

**WASHOE COUNTY DEBT MANAGEMENT COMMISSION  
QUARTERLY MEETING**

FRIDAY

1:00 P.M.

FEBRUARY 28, 2020

PRESENT:

**Naomi Duerr, Reno City Council, Chair (via telephone)**  
**John Sherman, At-Large Member, Vice-Chair**  
**Paul Anderson, Sparks City Council, Member**  
**Andrew Caudill, Washoe County School District, Member**  
**Peter Morris, GID Representative, Member**  
**Michelle Salazar, At-Large Member**

**Nancy Parent, County Clerk**  
**Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney**

ABSENT:

**Jeanne Herman, Washoe County Commissioner, Member**

The Washoe County Debt Management Commission met in regular session at 1:00 p.m. in the Washoe County Caucus Room, Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada, in full conformity with the law, with Vice Chair Sherman presiding. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, the County Clerk called the roll and the Board conducted the following business:

Vice Chair Sherman assumed the gavel because the Chair was not physically present at the meeting.

**20-003D**      **AGENDA ITEM 4** Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**20-004D**      **AGENDA ITEM 5** Election of Chair and Vice Chair.

On motion by Member Salazar, seconded by Vice Chair Sherman, which motion duly carried on a 6-0 vote with Member Herman absent, Member Duerr was elected as Chair of the Debt Management Commission.

On motion by Member Morris, seconded by Chair Duerr, which motion duly carried on a 6-0 vote with Member Herman absent, Member Sherman was elected as Vice Chair of the Debt Management Commission.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**20-005D**      **AGENDA ITEM 6** Approval of the minutes for the DMC meeting of November 15, 2019.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Caudill, seconded by Member Morris, which motion duly carried on a 6-0 vote with Member Herman absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 6 be approved.

Chair Duerr said she continued to be impressed with the quality of the minutes.

**20-006D**      **AGENDA ITEM 7** Appearance by the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District and presentation of its debt position.

John Peterson with JNA Consulting Group pointed out the Debt Management Commission (DMC) received a summary showing the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District (TMFPD) currently had no debt, though the Board of Fire Commissioners (BOFC) approved a \$4,415,000 bond on February 25, 2020. The bond was expected to close by the second week of March and be repaid over 10 years from the general fund. He remarked the interest rate had been estimated to be 2 percent, but a recent market change resulted in the interest rate dropping to 1.5 percent, one of the lowest he had seen in his career. He said the bond would be used to purchase fire equipment. Citing the materials provided to the Commission, he said the TMFPD had other obligations, such as pension and other post-employment benefits. The amount of annual pension payments was determined statutorily every two years and the TMFPD made its payments as required.

Vice Chair Sherman asked for an explanation of the processes used to approve the \$4.4 million medium-term bond and the bond the DMC would consider in the next item. Mr. Peterson responded the \$4.4 million bond was a medium-term general obligation (GO) bond, and these were limited to 10-year terms. These types of bonds did not pledge a specific set of revenues and were payable from all legally available TMFPD funds. He noted there was no specific levy of property taxes to repay the bond. He explained these bonds were typically approved by the governing body, in this case the BOFC, then by the Department of Taxation, at which point they returned to the governing body for final approval.

Mr. Peterson stated the \$2.1 million bond before the DMC was a GO revenue bond which would be additionally secured by consolidated taxes received by the TMFPD. One difference between this bond and the \$4.4 million bond was the requirement to present findings to the DMC which would ensure the pledged revenues would be more than sufficient to pay the annual debt service on the bond. He stated the need to levy a property tax was not expected so the TMFPD would not have to get approval from voters during the general election. Assuming approval by the DMC, he said, the TMFPD would go through a 90-day petition period allowing citizens to determine whether they wanted to put the issue on the ballot. If no petitions were filed, the TMFPD would be able to issue the bond.

Vice Chair Sherman noted he wanted the Commission to understand the \$4.4 million bond was a unique type of debt that did not require DMC approval. Mr. Peterson indicated

that a medium-term bond was a type of debt used by various agencies, and it would allow the TMFPD to take advantage of low interest rates. He repeated it would be repaid from the TMFPD general fund. He added he had not seen this type of debt in any other state.

