specifically -- you
17 can delineate between the, the roof, repairing the roof and
18 repairing the windows, or are those separate? Like, I wasn't
19 able to pull any, any specifics out of here other than just
20 the, the number \$2 -- \$270 --

21 BASSETT: Oh.

22 STOLDAL: -- \$247.

23 BASSETT: Okay. I submitted a, a budget form with
24 it and that has demolition at \$20,000, repair the parapet
25 walls at \$18,000, repair the smoke jacks at \$28,000, repair

1 and winterize the building windows at \$16,000, repair the
2 downspouts and storm sewer, sewer at \$40,000 --

3 STOLDAL: Right.

4 BASSETT: -- and install a new roof at \$125,000.

5 STOLDAL: So in -- in order of those, can any of
6 that be phased in, 'cause I've got those numbers, the parapet
7 walls, the smoke jacks, and so forth. I mean, would you do
8 the roof right away or do you have --

9 BASSETT: Oh.

10 STOLDAL: -- or do you have to do them in some
11 order?

12 BASSETT: Well, doing -- the, the, the roof would be
13 -- I would do the, the roof and then basically do it in almost
14 reverse order. Do the roof and the down spouts and the storm
15 sewers. The parapet walls would be -- that's part of the
16 roof, so those three items would have to be done almost
17 together. I mean, it would be very nice to repair the smoke
18 jacks, so I have more availability. The, the problem is, you
19 know, the big doors weigh two tons and it -- and they do fail
20 periodically. And they usually give us a warning when they
21 fail, so I can move equipment left or right to another track,
22 but to move a steam locomotive, I got to move it onto a track
23 with a smoke jack and without a smoke jack, it just smokes up
24 the entire engine house.

25 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair, I just have one, one more

1 question of Mark.

2 BASSETT: Yup.

3 STOLDAL: This, this is for -- you know better than,
4 than, than anybody the amount of energy, time, and challenges,
5 and almost hourly different challenges that, that you have to
6 deal with. Can -- are, are you able to take on another
7 project? I mean, it seems to me that there's some other
8 projects that are -- still need to be worked on and, and, and
9 may not have been -- get done in time for the funding. Help
10 me understand where, where -- whether if we fund this, we're
11 going to be able to do it.

12 BASSETT: Okay. On this particular project, I
13 actually spoke to the roofing contractor who helped me prepare
14 this on Saturday and he wished me good luck for today, so he's
15 standing by and we are ready to work on that. On our current
16 grants, they have been a challenge. There's no ifs, ands,
17 buts about that, but the good news is I should have a
18 contractor hired by the end of this month and the other thing
19 is some of the work has already started, like up at the McGill
20 Depot, we've already started the sewer water connections and
21 the other big advantages too. All of the construction work
22 that we're looking at in both the transportation building here
23 in Ely and the McGill Depot, that's all interior work, and so
24 that's not going to be weather dependent. So the short
25 version is we will have our two current grants finished

1 probably on January 2nd at 11:59 p.m., but they will be
2 finished by January 2nd, 11:59 p.m., 2023 and, like I've
3 mentioned, I have the contractor standing by on this one so we
4 can jump right on this.

5 STOLDAL: All right. Thank you, Mark. Thank you,
6 Mr. Chairman. I, I would make a motion unless there's other
7 questions.

8 OSTROVSKY: Any other commissioners have questions?
9 Mr. Bassett? I hear a (Inaudible).

10 KAVANAUGH: Mr. Bassett?

11 OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible)? Yes, Commissioner.

12 KAVANAUGH: Sorry, Chair. Mr. Chair. I -- my
13 internet, I think, is a little slow, so I apologize. I want
14 to thank you for the speci -- speci -- specificity of your
15 grant application on lining out your project.

16 BASSETT: I Thank you, Commissioner.

17 OSTROVSKY: Go ahead, Bob, if you want to make a
18 motion.

19 STOLDAL: On 20-20 -- 20-20, Nevada Northern Railway
20 Foundation, Inc., for the urgent building repair of the engine
21 house/machine shop for \$247,000, I make a motion to approve.

22 OSTROVSKY: We have a second?

23 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I second.

24 OSTROVSKY: All right. Any other comments from the
25 commissioners? Any comments from the public?

1 KAVANAUGH: Yes. This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.

2 OSTROVSKY: Yes.

3 KAVANAUGH: I would like to suggest that we add the
4 City of Elko in the grant application in naming the grant
5 application awardee.

6 OSTROVSKY: I'm not sure I understand. I'm sorry.

7 KAVANAUGH: Um --

8 STOLDAL: As part owner of the building.

9 KAVANAUGH: -- so we know that the property is -- we
10 know that the property is jointly owned by the Nevada Northern
11 Railway Foundation, Incorporated along with the City of Ely.

12 OSTROVSKY: Oh, okay. So --

13 KAVANAUGH: So I --

14 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

15 KAVANAUGH: -- I feel like we should include them as
16 part of the grant awardee.

17 OSTROVSKY: Okay.

18 BASSETT: Mr. Chairman.

19 STOLDAL: I accept. I, I accept that.

20 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

21 BASSETT: Mr. Chairman, I will submit a corrected
22 application cover page. I checked that and double checked it
23 and I -- I'm stunned I missed it, but obviously, I, I will get
24 that to you.

25 OSTROVSKY: We understand. Thank you, Mark. Does

1 seconder accept that little change? She does.

2 OLMSTEAD: Yes.

3 OSTROVSKY: Any other comments of the commissioners?
4 Any public comment? All those in favor of approving 21-20 in
5 the amount of \$247,000, please say aye.

6 MULTIPLE: Aye.

7 OSTROVSKY: Chairman votes -- any opposed? Chairman
8 votes in favor, unanimous of the commissioners in attendance.
9 Mark, good luck. I know it's a big project and I've been in
10 that engine house. It's a big building.

11 BASSETT: Yes, it is, Commissioner. Thank you all
12 very, very much. Appreciate it.

13 OSTROVSKY: All right.

14 BASSETT: Bye.

15 OSTROVSKY: That takes us to the We -- Western
16 Folklife Center. It, it is next to the last. Western
17 Folklife Center, Pioneer Hotel Fire Safety Compliance project.
18 Is someone on board?

