

DEBT MANAGEMENT COMMISSION
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

November 9, 1995

4:00 p.m.

Present:

Arthur Johnson, General Improvement District Representative, Chairman
Robert Seach, Member at Large, Vice Chairman
Margie Broderick, Washoe County School District, Commissioner
John Mayer, City of Sparks, Commissioner
Jim Pilzner, City of Reno, Commissioner
Richard Pugh, Member at Large, Commissioner
Grant Sims, County of Washoe, Commissioner

Judi Bailey, Washoe County Clerk
Jim Barnes, Deputy District Attorney

The Board met in special session in the Caucus Room of the Washoe County Administration Complex at 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada, in full conformity with the law, with Chairman Johnson presiding. The Clerk called the roll, and the meeting commenced for the purpose of conducting the following business.

OATH OF OFFICE

JIM PILZNER, representing the City of Reno as a member to the Commission, was sworn into office with the County Clerk administering the Oath of Office.

MINUTES

On motion by Commissioner Seach, seconded by Commissioner Pugh, which motion duly carried, Chairman Johnson ordered that the minutes of the meeting of July 7, 1995, be approved.

95-11D
WASHOE COUNTY DEBT MANAGEMENT POLICY
AMENDMENT

Jerry McKnight, Chief of Budget, gave a scenario of the amendments advising that this encompasses an amended schedule of "Future General Obligation Bonds Supported by the General Fund," and that they wish to incorporate this into the Washoe County Debt Management Policy.

Following a brief discussion, on motion by Commissioner Mayer, seconded by Commissioner Pugh, which motion duly carried, it was ordered that the amended Debt Management Plan for Washoe County be accepted.

95-12D

WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS
\$225,000,000

Jennifer Stern, Bond Counsel, advised that these bonds are secured by pledged revenues for the District; that they do not have the authority to charge students and raise funds in that manner; that this is a public need for schools in the District proposal; that the Commission's roll is not to preclude voters from having a say and to make sure this falls within the 3.64 cap rate; that the District's proposal is within the 3.64 cap rate and does not exceed its debt limit; and that the Commission needs to consider the public need served by the proposal and also the public need other local governments may provide as stated in their Capital Improvements Project List filed within the local governments current debt schedule. She added that the Commission should be aware that the new law puts into effect other restrictions on bond issues so there is more of a monitoring role even after voters approve the issue; that once it was approved, there were six years within which local government had to issue the bonds; that the Department of Taxation must take a look at the issue and approve the bonds, either conditionally or provisionally, which are limited. She added that the District has given a great deal of time and thought to this. Chairman Johnson stated that he met with Ms. Stern and she indicated that all criteria has been met.

Scott Nash, Howarth Montague and Associates, reviewed the financial aspect of the Washoe County School District, Nevada General Obligation (Limited Tax) School Improvement Bonds as proposed, Section 1, Outstanding General Obligation Debt and Statutory Debt Limitation including page 2, Subsection A, Outstanding Indebtedness; Subsection B, Proposed Indebtedness, page 3, Subsection C, Statutory Debt Limitation; and Section 2, Effect of Tax Levy on the District and Other Governments, page 4, Subsection A, The Proposed General Obligation Debt Service to Maturity for the School District, and Subsection B on page 5, Estimated Property Tax Rate Impact. Mr. Nash elaborated on page 6, Subsection C, the Effects on Other Local Governments, and Subsection D, Other Factors Which Affect Property Tax Rates, noting that this proposal will not result in a combined property rate to exceed \$3.64. He then outlined Subsection E,

Historical Overlapping Tax Rates, showing tables for City of Sparks, City of Reno, and Horizon Hills General Improvement District, and Subsection F, Historical School District Assessed Valuation, as shown on pages 7 and 8. The Board then reviewed and discussed Section 3, Additional Possible General Obligation Indebtedness or Overrides by Overlapping Entities, and Section 4, Public Needs to be Served by the Bond Proceeds Compared to Other Public Needs, Subsections A and B, Project Description, and Other Operating and Capital Needs. Roger Means, School District, gave an overhead presentation on the proposed Bond Issue for \$224,000,000, advising that a funding committee was hired to investigate the needs of the District beyond the year 2000. He addressed anticipated growth in the School District advocating the building of the proposed schools as a most pressing need, showing why the high schools are so essential.