Chair Duerr asked whether the fixtures that would be funded by the \$2.1 million bond included fire trucks and engines. Mr. Peterson replied the \$4.4 million would be used specifically for equipment. The \$2.1 million bond would be used for the acquisition of land for a station in Washoe Valley and improvements to Station 37. Chair Duerr said she was interested because the City of Reno recently discussed debt financing for equipment and were debating whether to pay as they went or take advantage of low interest rates; the consensus was to take advantage of the rates, though it was not a unanimous decision. Mr. Peterson agreed the low interest rates were very advantageous. He said they often had to weigh the benefits of both pay systems, noting equipment costs often increased each year. The TMFPD determined the bond was the best solution. Chair Duerr remarked this type of equipment was expensive, and Mr. Peterson confirmed the engines and brush trucks purchased by the TMFPD cost between \$500,000 and \$750,000. Additionally, machines were custom-built to fit the needs of the entity buying them.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

**20-007D**      **AGENDA ITEM 8**      Discussion and possible action on a resolution concerning the submission to the Washoe County Debt Management Commission of a proposal of the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District to issue Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District general obligation (limited tax) capital improvement bonds (additionally secured by pledged revenues) in the maximum principal amount of \$2,100,000.

John Peterson with JNA Consulting Group stated this item was for the issuance of up to \$2.1 million of general obligation (GO) revenue backed bonds which would be used for the acquisition of property in Washoe Valley and renovations to an existing fire station. He noted the \$4.4 million bond referenced in the last item was not approved by the Board of Fire Commissioners before this item was prepared, which is why the supporting documentation indicated there was no outstanding debt. He said the proposals for the \$2.1 million and \$4.4 million bond issuances would still be well below the limit set in the Nevada Revised Statutes. He highlighted the table on page 4 of his presentation, which showed the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District's (TMFPD's) GO debt limit was \$220,533,722, or 5 percent of its total assessed value. These bond issuances would still leave \$214 million available in unused debt. He explained the biggest consideration when the TFMPD considered its debt limit was affordability and not the size of the limit itself. The remainder of his presentation would deal with the affordability of the bond, though he reiterated the District would still be well under its limit.

Mr. Peterson indicated an interest rate of 3.75 percent was used when preparing the numbers for the \$2.1 million bond, though they expected the interest rate to be around 2.75 percent. Because the District would not be able to issue the bond until June or July, conservative assumptions were made. He said the debt service would be \$150,000 annually for 20 years based on a 3.75 percent interest rate. The TMFPD would pledge 15 percent of its consolidated tax (c-tax) revenues, around \$1,370,000, which would result in \$1.2 million in unused, pledged c-tax

revenues. He remarked all District debt would be paid out of the general fund, which was a different process than the one used by other entities. He estimated the debt payments for the \$4.4 million bond would be \$650,000 annually over the following 10 years. He concluded the bond was very affordable, mentioning the District ended Fiscal Year 2019 with a surplus of \$1.2 million. He added the TMFPD was usually conservative when budgeting its expenses, often times ending up more than \$1 million below its budget.

Mr. Peterson said the TMFPD did not anticipate the need to levy a property tax because the bond would be secured by c-tax revenues. Therefore, there was no expected impact on overlapping entities such as Washoe County. He asked whether there were any questions.

Member Morris brought up discussions between the Incline Village General Improvement District and the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District about a lawsuit in Incline Village regarding property tax. He wondered whether there would be any implications for the TMFPD in Washoe County's potential obligation to repay those property taxes. Mr. Peterson said he did not believe so because the boundaries of the TMFPD did not extend to Lake Tahoe and the TMFPD did not receive property tax revenue from residents in that area.

Vice Chair Sherman remarked Washoe County's proposal included consideration of litigation about overpayment of use tax. He explained c-tax was a bundle of taxes, the largest of which was the sales and use tax. The Department of Taxation had been sued and the lawsuit settled. He asked whether any adjustments had been made in the c-tax forecast, which took the TMFPD's share of that obligation into account. Mr. Peterson said it was not taken into account and it was his understanding those remittances would be spread out over a multi-year period. He added the percentage of c-tax the TMFPD received was relatively low, but he expected the TMFPD to be affected proportionately as much as other entities like the County.