19 HITCHCOCK: Yes, I have Carolyn Trainor. One moment.
20 Go ahead, Carolyn.

21 TRAINOR: Hello? Can you hear me?

22 OSTROVSKY: I hear you just fine. Thank you.

23 TRAINOR: Okay. I'm Carolyn Flores Trainor,
24 Development Manager for the Western Folklife Center for the
25 record. A little history, the Pioneer Hotel Building was

1 transformed into a three-story brick building between 1912 and
2 1913. It quickly became one of the centerpiece of downtown
3 Elko. Barbie Wessel (phonetic) wrote about the Pioneer Hotel
4 for a Northeastern Nevada Historical Society Quarterly
5 published in 1985. Ms. Wessel stated the building's unique
6 architectural style is significant because of its design
7 influences from the American arts and crafts movement. The
8 109 year old building is the home of the Western Folklife
9 Center and has hosted countless poets, musicians, artists, and
10 fans of cowboy culture, serving as a window to the rural west.
11 The Pioneer Hotel building is an important cultural center for
12 northeast, excuse me, Northeastern Nevada, and is used by an
13 ever-growing year-round community of local and international
14 artists, visitors, and customers. It also increasingly serves
15 as a physical home base that livestream viewers experience
16 virtually every time we go live from the iconic G Three Bar
17 Theater in the Pioneer Hotel building. The primary goal for
18 the Western Folklife Center over the next year is to expand
19 its reach by welcoming back past patrons and reaching new
20 audiences through its signature national cowboy poetry
21 gathering and other year-round programming. At the same time,
22 the Western Folklife Center will achieve financial
23 sustainability through increased earned and contributed
24 revenue streams. Many of our local businesses rent our
25 facility for their meetings, community, and special events.

1 Our convenient downtown location makes it a local favorite for
2 private events, parties, receptions, and celebrations in the G
3 Three Bar Theater and/or the Pioneer Saloon. For this
4 project, the repair and restoration of the ceiling and the
5 basement storage spaces and upgrade of lighting and emergency
6 exit signage will provide a more fire-safe environment for the
7 building. The ceiling area to be repaired includes spaces
8 where we store tables and racks, chairs, exhibit cases,
9 equipment, tools, and gathering-specific displays. Along with
10 storage space, we also have a wor -- woodworking area and a
11 green room for artists when they are here to perform at our
12 events. This restoration will bring the building into
13 compliance for items identified during the Elko Fire
14 Department's annual building inspection and will improve the
15 safety of the building. This project is shovel-ready, but we
16 can wait at the discretion of the commission -- commissioners,
17 excuse me. And I thank you for your consideration in funding
18 this project.

19 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. Any questions of the
20 commissioners?

21 STOLDAL: (Inaudible) a motion --

22 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. Ms.
23 Trainor, I'd like to thank you for submitting a complete and
24 thorough application and providing all of the documentation
25 necessary on the, on the application. With that, I would like

1 to make a motion to approve this grant application, number 20-
2 21 to the Western Folklife Center, the Pioneer Hotel Fire
3 Safety Compliance project in the amount of \$14,561.

4 OSTROVSKY: We have --

5 STOLDAL: I'd like to second that --

6 OSTROVSKY: -- a second?

7 STOLDAL: -- as well as the, the comments. It was
8 really an easy one with the photographs and the details and
9 the specifics to understand what the project is, so I second.

10 TRAINOR: Thank you so much.

11 OSTROVSKY: Any other comments from commissioners?

12 Any comments from the public? Hearing none, all those in
13 favor of the motion to approve Western Folklife Center, grant
14 number 21-21, say aye.

15 MULTIPLE: Aye.

16 OSTROVSKY: Opposed? Chairman votes in favor,
17 unanimous of all commissioners present. Thank you very much.

18 TRAINOR: Thank you.

19 OSTROVSKY: That leads us to our, I believe, is our
20 last grant application at Goldfield Historical Society.

21 Someone on the line from Goldfield?

22 STOLDAL: I have two more.

23 OSTROVSKY: You have two more? What do you have?

24 STOLDAL: You left Goldfield and Carlin.

25 OSTROVSKY: Oh, I'm sorry. You're right. This is

1 next to the last. I was in a hurry.

2 STOLDAL: Well, that's --

3 OSTROVSKY: This is next to the last. Anyway, is
4 someone on from Goldfield?

5 HITCHCOCK: Yes, we have John Ekman. John, you can
6 unmute yourself. I believe you can try *6 or *9, one of those
7 two.

8 OSTROVSKY: Still can't hear you, John.

9 HITCHCOCK: We are unable to unmute you, John. You'll
10 have to unmute yourself and that either you can do by *6 --
11 oh, there you are.

12 EKMAN: How about now? I think I'm unmuted.

13 OSTROVSKY: There you are. Yeah. Thank you, John.
14 We can hear you fine.

15 EKMAN: Okay. Again, it's John Ekman, I'm
16 President of the Goldfield Historical Society and our
17 requested funds for this round are to continue with the second
18 phase of the high school roof reconstruction project. As you
19 mentioned early on in this meeting, we are currently working
20 on the first phase of the project or the current phase, which
21 is rebuilding the timber and masonry structural elements,
22 releveling the building center, including the flat roof, the
23 skylight, the light shaft, recovering the flat roof, and doing
24 50% plus of the sloped roof steel sanding seam roof, and
25 hopefully, if we can get some bids back here in the next

1 couple of weeks, we should be getting started on that
2 directly. I will turn it back over to you.

3 OSTROVSKY: Questions from the commissioners.

4 STOLDAL: The -- Stoldal for the record. The -- are
5 -- what, what's your -- well, I don't want to ask a loaded
6 question. What I'd like to be able to, to, to get done is get
7 the roof finished, get it so it's, it's -- we've got the
8 foundation finished. I think we've got the windows finished,
9 and if we can get the roof done, then, then the work on the
10 interior can really, without being damaged. What's it going
11 to -- how much more is it going to take to get the roof done
12 financially? I know you have a challenge with contractors,
13 but if there's some additional money and they see it's a
14 bigger project, assuming this is -- this, this part of it gets
15 done, how much more needs to be done and at roughly what cost?

16 EKMAN: Assuming that the current project is
17 adequately funded, we'll find out when the contractors, you
18 know, respond to the, to the bid request and assuming that
19 this current request for \$170,000 is adequate considering all
20 the various other costs that are, are evolving as you've
21 discussed throughout this meeting today, we should be pretty
22 close to complete. We may still have some work on the sheet
23 metal, the soffits, the gutters. They're quite complex.
24 They're somewhat aesthetic and ornate, and -- but as far as
25 actually keeping the water out, they will, they will be

1 actually superfluous to that point, although they -- they will
2 -- they would direct the water off of the roof to various
3 downspouts. So in answer your question, our intention is that
4 the funding that is currently available and that we are asking
5 for in this proposed project, our intention is that this, this
6 will, this will cover the roof to the point where, where we
7 can keep the, the water out.

8 UNIDENTIFIED: Perfect.

9 OSTROVSKY: That, that answer your question, Bob, or,
10 you want to know more?

11 STOLDAL: As, as far as gutters, 'cause we're all
12 made aware of the gutters. If we see one more commercial
13 about fixing gutters, how much more is, is the gutter? Any
14 estimate on that?

15 EKMAN: That, that is, that -- I'll use a, a, an
16 engineering term. It's indeterminate right now. It's --

17 STOLDAL: Okay.

18 EKMAN: I, I don't know. I, I'm really not that
19 familiar with the, the cost or the skill of fabricating sheet
20 metal gutters that are more than just gutters, but on the two
21 sides of the building that face the streets, it's on a corner,
22 on those two sides, they're very, very, very complex. And on
23 the other two sides, they're less complex. But the simple
24 answer to your question is I am just not that sure as to what
25 the cost will be for those gutters.