In the ensuing Board discussion, Commissioner Broderick advised that the School District Board of Trustees is cognizant of the needs of sister entities. Chairman Johnson said that, when the tax rate nears the cap, consideration must be given to what the community needs most and what is best for the public overall. He advised that the Board needs to determine whether or not the size of the bond will have a negative effect on the other entities, and whether or not it is in compliance with NRS. Commissioner Broderick pointed out that the schedule of the issuance of securities and retirement of the securities has met all legal criteria. Mr. Means delineated the planned schools and advised that the Committee had recommended less, but in considering the future needs, the Trustees determined that more schools were needed in elementary education in order to reduce first and second grade class sizes; and he then explained the rest of the proposal.

Commissioner Sims advised that this will wipe out the opportunity for other governments who may wish to go to the voters, and this concerns him; that he would like to see a scaled down version of the District's proposal, and in doing that, consider priority items and the needs of the entire community. Chairman Johnson commented that entities should be looking at reducing taxes instead of increasing. Commissioner Pilzner stated that he would like to see something come back on a scaled down version. Commissioner Broderick stated that there is currently an overcrowding in many classrooms; that this

will take us ahead for a few years; and that there has been demonstrated a need for vocational occupation courses for children, and work on this has to be commenced now. She advised that high schools require two to three years to construct.

Commissioner Sims pointed out that two-thirds of the voters do not have children in school and only one-third do, and that he has to justify approving this in his mind which he is having trouble doing as there are other needs in the community.

Chairman Johnson then opened the meeting for public comment.

Bill Sidler advised that he agrees with Mr. Sims and made reference to an article published in the Reno Gazette-Journal. He commented that the responsibility of this Board is not for the School District, and he believes they have increased the growth rate assumptions to their advantage. He noted that although it will be only a slight increase in taxes, he believes there would be nothing left in other areas of need.

Jean Johnson said that she believes more work is needed on this before the cap is placed in jeopardy; Joy Gums, CPA, spoke in favor of multi-tracked schools; and James Clark of Incline Village suggested that the Incline Schools be broken away from the Washoe County School District.

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing and brought the matter back to the Board for deliberation. He advised that he has talked with many people and some have innovative ideas; that many feel the public need has to be thoroughly addressed; that those responsible for growth need to be made responsible for the effects of growth; and that he believes that breaking through paradigms and moving on to something constructive is essential. Commissioner Broderick stated that the School Board of Trustees is aware of the problems existing in today's schools, and that the job to be done here is to bring before the voters a request for needs that are well justified with the knowledge that this is not taken lightly.

Following discussion, Commissioner Broderick moved, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, that A Resolution for a Proposal to Issue General Obligations for the Washoe County School District be adopted. A discussion ensued and Commissioner Pugh suggested that this be continued and brought back with a couple of alternatives. Ms. Stern

advised that if this is continued, it has to be brought back to the Board within ten days which would not be sufficient for the School District to review and consider alternatives. She also noted that February 2 is the Primary election ballot deadline for submitting questions, and the Trustees last scheduled meeting before that time is January 23.

Upon call for a roll call Vote the following were received:

Commissioner Grant Sims:	NO
Commissioner Richard Pugh	NO
Commissioner John Mayer	YES
Commissioner Jim Pilzner	NO
Commissioner Margie Broderick	YES
Commissioner Robert Seach	NO
Chairman Art Johnson	YES

Commissioner Sims advised that he could not make the finding that the ability of the other entities would not be negatively impacted and that if they reconsider their proposal, they can return with another proposal as soon as they want.

Commissioner Seach left the meeting.

A discussion ensued concerning further instruction. Commissioner Pilzner suggested that some direction be given so that things may be worked out and that communication with the school District is essential. Commissioner Mayer stated that communication is a two-way street, and that the entities need to work with the School District instead of against them. Mr. Nash advised that structure of the debt has a big impact at the \$200,000,000 level and that timing is a very important determinant and that now is the ideal time.

Following such discussion, on motion by Commissioner Sims, seconded by Commissioner Pilzner, which motion duly carried, Chairman Johnson ordered that the Managers of the three entities be directed to work with the School District to work toward another amount which may be more acceptable.