Vice Chair Sherman indicated certain entities needed to file documents, such as debt management policies, contemplated debt, and capital improvement plans, each year with the Debt Management Commission (DMC). Those documents would also need to include debt proposals that came before the DMC. He wanted an assurance that those documents were updated to contain this proposal. Mr. Peterson said the proposal itself was an amendment to the documents submitted to the DMC. Vice Chair Sherman wanted to make sure it was understood that plans needed to be amended.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Anderson, seconded by Member Caudill, which motion duly carried on a 6-0 vote with Member Herman absent, it was ordered that a resolution be approved concerning the submission to the Washoe County Debt Management Commission of a proposal of the Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District to issue Truckee Meadows Fire Protection District general obligation (limited tax) capital improvement bonds in the maximum principal amount of \$2,100,000.

**20-008D**      **AGENDA ITEM 9** Appearance by Washoe County and presentation of its debt position.

Assistant County Manager Christine Vuletich reminded the Debt Management Commission (DMC) she had presented the County's debt position a year before and not much had changed. She reviewed the bonds the County re-funded since the prior presentation, all of which were laid out in the spreadsheet she provided. She noted the refunding in May should have been reflected in the County's debt management policy which the DMC received in August, but the August re-funding would not have been. These re-fundings would save the County \$1.2 million in interest.

Ms. Vuletich recalled the County appeared before the DMC in May for the approval of bonds to fund the expansion of the South Truckee Meadows Water Reclamation Facility. The project was delayed pending the completion of the environmental impact report. She anticipated issuing those bonds in May, which was why they were not included in the summary spreadsheet. She noted the spreadsheet was created to show the County's balance as of June 30, 2020, taking into account debt service payments that would be made in 2020. She reviewed the remainder of the spreadsheet, adding the irrevocable other post-employment benefits trust was funded annually, and it was 48 percent funded at this time.

Chair Duerr asked for clarification about the subordinate lien car rental C revenue bonds. Ms. Vuletich answered they were capital appreciation bonds which accreted in principal value each year. Subordinate bonds were paid if there were funds available after paying senior bonds. Chair Duerr asked whether the City of Reno was the only entity making payments directly to the owners of the baseball stadium. Ms. Vuletich responded the subordinate bonds were owned by a trust and the County had made a few payments. They were completely paid by car rental fees, so payments on them were not made in years when tourism was down. Chair Duerr said the City of Reno had made up that shortfall from their general fund. Ms. Vuletich pointed out the County had no requirement to do so unless there were sufficient fees, and there was no shortfall from the County's perspective. Chair Duerr said it was her understanding the Reno City Council voted each year whether to make up the \$750,000 shortfall from the general fund. Ms. Vuletich believed the City of Reno might have had its own debt issuance, but the County had separate financing. Chair Duerr said she would bring clarification to a future meeting. Member Morris asked whether interest still accrued in years when no payments were made. Ms. Vuletich answered interest increased and the principal amount accreted. She said it was advantageous to pay when they could, but the term of the bonds was through the year 2057.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

Vice Chair Sherman said he wanted a motion to acknowledge the report, something he forgot to do in Agenda Item 7. Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson responded it was fine not to take action in Item 7 because it was listed as 'for possible action' but acknowledging receipt of the presentation was an acceptable method as well.

On motion by Member Morris, seconded by Member Salazar, which motion duly carried on a 6-0 vote with Member Herman absent, it was ordered that the presentation by Washoe County of its debt position was acknowledged.

**20-009D**      **AGENDA ITEM 10** Discussion and possible action on a resolution concerning the submission to the Washoe County Debt Management Commission of a proposal of Washoe County to issue Washoe County general obligation (limited tax) Nevada shared radio system bonds (additionally secured by pledged revenues) in the maximum principal amount of \$15,000,000.