1 STOLDAL: Thank you. That's --

2 OSTROVSKY: John, this is the Chairman. I think what
3 you're hearing is if we do have another round where we have
4 some leftover funds, I, I think it would be wiser on your part
5 to get some expertise -- experts in and, and get a good handle
6 on what it might cost to, to complete that gutter work, which
7 is, you know, I, I think important in the long run to keeping
8 a roof in good shape. So we would look forward to seeing that
9 soon. Other questions?

10 EKMAN: I, I will do that.

11 OSTROVSKY: Any, any other questions from
12 commissioners? Hearing none, accept a motion.

13 STOLDAL: All right. Stoldal for the record. For
14 21-22, the Goldfield Historical Society, the Goldfield
15 Historic Building Restoration Project for the sum of \$170,000,
16 the motion is for approval.

17 OSTROVSKY: Do I have a second?

18 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead.

19 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner.

20 OLMSTEAD: (Inaudible).

21 OSTROVSKY: I accept Commissioner Olmstead's second.

22 Any further questions of the Commission? Any comment or
23 questions for the public? Hearing none, you've heard the
24 motion to approve grant application 21-22, Goldfield
25 Historical Society, the amount of \$170,000. All those in

1 favor, say aye.

2 MULTIPLE: Aye.

3 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chairman votes in favor.
4 It's unanimous of the commissioners present. Thank you very
5 much, and we'll look forward hopefully in the next short
6 round, and maybe we'll take a look at your gutters.

7 EKMAN: Thank you.

8 OSTROVSKY: Now we get to the final application. Is
9 the Carlin Historical Society for the Carlin Schoolhouse
10 Rehabilitation. Again, is someone on from Carlin?

11 HITCHCOCK: Yes, I'll bring Ella on. Go ahead, Ella.

12 TRUJILLO: Hi, everyone. My name is Ella Trujillo,
13 and I'm the Treasurer with Carlin Historical Society, and,
14 yes, I'm the last one, so everybody can say yay. We were
15 lucky enough to receive funding from the Commission this last
16 grant cycle to start restoration work on the schoolhouse, and
17 I got great news this morning. It looks like our contractor
18 is going to be able to pour concrete starting tomorrow, and so
19 our -- all of our concrete sidewalk and other elements will
20 hopefully be done by the end of the week, so we are super
21 excited about that. And then it's just installing the hot
22 water heater to go forward, so we are looking to the future,
23 and this grant application, you can see is directly related to
24 the exterior of the building, which is the priority. The
25 interior is in really good shape. Obviously, it needs some

1 work, but it's serving purpose -- the -- serving the purposes
2 for the building right now, so we're looking at the brick
3 restoration and the rain gutter system replacement, and then
4 some planning, including some architectural plans and an
5 architectural study for the roof, so, the building itself,
6 briefly, more recent research has revealed that the building
7 may be older than we originally thought, which is fascinating
8 for us. And it's also amazing that the building is in the
9 shape that it's in, and I attribute that to the building being
10 used by the community for so many different purposes. It's --
11 I look at this building and I say -- I, I just think it's
12 amazing. I mean, it has been a schoolhouse. It has been
13 basically city hall. It has been a senior center and now it's
14 a museum, and I think that's why the building is so important,
15 and I think that's why the community thinks it's so important.
16 But it's also given us opportunities that I never thought we
17 would have. On a personal level, I got to visit with both of
18 Carlin's third grade classes this year, and I got to teach
19 them about the heritage of their town, including why their
20 mascot is a railroader. You know, these kids, they grew up in
21 a mining community, not a railroad community, so, it's great,
22 especially to see their fascination, that, that beginning
23 scene at the movie of Frozen, which I don't know if you've
24 seen it or not, but they're harvesting ice and for those kids
25 to learn that that happened in their town, it just -- it's

1 great. And that wouldn't have happened without this building
2 and the, the community volunteers that have worked tirelessly
3 to make programming happen and to get the building in a place
4 where the public can come and see it and learn about this
5 town's fascinating past, and I learn more every single day.
6 So, I, I think that not only has this building been great for
7 the past, but I think that we all have a vision that it can be
8 -- can make a huge difference for Carlin in the future,
9 especially from a tourism perspective. The heritage of the
10 Chinese railroad workers has completely been a surprise for us
11 as well, and we think it's great that people come all the way
12 from China to see what's in our building, so, I hope the
13 Commission will consider funding the whole project, but, as we
14 laid out in our application that -- we did list everything by
15 priority. So, we will be content with whatever the Commission
16 decides to do for us.

17 OSTROVSKY: Thank you. I'll start by asking a
18 question. There seems to be some question about what -- how
19 you intend to restore the brick and other masonry.

20 TRUJILLO: Mm hmm.

21 OSTROVSKY: Are you familiar with the staff's
22 concerns?

23 TRUJILLO: No, I wasn't informed of any concerns, but
24 I will do my best to address them.

25 OSTROVSKY: Well, staff believes you need additional

1 information.

2 TRUJILLO: Okay.

3 OSTROVSKY: Could you -- here, I'm going to need,
4 staff's help just a little bit. Rebecca, can you comment on,
5 on the treatment of the brick?

6 PALMER: Certainly. For the record, this is
7 Rebecca Palmer. I'd like to sort of start with, with the
8 application of water repellants to brick is usually not
9 recommended and we would not approve such an application.
10 Those act -- the application of water repellants can
11 significant -- could significantly damage the historic fabric,
12 and it's -- we really need far more information concerning
13 that, but, but perhaps I could beg the indulgence of the Chair
14 and, and really address more broadly the proposal. After
15 looking at the proposal by my staff, one whom is a qualified
16 architect, we really believe that this proposal is somewhat
17 out of order. I think -- we think that the activities perhaps
18 could be reprioritized and, for example, item number 1 really
19 should be the architectural study to determine the
20 deficiencies, including the seismic study since this is likely
21 an unreinforced masonry building. The roof really should be
22 replaced first before any other construction work is done
23 because if, if the roof is replaced after or, or all the
24 construction occurs and, and penetrates the roof, it could
25 certainly void the, the warranty. Drawings and specifications

1 should be prepared for estimating the cost, bidding and
2 permitting for the new roof. You know, if the goal is to
3 reconstruct the bell tower and the widow's walk, those
4 elements should be reconstructed during the installation of
5 the new roof. If seismic strengthening is needed before the
6 roof is installed, that should be part of the specifications
7 and study. Then the new rain gutters, downspout system should
8 be installed during the roof installation, and then all the
9 proposed masonry work should be done after the roof is
10 completed, and then finally, the ADA accessible entrance
11 should, should be done last. This is in slightly -- that
12 would be our recommended prioritization.