NRS CHANGES MEMBERSHIP AND TERMS

Chairman Johnson advised that he had tried to put together answers to questions and concerns that had been discussed at the workshop. He advised that these amendments have to be presented to the 1997 Legislature, and that the term changes would provide some-one experienced to be on the Commission all the time.

5:55 P.M.

There being no further business to come before the Commission, the meeting was ad-journed.

Arthur Johnson, Chairman
Debt Management Commission

Attest: JUDI BAILEY, County Clerk

11/9/95
PAGE 276

DEBT MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

PAGE 275
11/9/95

DEBT MANAGEMENT COMMISSION

DEBT MANAGEMENT COMMISSION
WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA

December 13, 1995

2:00 p.m.

Present:

Arthur Johnson, General Improvement District Representative, Chairman
Robert Seach, Member at Large, Vice Chairman
Margie Broderick, Washoe County School District, Commissioner
John Mayer, City of Sparks, Commissioner
Jim Pilzner, City of Reno, Commissioner
Richard Pugh, Member at Large, Commissioner
Grant Sims, County of Washoe, Commissioner

Judi Bailey, Washoe County Clerk
Jim Barnes, Deputy District Attorney

The Board met in special session in the City of Sparks Legislative Building Council Chambers, 425 4th Street, Sparks, Nevada, in full conformity with the law, with Chairman Johnson presiding. The Clerk called the roll, and the meeting commenced for the purpose of conducting the following business.

MINUTES

On motion by Commissioner Seach, seconded by Commissioner Pugh, which motion duly carried, Chairman Johnson ordered that the minutes of the meeting of July 7, 1995, be continued to the next meeting to provide additional time for review by Commission members.

95-13B WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT PROPOSAL TO ISSUE GENERAL OBLIGATIONS

Mary Nebgen, Superintendent of the Washoe County School District, advised that she and the Board of Trustees are here to request a new proposal for the 1996 school bond issue in a reduced amount of \$196,000,000. Outlining the presentation, she advised that she had listened to the tape cassette recording of the meeting held on November 7, 1995, and that included in the material provided in the form of a notebook regarding the new proposal provided to each of the Commission members, are responses in the last section of their presentation to questions taken from that audiotape. She further stated that there also is a follow-up on the request the Board made for the School District to meet with the

staff of officials of the Cities of Sparks and Reno, and of Washoe County.

She then reviewed the document with a brief history on what entailed the formation of the proposal and the reasons therefor at the onset. She noted that their enrollment projections have been accurate and she would like to affirm the correctness of the method they use in doing this, and stressing the fact that the School District's moneys have always been spent in accordance with regulations. She delineated many of the considerations in coming up with this proposal and cited some of the national recognition the District has received advising that they have an excellent reputation in the nation.

Scott Nash, Financial Consultant, outlined the impact on the tax rate and reviewed the District's financial picture and advised that the School District is within its debt limit. Included in the review were (1) Outstanding General Obligation Debt and Statutory Debt Limitation, (2) Effect of Tax Levy on the District and Other Governments, (3) Additional Possible General Obligation Indebtedness Overrides by Overlapping Entities, and (4) Public Need to be Served by the Bond Proceeds Compared to other Public Needs. Also included was the Ad Valorem Tax Rates Levied within Washoe County Fiscal Year 1995-1996.

Judith Moss, Vice President, School District Board of Trustees, gave a brief review of the bond development process, advised that there are 55 elementary schools, 11 middle schools, and 10 high schools; that the current school year enrollment is 27,672 with the projected enrollment for 2000/2001 at 58,500; that there are currently 5,700 employees in the School District; that this year's general fund budget is \$194,500,000; that the Board has taken a proactive part to insure quality public education delineating some of those actions which they see as important to children; and in November of 1994, the formation of a Capital Improvements Task Force took place and that this Task Force presented its final report to the Board of Trustees in July of 1995. She then stated the number of times the Board has met to consider the bond issue adding that they have researched issues and the alternatives thoroughly which are pertinent to the School District and have carefully considered the effect of this on the tax rate of other governmental agencies. She stated that they are asking that the voters of Washoe County be given the opportunity to decide this issue.