Kathy Sisolak of Hobbs, Ong & Associates stated Washoe County sought approval from the Debt Management Commission (DMC) to issue general obligation (GO) bonds for the Nevada Shared Radio System, in an amount not to exceed \$15 million. The bonds would be paid for by consolidated tax (c-tax) and no increase in property tax was expected to repay the bonds.

Ms. Sisolak reviewed pages 6 through 13 of her documentation, noting this bond issuance would still leave the County \$1.6 billion of its statutory debt limit. She mentioned the interest rate used on the bonds in this item was 3.2 percent, which was very conservative; she thought the rate would be much lower in June and July when the bonds were issued. She brought up that the coverage had ranged from 2.6 times to over 3 times over the prior three years. In an effort to be extra conservative, she said, the budgeted tax pledged revenues assumed no growth. Page 11 illustrated the impact on the tax rate if revenues were insufficient to pay the service on the bonds, though she believed that would not happen. She reminded the Board the \$3.66 debt cap had already been reached, acknowledging debt service took priority over the operating rate.

Member Salazar wondered why there was a disparity in the debt position figures in Agenda Item 9's presentation documents and Ms. Sisolak's packet. Assistant County Manager Christine Vuletich confirmed there was a difference in the end date of the two figures. Additionally, Agenda Item 9's presentation did not include the Reno Sparks Convention and Visitor's Authority (RSCVA) bonds, which were issued through the County, but the County did not pay on that debt. She admitted the County ultimately had the responsibility to pay should the RSCVA be unable to, but they did not anticipate that. It was listed in the documentation for this item which presented a more conservative view.

Vice Chair Sherman commented the DMC could not weigh in on the merits of the project but asked for more information about the Nevada Shared Radio System. Ms. Vuletich explained it was a public safety system which operated regionally in Washoe County, and it served more than 20 partner agencies. The current analog system was approaching its end of life so the County was working with the Nevada Department of Transportation and NV Energy on a statewide system that would utilize digital P25 standards. She indicated any local officers' radios would function if the officers had to travel to Las Vegas or Ely. The financing was for construction and expansion of the infrastructure.

Member Morris brought up the fact the North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District (NLTFPD) had expressed concern about being involved with many agencies who used different radio frequencies. He asked whether this would help solve that problem. IT Manager Quinn

Korbolic thought it should help because all partners were working to increase coverage for the NLTFPD. They were currently working with the NLTFPD to mitigate coverage issues until they were on the shared system. He added it might help with mutual aid agreements in Nevada but not those with California agencies because the project was only to upgrade the system and improve radio coverage.

Member Anderson inquired whether the \$15 million was the County's portion of the cost. Ms. Vuletich replied that was the cost for the entire system, and the partner agencies and users paid an annual charge for usage. There would be an additional charge for the infrastructure. While the bonds were backed by c-tax, she explained, the funding source would come from payments by entities which were proportionate to their number of radio IDs. The County would be the issuer of the bond. Member Caudill inquired as to whether the Washoe County School District's portion of \$2.5 million would be part of the \$15 million. Ms. Vuletich confirmed it would be. She mentioned the Airport District wanted to prepay their portion, which was an option being made available to all entities; the School District was currently weighing whether to pay up front or take advantage of financing. This was why the proposal was for a maximum of \$15 million, though she expected it would be less than that once agencies notified the County of their plans.

Member Anderson thanked the County for working with many agencies to do what was best for the community and giving entities the option of when to pay for it.

Member Morris asked whether the debt would become the obligation of any entities who chose to finance their portions. Ms. Vuletich responded it would not become a debt obligation. It would increase their annual operating costs to utilize the system, but the debt obligation would belong to the County. She expected the finance charge would be low due to low interest rates.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Caudill, seconded by Member Anderson, which motion duly carried on a 6-0 vote with Member Herman absent, it was ordered that the proposal for Washoe County to issue Washoe County general obligation (limited tax) Nevada shared radio system bonds in the maximum principal amount of \$15,000,000 be approved.