13 STOLDAL: Mr. Chair.

14 OSTROVSKY: Yes, Mr. Stoldal.

15 STOLDAL: Rebecca, clear logic that, that is there,
16 including having a seismic plan, 'cause we're going to put a
17 new roof and put the bell tower back on and I think the
18 applicant a few minutes ago said the building is really older
19 than they thought, and they're surprising that it's standing
20 up, but this is such a, an important structure and, and I will
21 tangent and that is, it's really exciting to see Carlin -- I
22 don't what the word -- come to life with its historic
23 presentation effort, so I really want to support it, but my
24 questions to you, Rebecca, what do you guesstimate that the
25 study that you're suggesting, and I think is, is wise, is how

1 much would that cost roughly? Estimate, guess, something we
2 could put in no more than our figure.

3 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
4 My recommendation here, given the, the unusual economic
5 circumstances that we face, is that perhaps the applicant
6 could get some estimates on what that seismic study could be.
7 I, I would hesitate to guess what a possible seismic study
8 might cost for a building this size.

9 STOLDAL: Well, then I'm, then I'm going to make a
10 guess because I think we need to have a figure that, that they
11 can use to go out and immediately get something against -- get
12 started to work on this, so, so we have a plan, a presentation
13 that's going to come back in June, July, August, September in,
14 in, in the next 90 days so we can look at helping restore the
15 roof and the -- 'cause all, I -- I think that what you just
16 suggested, the roof, the bell tower, all those things, the
17 gutters, need to be done at roughly, roughly the same time.
18 If, if I said \$75,000, do you think that kind of a study can
19 be done within that figure?

20 PALMER: For the, for the record, this is Rebecca
21 Palmer. Why don't -- there, there is nothing in the statutes
22 or in the operating policies and guidelines of this Commission
23 that prevents the Commission from awarding a grant for an
24 activity, and then when the costs are available, we would then
25 inform the Commission. So perhaps the award could be for the

1 seismic study up to a certain amount, maybe \$75,000, and then
2 when the actual costs come in, we would inform the Commission
3 of what that cost was at the next meeting. So rather than put
4 a dollar figure on it at this point, award the activity up to
5 a threshold, and then staff will work with the applicant to
6 get that study estimate prepared for which we would then come
7 forward at the next meeting.

8 STOLDAL: So I, I --

9 PALMER: Does that sound like an --

10 STOLDAL: -- that sounds like a plan, so -- but I
11 mean, I want to make sure that we, we -- that the Commission
12 is asking for a very -- the very specific report, more than
13 just seismic, but this expanded study would include -- what
14 elements is, is the staff recommending that the new study in -
15 - in -- include? Construction plans? Seismic study? What
16 are the things that we are going to be asking for them to come
17 back for?

18 BROWN: May I? This is Kristen from SHP --
19 Kristin Brown from SHPO, if I may add some information? I
20 just want to point out that the application already includes a
21 study and there is a dollar amount attached to that, so I
22 think the question would -- there's already an architect based
23 in Elko that has proposed doing this study for a certain
24 amount of money, for \$18,600. So I think the question would
25 be what did that architect intend to include for that \$18,600

1 and what can be added onto that to make it a more -- something
2 very usable for the city? Because, you know, seismic is a key
3 element. We need to make sure that the walls are tied to the
4 roof, and we need to make sure that, that, you know, that kind
5 of thing is done. It's not a huge building. I don't think
6 it's going to take a lot, you know, seismic-wise, but then we
7 want to know if the roof structure is capable of supporting
8 the reconstructed bell tower and widow's walk, and then we
9 would like to get some -- we need enough -- we would ideally
10 like to get enough drawings and specifications so that it
11 could go out to bid to get quotes on the reinforcement of the
12 roof structure, the tying, you know, putting in a diaphragm,
13 tying the roof to the, to the walls to achieve seismic
14 stabilization, and then, you know, putting the roof on and
15 reconstructing the bell tower. So all of that really has to
16 be done kind of at the same time. When the roof is off, one
17 of the things that we were concerned with is putting a roof on
18 too soon and then going back a couple years later to
19 reconstruct the bell tower is not a good idea because it might
20 void the roof warranty because you're going to be introducing
21 a bunch of penetrations into that roof. So we would really
22 like to see if the goal is to reconstruct those items on top
23 of the roof, it would be really, really nice to do all of it
24 at once. Tie the, tie it together, seismic bracing, reinforce
25 any sort of roof framing members, rebuild that bell tower and

1 widow's walk, and put a new roof on with all the flashing
2 that's required at the same time. So getting that study done,
3 I mean, like I say, there's already a study being created, so
4 the question is how can we get it to the next level to be able
5 to go out and get bids on doing the work? So as -- we just
6 need the drawings and the specifications, so I think it's a
7 question for the architect. Does the architect need to
8 subcontract with an engineer for this, for seismic stuff? You
9 know, those are the questions.

10 STOLDAL: So, so Chair, here's what, here's what R6
11 Studios is, is saying that they're going to do for the
12 \$18,600. They're going to complete a structural analysis of
13 current deficiencies, description of work to be performed to
14 correct structural and architectural issues, structural and
15 civil engi -- analysis will be completed by Far West
16 Consultants out of Elko, electrical, plumbing, and mechanical
17 analysis will be included but a detailed in-depth analysis of
18 these systems is not included in the report. This proposal
19 does not include architectural or structural construction
20 drawings. We will assess the entire building, but focus in-
21 depth on the roof, the foundation, and, and original windows.
22 It sounds like we're halfway there with this, but we're, we're
23 not getting all the things necessary to give Carlin, here's
24 what, what, what you need to do next and to come back and ask
25 for more money. Chairman, I'm not sure what the next step is

1 other than take what Kristin just said and, and list those as,
2 as things and, and add it to this, and then go out to, to bid
3 again.

4 OSTROVSKY: You know, I -- this is the Chairman again
5 -- I, you know, Bob, you mentioned \$75,000, which sounds a lot
6 compared to the -- what they were asking. I mean, maybe not
7 to exceed \$50,000 or \$60,000 to include the drawing, so they
8 could go to bid and come back to us with some better numbers
9 and a better priority list of projects to be completed, brick,
10 wall, ADA, et cetera, so I would -- I'd be happy to support
11 some number that -- not to exceed, say, \$60,000 and hope they
12 can come back to us with more detail that we could then award
13 in, in our next meeting or as soon as possible.

14 STOLDAL: Kristen, I, I know I was -- we were
15 putting Rebecca on the spot, so the spot's going to jump over
16 to you. Is, is \$50,000 a reasonable number?

17 BROWN: I would think so based on the original
18 quote, but I would like to point out that Mel Green is present
19 on the call and he might have some insight if the Commission
20 would be interested to hear from him as well.

21 OSTROVSKY: We're, we're always interested to hear
22 from Mel. So if he would like to come on, give us some
23 advice.