**20-010D**      **AGENDA ITEM 11** Update of Debt Management Commission By-laws, Rules, Policies and Procedures [FOR POSSIBLE ACTION] — A review, discussion and possible action to update the 97-11DMC Debt Management Commission By-laws, Rules, Policies and Procedures to reflect current Commission policies and standard practices.

Deputy District Attorney Jennifer Gustafson recalled the Debt Management Commission (DMC) discussed up to Article VII at the last meeting, so had she made further redline changes to the original clean copy of the bylaws. She suggested discussing each article to explain her changes and get feedback from the DMC, at which point they would determine whether to approve the bylaws with minor changes or bring them back for approval at the next meeting. She noted she incorporated changes suggested by Vice Chair Sherman and the County Clerk's office.

Regarding Article I, she removed the sentence concerning the DMC establishing the percentage of ad valorem tax, reworded the concept, and moved to later in that section. Vice Chair Sherman felt the change made it clearer that counties' debt management commissions did not set ad valorem tax rate limits. He explained those commissions chose the percentage of the limit that would trigger a public meeting discussion.

Member Morris asked whether there was a need to clarify the sentence proposed to be stricken about general improvement districts (GIDs). Ms. Gustafson responded she retained language that the DMC considered proposals to incur general obligation debt, enter into certain installment purchase agreements, or levy special elective taxes. Additionally, the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) addressed GIDs with populations under 5,000. After some deliberation, it was determined the sentence would be removed because the prior sentence encompassed any GID exceptions and the appropriate NRS chapter was referenced earlier in the paragraph.

Ms. Gustafson reviewed the changes she made to Article II, mentioning the language she added to Section 2 was from the NRS, which she thought would be helpful to include in the bylaws.

There was a discussion about Article II Section 1 and whether the representatives were required to be elected officials. Ms. Gustafson said her interpretation of the NRS language was the appointed Member only had to be a representative of the agency. Vice Chair Sherman agreed and opined the NRS would specifically state if appointments were required to be elected officials. Member Morris brought up the card-drawing system by which he was elected and asked whether that appointment process needed to be included. Ms. Gustafson thought the bylaws did not need to discuss that process because the NRS went into great detail about it.

Ms. Gustafson reviewed the changes made in Article II Section 3 and remarked the proposed changes to Article III were included to clarify that talking to another Member would not constitute a violation of the Open Meeting Law (OML). Additionally, the changes clarified and defined conflicts of interests, financial interests, and times when recusal would be necessary. She asked whether any additional language or amendments to her language were necessary. Chair Duerr wondered whether clarification was needed to delineate between a Member's interests as it pertained to their original board versus their personal interest. Vice Chair Sherman provided a hypothetical example of a Councilmember who also worked at a bank and would personally benefit from a bond issuance. He compared this to a person who bought bonds issued by the government as part of their own portfolio, which he felt would not be a conflict of interest. Ms. Gustafson clarified a City Councilmember would not have ownership interest in the passage of a bond, it would just be part of their job. After further discussion, it was decided to keep the language.

Ms. Gustafson reviewed the proposed changes to Article IV. She indicated the changes to Section 3 were made at the request of the Clerk, who pointed out they did not have discretion over what was included on an agenda. The Commission approved the changes suggested for Article IV.



Ms. Gustafson reviewed the proposed changes to Article V. The changes made to Section 2 were to emphasize that some votes would require a two-thirds majority while all other votes needed a typical majority. Regarding Article VI Section 2b, she noted OML requirements for subscriptions were only for six months, but Vice Chair Sherman had recommended extending that to a year. It was decided that it would be changed to one year. She noted Section 2c was included to protect the DMC by allowing them to reschedule a debt issuance item if someone provided a massive amount of documentation.

Vice Chair Sherman opined the DMC was only required to have one meeting a year, though he felt they should have four. He indicated separate meetings could also be called if an agency had a proposal that did not fit in with the current meeting schedule. Ms. Gustafson clarified the definition of week in the provision about supplying documentation meant a calendar week.

Ms. Gustafson reviewed Article VII, pointing out Vice Chair Sherman requested the modification suggested for Section 1. She mentioned the Clerk's Office requested that legal counsel should be the one to make the OML and NRS Chapter 350 available at meetings. She inquired whether the Commission thought there was a need to include Section 5 in the bylaws since it was already included in the NRS, and the consensus was to remove it.