24 GREEN: I, I'm golfing here. Oh, this is my --
25 this is a baby picture that's up there, by the way. I, I

1 think that you're going in the right direction and they need
2 to know what the issues are before they can produce the
3 drawings and the designs necessary to, to, to mitigate those
4 and to restore the structure. So from this conversation,
5 seems logical to me that, you know, what Kristen has said is
6 the right path to have the architect-engineer team, you know,
7 do such a study. They can guide the City of Carlin or the
8 Carlin Historical Society, and we were, you know, there's been
9 a lot of conversation about budget and it seems to me like the
10 \$18,000 might be low for what they're thinking about, so I, I
11 would think if you're going to ask for such a study, you need
12 to increase perhaps \$40K 'cause I would bring in more
13 mechanical engineering. They had civil and structural --
14 civil engineered survey. There was a lot of players and I
15 think we want to use them all to the best that we can. I
16 don't know if I'm rambling or not, so excuse me, but --

17 OSTROVSKY: Mel, would you add \$40,000 or a total of
18 \$40,000?

19 GREEN: It's -- I don't know. I think \$40,000
20 total and let's -- I think the architect can work with that.

21 OSTROVSKY: Okay. Well, anybody have any other
22 questions for Mel? We, we appreciate your, your --

23 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I have a
24 question for Mel. Mel, would it require -- would, would it
25 require having a seismologist come from Reno or Salt Lake to

1 do an analysis of the building? Is that a completely
2 different person who comes in to do that?

3 GREEN: For design of buildings, the US Geologic
4 Survey has prepared seismic probability maps for the entire
5 country. So within the building code or the available
6 provisions of the building code, the structural engineer will
7 get the design values for putting the -- for evaluating and
8 designing the building. So such a player is not required.

9 KAVANAUGH: Perfect. Thank you.

10 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mel. Mr. Stoldal, would you
11 like to make a motion?

12 STOLDAL: I'm working on it and, and, and so the
13 motion would be for 21 -- first of all, to back up, I think
14 that the -- I get the sense that the Commission supports the
15 concept of getting the, the bell tower back and, and
16 identifying that building as, as the, the school, so with that
17 in mind, with 23-23, Carlin Historical Society, Carlin School
18 Rehabilitation, I would support a motion that would fund up to
19 \$45,000, a study, a seismic study, and other studies that
20 staff would work with Carlin to include, construction and, and
21 other necessary documents to be able to have the City of -- or
22 the Carlin Historic Society come back to the Commission to be
23 able to say, we need this for the roof, we need this for the,
24 for, for the project, but specific dollar figures. That would
25 be my motion.

1 OSTROVSKY: Do I have a second?

2 KAVANAUGH: Seconded by Commissioner Kavanaugh.

3 OSTROVSKY: Any questions? Any public --

4 KAVANAUGH: I, I do have a question.

5 OSTROVSKY: Yes. Go ahead, please.

6 KAVANAUGH: Commissioner Kavanaugh. I have a
7 question. So, just for a point of clarification, does this
8 then allow them, once they've received all of the plan, once
9 they've done this seismic study and, and have developed a plan
10 for this project, are they -- I'm assuming they're permitted
11 to come back and apply for additional funding to get this
12 project rolling?

13 OSTROVSKY: That's correct.

14 KAVANAUGH: That's perfect.

15 OSTROVSKY: Is there a second?

16 KAVANAUGH: Yes, I seconded that motion.

17 OSTROVSKY: Oh, I'm sorry. Any other comment? Any
18 public comment? All those in favor of the motion to grant
19 \$45,000 to project 21-23, purpose of study and preparation of
20 documents, all those in favor, say aye.

21 MULTIPLE: Aye.

22 OSTROVSKY: Any opposed? Chairman votes in favor.
23 It's unanimous of those commissioners present. We look
24 forward to seeing you back when all those documents and
25 materials are ready. Thank you very much.

1 UNIDENTIFIED: (Inaudible).

2 OSTROVSKY: Sorry.

3 KAVANAUGH: Chairman?

4 OSTROVSKY: Yes. This is Antoinette -- Commissioner
5 Kavanaugh. I would like to thank you, Ms. Trujillo, for
6 continuing to promote the Carlin School's history, which has
7 played a large, large part in the, in the Elko County School
8 District history, so I commend you for doing that and teaching
9 about the harvesting of, of ice and other things that were --
10 that the railroad was used for in the development and, and
11 economic development of Northeastern Nevada. Congratulations.

12 TRUJILLO: Thank you, Commissioner Kavanaugh.

13 OSTROVSKY: We've completed item number 7, including
14 approving the various amounts. I -- we use item 8 as
15 discussion of the grant, awarding of grants. Do we know what
16 the total we awarded and what the remaining balance will be
17 that the Commission has available? I don't know if staff's
18 had a chance to -- we just moved some numbers around, so it
19 may take them a minute to come up with that.

20 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. I have those numbers. So far
21 you have awarded \$3,335,895, and the remaining balance here is
22 \$454,105.

23 STOLDAL: Wow. I'm sure glad you did the math
24 'cause I came up with \$2,800,000, so we're, we're close for
25 only --

1 HITCHCOCK: I can share my screen if you would like to
2 see the numbers, sir.

3 STOLDAL: Well, you know, it would help if you could
4 to -- 'cause I, I hate being \$500,000 off in my checking
5 account.

6 HITCHCOCK: Of course. And you can correct me if I'm
7 wrong on any of these numbers. Here we go.

8 OSTROVSKY: There's \$200,000 set aside on top of that,
9 right? For administration.

10 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir.

11 PALMER: For the, for the record, this is Rebecca
12 Palmer. In addition to the reserved funding available in this
13 grant cycle, it is likely we will have about \$80,000 remaining
14 in FY19 and '20 to re-grant. In discussing this with the
15 treasurer's office, we can re-grant to any applicant in the,
16 in the FY21-22 cycle, who was also a grantee in the FY19-20
17 cycle, so there's an additional \$80,000 to consider at that
18 point.

19 OSTROVSKY: Okay, Bob, now that -- thank you. Now
20 that you've had a chance to look at these numbers, do you --

21 STOLDAL: Oh, I'm not that fast.

22 OSTROVSKY: Oh, okay. I'll let you take a minute and
23 take a look at them.

24 STOLDAL: No, I, I, I'm just -- I have to go back
25 and, and, and -- 'cause I made the notes on each, on each

1 sheet, but I'm sure the staff is correct, but I was wondering
2 why I was \$500,000 off, but that's, that's the way it is. I
3 think it was inflation that hit during the meeting.

4 HITCHCOCK: I also have my notes put in here for each
5 one where, if they're pending approval.

6 STOLDAL: Does this money, does this money include
7 money we set aside? Or is it just the actual grants or does
8 it include, for example, the money for Washoe County?

9 HITCHCOCK: Yeah, for example, Washoe County, I have a
10 note here that you approved \$110,000, the \$110,607 approved,
11 \$230,443 set aside for future approval -- future approval. I
12 just included that whole amount in what you --

13 STOLDAL: Okay. So, so that's where the \$4 -- the
14 \$400,000 that I was off --

15 HITCHCOCK: You're off. That's probably it. Correct.

16 STOLDAL: Yeah. Okay. Yeah.

17 HITCHCOCK: And the same -- we have awarded the
18 \$83,200, but we're holding the funding until the next meeting
19 is held to get more information from White Pine.