Regarding Article VIII, she indicated that scenario recently came up on another board for which she was counsel, and she felt requiring a written request for a special meeting by three commissioners could result in OML violations. She suggested reducing it to two commissioners to decrease the likelihood of that happening. Vice Chair Sherman opined a special meeting was any meeting held besides the four quarterly meetings. He commented an entity could request a special meeting if they had a proposal. Ms. Gustafson said the intent of this section was to address a situation where the Chair did not want to call a special meeting. The decision was made to change the requirement to two Members.

Member Morris asked who could get an item onto a DMC agenda. Ms. Gustafson responded the agenda was often dictated by entities with debt proposals. She indicated she would add language to clarify that point. Typically, any Member could request an item to be placed on an agenda. Chair Duerr noted requests could be made outside of DMC meetings as well. Ms. Gustafson stated she would add language that members of the public would have to go through the Chair with any requests for topics, with the caveat that debt issuances needed to go through the Clerk. Deputy Chief County Clerk Jan Galassini pointed out Article VI Section 2a required the Chair and legal counsel to approve the agendas. Ms. Gustafson agreed this was why members of the public needed to go through the Chair with their requests.

Ms. Gustafson reviewed Article IX, even though she thought it would not have much relevance to the DMC, followed by Article X. She said the suggestion to remove approval of the agenda was made because it was an archaic practice. Vice Chair Sherman asked how items could be removed from the agenda or taken out of order without an agenda item to allow that. Ms. Gustafson said that was generally considered an administrative action that did not require board action and the Chair would be able to make those recommendations.

A discussion followed about the legal implications of allowing a vote to re-order agenda items or continue them to a later meeting without it having its own agenda item. Ms. Gustafson said that would not be an issue, though deleting an item entirely could be problematic. Chair Duerr remarked the City of Reno had numerous debates about deleting, adding, and reordering items during a meeting. Her inclination was to delete that provision in the bylaws and leave it up to the Chair's discretion. Ms. Gustafson pointed out all agendas contained default language allowing items to be taken out of order, combined, removed from the agenda, or continued to another meeting. Vice Chair Sherman wondered if removing the provision would make things unclear for future commissions. After further discussion, Ms. Gustafson said she would add clarifying language to Article VI and remove the sentence about approving agendas during meetings.

Vice Chair Sherman expressed confusion by the concept of public hearings since everything in a DMC meeting required that the public be allowed to speak. He worried someone might be led to believe public hearings would require governments to follow scripts that were different than normal hearings the public was also involved in. Ms. Gustafson said the old bylaws had separate sections in Article XI for business items and public hearings, which she combined. She wondered whether they needed to make any distinction at all. After further discussion, it was decided the language would be modified to say all business of the day would be heard before administrative items like approval of the minutes, which would be heard at the end of each meeting.

Ms. Gustafson remarked the old bylaw language allowed five minutes to public speakers who spoke on behalf of a group while individual public commenters were given three minutes. She asked whether they wanted to keep that language. First, the Members concurred the language should read "public comment should be limited to three minutes per person per comment period".

A lengthy discussion followed about the Chair being able to grant additional time for public comment at their discretion. Member Caudill cautioned against it because it could result in OML complaints. Member Anderson liked the idea of giving the Chair flexibility but understood the concern. Member Morris thought the DMC would not experience some of the same issues experienced at Incline Village General Improvement District or Washoe County School District (WCSD) meetings. Member Caudill opined meetings where property tax issues were discussed could result in 100 commenters and it would not be right to give some three minutes and some five minutes. Chair Duerr noted the Chair worked under the consensus of the group and giving additional time to commenters who supported their position could result in the other Members appointing a new Chair. It was ultimately decided the final sentence in Article X Section 2 would be removed.

Ms. Gustafson reiterated she tried to combine the original Articles XI and XII and wondered whether it would be beneficial to clarify that public hearings were debt proposals. She opined she did not like the flow of Article XI Sections 1 through 5, but the OML laid out that basic order. The language she included in Sections 5a through 5c were from the 1997 version of the bylaws. She indicated she would modify the language in Section 5d to read that speakers would be given three minutes.