20 STOLDAL: So Mr. Chair, the, the number that, that I
21 have that we have firmly granted, we have indicated we're
22 going to hold some money pending, pending coming back and, and
23 they could apply for that, so we sort of set that aside, but
24 that's not a lock that they're going to get it. They still
25 have to come back. The same thing with -- we just -- with

1 Carlin. But so far that we have hardcore granted, the number
2 I have is \$2,800,418. I don't know if that matches with, with
3 staff to drop out all those things other than what we have
4 done today.

5 OSTROVSKY: That number added to the reserve, we put
6 aside added to funds that are not expended yet. We, we've got
7 a considerable amount of money yet to, to grant in this cycle.

8 STOLDAL: Right. And I think some of those, for
9 example, the Carlin, may, may very well come back with, with a
10 number that will take a, a piece of that. Washoe County will
11 likely come back, 'cause some of the -- and again, it's
12 quickly how, how can -- how fast can they turn around and get
13 these studies done in time to meet some -- 'cause if we don't
14 get the information back until June of next year, it's going
15 to be a challenge to --

16 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

17 STOLDAL: -- to do that and we still have Hawthorne.
18 Hawthorne could, could come back in, in, in September and say,
19 We need -- we qualify and here's what we're looking for.

20 OSTROVSKY: So that is all work we will have to do at
21 our next meeting --

22 STOLDAL: Yeah.

23 OSTROVSKY: -- Bob. I will make sure that staff
24 double checks this and then sends it out, distributes to the
25 commissioners, so they, they've got a reference table to look

1 at and double check their own thinking and, and prepare for a
2 future meeting. Before I move on to the next item, is, is any
3 question staff has about this? You okay? You need any
4 guidance from the Commission in any way?

5 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
6 No, I think we have adequate guidance. Thank you, sir. And,
7 again, right now, we have \$1,080,000 available in bond
8 proceeds. The rest will have to be -- will be available in
9 November.

10 OSTROVSKY: If it -- yeah, I understand. I -- with
11 permission of -- or the guidance from the rest of the
12 commissioners, I, I would just delegate that authority to
13 staff. They know how much money they have available and be
14 able to dole that out to the shovel-ready projects that can
15 use that 'cause some of these people can't get too -- we can't
16 get faster than the money comes, so we, we've got to, got to
17 make sure some of these projects don't get into the situation
18 where they have expenditures where we don't, we don't yet have
19 reimbursable funds. It, it -- and I think, Rebecca, you, you
20 got a pretty good idea looking at these which ones are go --
21 ready to go and which ones are going to require enough time
22 and they have to go to bid and so on that, that we've got to
23 make sure we get the rest of the funds in our bank account.

24 PALMER: Yes, sir.

25 STOLDAL: Mr. Chairman?

1 PALMER: Oh.

2 OSTROVSKY: Yes, Bob.

3 STOLDAL: Do we need to do anything with Storey
4 County? Are we telling them, yes, we've got some money, but
5 you have to wait till September?

6 OSTROVSKY: I have to go back. What did we do with --
7 I have to go back and look at Storey County.

8 STOLDAL: I'm not sure that we know how much they're
9 asking for. Is that 01?

10 STOLDAL: I think it's 01 or 02, yeah.

11 KAVANAUGH: Yeah, that's 01.

12 STOLDAL: And what did we, what did we grant them?
13 72?

14 KAVANAUGH: Yeah.

15 OSTROVSKY: \$72,711, is that --

16 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kav -- yeah.
17 \$72,711.40.

18 STOLDAL: I'm not sure what, what, what the process
19 should -- would you -- 'cause I can't -- I'm reading their
20 notes there. Does it, does it, or does it say?

21 OSTROVSKY: We had to reduce the award because it
22 exceeded the dollar value. I'm not remembering it. I think
23 we did -- I don't have the chart in front of me. I think we
24 did give them the entire \$80,418, as I recall.

25 KAVANAUGH: Yes. This is Commissioner Kavanaugh.

1 Yes, that's correct. We've had that discussion and then we
2 did approve for the full amount. According to my notes, we
3 approved for \$80,418.

4 OSTROVSKY: That's what my notes show too.

5 PALMER: For, for the record, this is Rebecca
6 Palmer. Staff had indicated that the estimated hourly rate
7 was higher than the Commission had originally established in
8 their grant manual and in this particular case of CCCHP-21-01,
9 the Commission decided to award above the rate originally
10 identified in the grant manual.

11 STOLDAL: But I think, aren't they asking for
12 additional funding because something was -- there's a section
13 that was excluded from pricing?

14 PALMER: For the record, this is Rebecca Palmer.
15 Yes, sir. You are correct.

16 STOLDAL: If I obtain the cost of the exclude -- I'm
17 reading the, the, the chat. If I obtain the cost excluded
18 items from it, et cetera, would I be able to present an
19 updated bid estimate to the Commission for the increased
20 amount? Of course, the answer would be yes, but that wouldn't
21 be till September. So I guess we don't -- there's no action
22 we need to take beyond what we already did.

23 OSTROVSKY: That's correct, in my opinion. Okay. Any
24 other discussion or comments regarding 7 or 8? If no, we'll
25 move on. We'll have an opportunity in a moment to discuss

1 future grants. So, item 9 of the agenda is to elect a Chair
2 and Vice Chair, which is required by NRS 383.502A. So I would
3 open the floor for nominations for Chair.

4 STOLDAL: Well, as, as required -- Stoldal for the
5 record -- under NRS 383.500, the Commission on Cultural
6 Affairs and Historic Places is required to elected a Chair
7 from its membership. Today is the appropriate day to do that
8 since I, I'm not sure everybody's going to the polls, but I'll
9 be heading there after this meeting. I would like to nominate
10 Robert Ostrovsky based on him not sending any mailings or
11 robocalls out for his --

12 OSTROVSKY: Reelection.

13 STOLDAL: But also -- seriously, but for the great
14 work that, that you have done in keeping this often
15 challenging process, but a very important process with
16 taxpayer dollars and important historic things moving forward
17 in a very professional way. So that's my nomination.

18 OLMSTEAD: I second the nomination. Commissioner
19 Olmstead.

20 OSTROVSKY: Do we have a nomination for Vice Chair?

21 OLMSTEAD: Commissioner Olmstead. I would like to
22 nominate Robert Stoldal for Vice Chair.

23 OSTROVSKY: Are there any other nominations for either
24 position? Hearing none, as there was only one nomination for
25 each position, I will still take a vote. Those who support

1 the reelection of Chairman Ostrovsky and the reelection of
2 Vice Chairman Stoldal, please say aye.

3 MULTIPLE: Aye.

4 OSTROVSKY: Thank you very much. I appreciate your
5 support. Commission does valuable work and many states wish
6 they had commissions like this to do that, and we should
7 always remember when we talk to our members of the
8 legislature, thank them for giving us these funds to make
9 available to do this work and encourage them to keep giving to
10 a good cause. We get a lot done and we will get a lot more
11 done with these larger numbers that we've been able to
12 produce. These projects are vastly important to the state, to
13 its history, and to the government, to the -- just the folks
14 out in the rural and, and even urban areas that put their
15 heart and soul into these, these projects. So thank you all.

16 STOLDAL: Mr. Chairman, I, I, I look at, at not only
17 as these being historic, 'cause we have the, as we've talked
18 about before, the two functions, which preserve and restore
19 the history, but bring life back into these buildings. But as
20 we're -- as, as the state is doing that, it creates a stimulus
21 in this community, a financial stimulus, in the short term and
22 in the long term. In the short term, the, the construction
23 that's going on, whether they're the construction teams come
24 in. They're spending their money in town, resources and, and,
25 and it's all taking place in, in, in a community and many of

1 them rural. And then secondly, it's a longer term stimulus
2 package in the sense that visitors may stop over and get
3 lunch, get gas, stay overnight in these, in these communities,
4 so it's really more than just bringing cultural affairs and
5 historic places to life. It is, it is an economic stimulus to
6 the, to these communities and I think that's part of what we
7 need to make sure we tell our legislators.

8 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Bob.

9 KAVANAUGH: If I -- this is Commissioner Kavanaugh.
10 If I could add to that, I would also like to say that these
11 projects bring back social stimulus of community pride. We've
12 lost a lot of that over time and when we talk about our
13 history and we talk about the longstanding development history
14 of Nevada and how things came to be, it really helps to
15 instill that community pride and that -- so that becomes a, a
16 social construct within our community that brings the glue
17 back to us living truly as a community. So, I would just like
18 to add that to Mr. Stoldal's comments, because I think that
19 too instills that pride of who we are as Neva -- Nevadans.

20 OSTROVSKY: Well, thank you. Item number 10 for
21 discussion only are ideas for possible modifications to the
22 grant program in future cycles. Multiple properties on a
23 single application, for example, number of grant cycles in the
24 biennium and the application and grant manual. It is
25 discussion item, the purpose of which is to raise these issues

1 and if they take action, to take them up in a future meeting,
2 probably our next meeting. You know, we've had this multiple,
3 multiple property issue before, Brewery Art Center, which has
4 got multiple buildings on a facility, the, the railroad
5 property in Ely, which has multiple buildings, and whether or
6 not -- it stands now, we require single application. I don't
7 know if you want to consider changing that or not. I don't
8 know if anybody has comment or not. We, we need to take it
9 up, I think, at our next meeting, decide and when we put out
10 the next grant cycle, how we will get these folks to -- give
11 them guidance on how to do that so we don't have confusion out
12 there in, in the community is to what they want to do if they
13 want to add an ancillary building. You know, the Huntridge
14 had more than one building on it. We've been pretty focused
15 on single buildings requiring another application for another
16 building on the same property. That's one of the items I
17 think we need to discuss in the future. I don't know what
18 other commissioners think about other items or that item.

19 STOLDAL: Well, the challenge, the challenge is sort
20 of stemmed from, from the, the Northern Nevada Railway
21 Foundation just because it's such a, a massive project that
22 goes from potentially Cobra all the way down to Ely over to
23 Ruth to, to, to McGill, even though it's out of the Nevada,
24 although I, I think that Mark Bassett indicated that they
25 don't own the rail line between Ely and, and Ruth, but it's a

1 complicated process. So basically we have told Mark, if it's
2 a different location, you, you can submit app -- separate
3 applications, but if it's from the, the, the primary place,
4 the, the depot area, that's got to be one, one application.
5 Same thing with the brewery in Carson City. They had the
6 brewery building and then they also bought the church and it
7 was a half a block up, but it was still owned. It was still
8 the same, but a different address, so they were allowed to
9 file one application for there and another one for, for the
10 brewery building. There was some feeling that was kind of
11 unfair, that they were sort of cutting and dicing and, and,
12 and slicing, and, and this Commission has left it to where, if
13 it's the main area, that can only -- we can only accept one
14 application from there, but if it's an outlying area like
15 McGill or someplace else, we'll, we'll accept the second
16 application. I think it's worthy of, of having an additional,
17 additional discussion. The, the second thing is we sure had a
18 lot of non-edit audits and a lot of different explanations
19 and, and quite frankly, most of the explanations were, were,
20 were pretty straightforward and, and really honest. I don't
21 mean dis -- I don't mean there were -- I don't mean honest and
22 dishonest, but they were really straightforward in what they
23 do and how they sort of check their books and all they had to
24 do was write that into the application, and I think it would,
25 it would've been fine. I looked at both the grant application

1 and, and the grant manual. It's really clear. You need to do
2 that. You need to tell the State and this Commission how you
3 balance your books, what's your financial, so I think we
4 should look at that, maybe move it up and maybe have a little
5 bit more explanation. If you don't have an audit, tell us
6 what you do. Something like that. Maybe we can have that
7 discussion as well.

8 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, Bob. You know, audits are
9 expensive, particularly for very small --

10 STOLDAL: Yeah.

11 OSTROVSKY: -- groups, you know. If you're the City
12 of Reno or the City of -- for Boulder City, it's easy. You
13 have an auditor anyway, but it's not so easy if, if you're
14 scraping together a few bucks in a, in a small area and you
15 have trouble raising funds for any purpose, so I agree. I
16 would like to see that discussion. I -- we need to have some
17 discussion about how strict we want to be in the future on
18 complete and accurate applications. You know, we've -- there
19 were a lot of unanswered questions, material that wasn't
20 submitted. We advise people to do it, bring us up to date,
21 but I mean, you could get really tough and tell them, we're
22 not going to take your application unless it's complete, or,
23 or do we, do we move the deadlines around and give staff time
24 to say, we're sending it back. It's incomplete. We won't
25 even consider it. You've got 30 days to correct it or, you

1 know, that's a lot of staff work. So I think we have to talk
2 to staff and amongst ourselves about how strict we should be
3 and, and I think we, you know, I personally think the
4 application is not that difficult to fill out.

5 STOLDAL: No.

6 OSTROVSKY: I don't know why you can't give us resumes
7 of the key players, one or two pages, which we didn't get in
8 some of the applications. Things like that, which are easy to
9 do, but -- and we became a checklist and they still didn't do
10 it. So it was very frustrating this time around and I think
11 we need to make a firm policy decision about how much latitude
12 and what procedure -- what will happen if you don't provide
13 all of the information as required. So I'd like to have that
14 discussion too.

15 STOLDAL: Well, we sort of did it a bit with White
16 Pine. We didn't tell them no, but we said, you're not going
17 to get a yes until you --

18 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

19 STOLDAL: -- so maybe that's the answer is we tell
20 them, we just -- well, we should have that discussion and, and
21 figure out if, if you don't fill out, out the application and
22 you don't explain why you didn't do it -- I was -- I will tell
23 you on the record that I was concerned about the application
24 from, from Mark Bassett, why, why he would take out the
25 ownership, but I was satisfied with his answer.