Ms. Gustafson asked whether the procedure for business items should be included in the bylaws. Chair Duerr stated the order listed in the first five sections of Article XI had been adopted by the Reno City Council and it worked well; public commenters were able to be more informed when they spoke. She asked for an explanation of the difference between presenters and speakers. Ms. Gustafson replied the wording was from the 1997 version, but she interpreted speakers as being public commenters. It was decided that language differentiating these two terms would be included and Section 5d would end after “speakers shall limit their presentation to three minutes”.

Member Caudill asked whether the idea of public hearings appeared in the NRS. Ms. Gustafson said she had not found it as it pertained to the DMC. Member Caudill, Member Morris, and Chair Duerr provided examples of the ways their boards handled public hearings. Chair Duerr added public hearings had different noticing procedures than the typical 3-day notification required for public meetings.

Chair Duerr asked whether debt items had different noticing requirements and Ms. Gustafson said she was not aware of any. Vice Chair Sherman stated the issuing entity needed to ensure proper noticing in the newspaper and the DMC did not have any specific publication requirements. He opined one possible exception could be when a municipality wanted to put an item on the ballot to raise the property tax. All affected municipalities would need to be noticed and given the chance to respond, and their governing bodies would have the authority to take a position. That would still not constitute the need for a public hearing before the DMC. He clarified it would be the proposing entity’s duty to notice those other municipalities.

Member Anderson felt the language should be removed if it did not actually have to be included. Ms. Gustafson said she would research whether public hearings were necessary to hear debt items and she would get back to the Commission; she added there was nothing in NRS Chapter 350 about public hearings. The consensus was the procedure language would be removed if there were no requirements for the DMC to hold public hearings.

Ms. Gustafson reviewed Article XIII and asked whether there were any other comments or requested changes to the bylaws. Hearing none, she said she would bring them back for approval at the next DMC meeting. Member Morris thought there should not be the need for further long discussions unless Ms. Gustafson determined the public hearing language needed to be addressed.

There was no public comment or action taken on this item.

**20-011D**      **AGENDA ITEM 12** Board Member Comments.

Chair Duerr asked about the date of the next meeting and it was determined it was scheduled for May 15 at 11:00 a.m.

Ms. Gustafson thanked the Debt Management Commission (DMC) for their feedback on the bylaws. Members thanked Vice Chair Sherman for his research.

Chair Duerr asked whether the DMC wanted the Sun Valley General Improvement District to make another presentation since no representative from the district had been able to present to the DMC the first time. Referencing a prior discussion about the information the DMC wanted to receive from these entities, Vice Chair Sherman wondered whether the DMC should also request copies of the quarterly economic surveys all local governments were required to fill out. He thought they would contain additional information that put debt obligations into context. Member Morris indicated the Incline Village General Improvement District filed a different form. Vice Chair Sherman responded this was a different document than the annual indebtedness report.

Chair Duerr summarized the DMC requested presentations from some of the larger groups who provided their annual documents to the DMC. She said she could work with the Clerk's Office if no one had any specific requests. She thought it was a great idea to request the quarterly economic surveys as well as Vice Chair Sherman's prior suggestion of requesting debt service ratios. Vice Chair Sherman responded the latter was important information when considering a proposal, but he was unsure whether entities prepared that as a matter of course. Additionally, an entity's history of missing payments due to poor debt service ratios would show up on their quarterly economic survey. The Clerk's Office was given direction to attach that document when future presentation requests were made.

**20-012D**      **AGENDA ITEM 13** Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

\*      \*      \*      \*      \*      \*      \*      \*      \*      \*

**3:25 p.m.**      There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection.

---

**NAOMI DUERR**, Chair  
Debt Management Commission

**ATTEST:**

---

**NANCY PARENT**, County Clerk  
and Ex Officio Secretary,  
Debt Management Commission

*Minutes Prepared by  
Derek Sonderfan, Deputy County Clerk*