1 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

2 STOLDAL: Be -- because he also said in the
3 narrative that this is who the ownership is, but why you
4 would, with the line up there, it clearly says, don't, don't
5 alter this, so all their explanations were straightforward,
6 open about this and that and, and the other challenge is we
7 need to make hardcore at the top. You need an audit or an
8 explanation why, and you need to tell us who the owner is of
9 these buildings or these things. That's got to be -- we -- if
10 we don't have those or an explanation why, we move on.

11 OSTROVSKY: Yeah.

12 KAVANAUGH: This is Commissioner Kavanaugh. I was
13 fully prepared today after looking, you know, going through
14 our, our notes, our packet that we have from our, our staff to
15 not approve some of these grants because they were missing
16 components of the grant. I've served on a number of state
17 organizations where we have not only awarded state funds, but
18 also federal funds as a flow through and we have not awarded
19 grants if they were late or incomplete, because we own it. If
20 that organization doesn't come through with those documents,
21 we as a commission, we own it and we have to explain to the
22 taxpayers if something goes awry. So I -- to be quite blunt,
23 I, I was prepared today to say not approved and I was -- I've
24 never been through the process in this commission, so I was
25 follow -- I was being a follower today and, and I think it

1 makes it cleaner for us if we just say, if you have an
2 incomplete grant, it will not -- it won't -- it will not go to
3 the Commission and if it doesn't come to the Commission, we're
4 not put in a position to have to split hairs about it and if
5 we do that, then the staff -- if we tell our staff, if they --
6 if it's an incomplete application, it will not come forward to
7 the Commission for a review. And if the, if the applicants
8 know that, guess what's going to happen? You're going to get
9 complete applications. It happens. That's how it works. The
10 word on the street now will be, well, my application wasn't
11 completed, but they awarded the funds anyway. So we have to
12 decide how we're going to, how we're going to move forward.

13 OSTROVSKY: (Inaudible).

14 KAVANAUGH: I would recommend, I would recommend that
15 we have that conversation and we, and we delineate it for our
16 staff so that they know that we mean we're going to stand by
17 whatever we say we're going to do. I think we have to be, you
18 know, as, as Bob had stated earlier, we're responsible for
19 these funds and awarding these funds and I'm, I'm -- I feel
20 like we're at the mercy of those people to provide that --
21 those documents now to our staff as we move forward. But with
22 that said, I, I know too that we were really in a, in a
23 position to have to make some awards today because we don't
24 want to see that funding go to the wayside. We want it to be
25 purposefully used throughout the State of Nevada. We don't

1 want to be stuck with it and I, and I feel and understand that
2 as well. So I'll --

3 OSTROVSKY: Well, I think --

4 KAVANAUGH: I think we should really have a
5 conversation about how we're going to proceed.

6 OSTROVSKY: Yeah, I absolutely agree. I, I don't know
7 where we're land in that discussion, but we need to have that
8 and make a firm decision 'cause I think to be fair to the
9 applicants, they should know, staff should know, and this
10 Commission should know what the rules are and once you have
11 rules, it's easy to live by them. When you don't have rules,
12 it becomes very gray, and gray is not where we want to be. We
13 want to be in the black-and-white category.

14 OSTROVSKY: And I agree with Commission Kavanaugh. I,
15 I -- but I will also, as we, we talked about at the beginning,
16 these were some of the, I would say, worst, but it's probably
17 not the best word. Some of the worst applications that we
18 have ever had. Nine -- 90% of them are filled out properly
19 and, and everything is -- whatever occurred, we can blame it
20 on COVID or whatever. This time around, they were just not
21 up, up to snuff and, and so I, I hope that what Commissioner
22 Kavanaugh said, so they don't go out there, well, we don't
23 have to fill it out. They're going to approve it anyway.
24 That's not true. I, I, I had no, no, no on, on several of
25 these and I heard the explanation and I said, well, okay, this

1 is a, this is a really important project. We don't want to
2 lose the money and they've been put on notice. They better
3 come up with, with the, the, the document, but that means more
4 work for, for, for the staff. So it's a topic and I think we
5 do need to put, put the, the, the, the foot down on making
6 sure 'cause none of the questions -- they're all relevant
7 questions. They're all important questions as to, as to why,
8 why you should get \$250,000, \$70,000, \$300,000, \$400,000.
9 know that's not a lot of money these days, but he says, he
10 says semi-sarcastically, but the, the, but -- and again, these
11 -- we are charged with developing a cultural network around
12 the state. That's the other thing that we are charged with,
13 so, we just need to make sure we do it in the most efficient
14 and, and credible way. Thank you, Chair.

15 OSTROVSKY: Any other comments from commissioners? If
16 not, thank you very much. Before I go to public comment, I
17 just would like to thank everyone for taking their time out
18 today. We were in the envious position today of not having to
19 make huge cuts and asking people to, to make tough decisions
20 about how to phase in their projects because for the first
21 time in -- that I've been involved in this commission, we
22 actually had funds available, and we didn't, didn't have to
23 shortchange people because we didn't have the money available,
24 so it was, it was a different, a little different process
25 today, but it, it worked out fine. Now's the time for public

1 comment. Comment will not be restricted based on viewpoint.
2 No action will be taken on any matters raised during public
3 comment period not already on the agenda. I would ask that
4 anyone who wants to make public comment, please identify
5 themselves for the record. This is now the appropriate time
6 for comment. So is there any member of the public that would
7 like to make any comment?

8 HITCHCOCK: Yes, sir. Mark Bassett would like to.

9 OSTROVSKY: All right. Mark, please.

10 BASSETT: Again, good afternoon, commissioners and
11 thank you very, very much. I, I can feel your pain on
12 incomplete applications. I mean, I had a mistake on mine.
13 The only thing I'd like to point out is that a lot of these
14 organizations that have submitted are, are volunteer
15 organizations and they're, they're doing this because they
16 want betterment for their community and everything else. One
17 possible idea might be, is that you in the next grant
18 application cycle, you give a 45-day review period. In other
19 words, let's say for sake of argument, the grant is due
20 December 31st and if you want a complimentary review, you have
21 the grant to, to SHPO by November 15th and then that gives
22 SHPO a chance to review it and maybe pick up all of these.
23 But the other thing that happens too is that we've had other
24 organizations have a Zoom meeting for the grantees to go
25 through and review the grant process at the beginning and

1 other organizations have made that a mandatory Zoom meeting.
2 So just another thought too. So again, thank you for your
3 time and I appreciate your support.

4 OSTROVSKY: Thank you, Mark. Anyone else have a
5 comment? Has any commissioner received any email, telephone
6 calls, text messages, any other public comment that should be
7 put on the record during the meeting? Haring none, I, again,
8 thank everyone for their time today and look forward to seeing
9 you in the near future where maybe we can wrap up the rest of
10 these -- this grant process for this cycle. So there being no
11 further agendized items, I would now adjourn this meeting.
12 Thank you.

13 STOLDAL: Thank you.

14 KAVANAUGH: Thank you. Mr. Chair. Thank you for your
15 leadership.

16 OSTROVSKY: Thank you.

17 WALSH: Thank you, Commission and staff. Well
18 done.

19 STOLDAL: Good-bye.

20 [end of meeting]

21

22

23

24

25