Dan Coppa, member of the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, addressed the contents of the Task Force Report included in the notebook of materials; advising that one of the peculiar things that has come to light is the issue of growth in the County, from the Lake to the high extremes of Washoe County, and the effect of that on school population, stressing the need for more schools and the necessity of allowing this bond issue to go before the voters. He added that the Task Force was formulated by the School Board to go out and consider the possibility of a bond for the purposes of looking at overcrowding, program expansion, and existing facilities; that the makeup of the Task Force is comprised of 18 people from all kinds of backgrounds; that they have met on numerous occasions; that what is unique about the report they submitted in July of this year, on which they did an outstanding job, is that they made several recommendations; that those

recommendations were that we need to look at new high schools as well as elementary and junior high; and in addition, that we need to look at some existing programs and some improvements to existing facilities. He advised that the Task Force recommended to the Board of Trustees things that are outlined in the packet including 2 high schools, 2 middle schools, 3 elementary schools, and also considered financing for sites, and water acquisition; that they also looked at upgrading facilities in terms of such things as roof and asphalt repairs as an improvement to existing older structures; that the School Board opted for education needs rather than those repairs, i.e., more instructional programs, expanding some programs, looking at occupational education, technology improvement, alternative education facilities; and that they recommended 172 million dollars and the School Board asked for a 224 million dollar bond which request was denied by the DMC. He added that the School Board saw things needed that the Task Force did not see, i.e., a third high school with the growth rate as it is, 3 additional new elementary schools because of the growth rate anticipated, consideration of first and second grade class reduction to 16 students per teacher, whereas the committee had looked at 23 per teacher, and that is what we proposed before this Commission, which was denied. He went on, stating that the School Board then regrouped and relooked and we are now before this Board for a new proposal reducing the bond by one high school, noting the original decision remained to opt for programs and education over other needs.

Marilyn Fendelander, member of the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, advised that a separate committee was established under the recommendation of the Task Force to look at how the moneys they had set aside for older school improvement would be allocated, and this 11.7 million dollars for older school improvements became a daunting task, as there were actually 22.8 million dollars in requests for older school improvements and the requirement was to cut that down by approximately one-half. She advised that the priority was for the inclusion of only older schools in the consideration, schools built before 1978; second priority was safety (things like fire alarms, fire retrofitting, and sidewalk repair) and environmental issues (asbestos abatement, underground fuel tank removal); and the remaining funds were to be allocated among the older schools for their individual repair needs; that no money was given for improvement or expansion of any administrative space. She also advised that no money was allocated for school or any school expansions, even though this would give much needed enhancement to some older schools, as the committee felt it was important to improve existing space and not to add square footage.

She advised that the committee's conclusion was that there was not enough money to address all the needed repairs to the schools, and therefore recommended the following as to how to best allocate the 11.7 million dollars: (1) repair the heating at Reed High School, Reno High School, and Washoe High, (2) make sure the schools were up to safety standards and environmental issues as mentioned previously, and (3) use a formula to allocate the balance of the funds among the old schools, knowing that these would not meet all the repair needs but would at least take care of some of them. She advised that this was presented to the School Board on October 10, 1995, and the Board asked the Task Force to reevaluate their allocation of moneys, because according to the formula, some of those

schools were going to get more money than they had asked for their repairs, and others would not get enough to make the repairs they had asked for, and to review each of the facilities to insure that each had basic needs, i.e., adequate lighting, plumbing, electricity. She then referred to the guidelines for older school improvements contained in the packet which showing the needs, and advised that the Task Force looked at these to assure that the schools at least meet the basic standards which they felt was the most important use for older school funds. She added that the Task Force will be coming back with recommendations to assure that all of these schools have their basic needs met.

Rusty Crook, a member of the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, addressed the topic of Occupational Education, advising that the Task Force consisted of two Board members, three associate superintendents, and a representative of each field of education; that they met regularly for two years; that in order to find out where they stood, they made comparisons with Clark County, Phoenix, et al., and found out they were behind in facilities; that there is no legislation governing occupational education or providing that this be taught; that the latest statistics obtained from the National Education Association show that only 22% of the students graduate from a four-year college; and that for those remaining, the other less formal education is in the high schools or in the 12 years of school. He made an analogy of training animals for twelve year without resulting ability to do tricks which would be a detriment, and that in the same sense, these young people have to be taught some job skills and that the District is are working now to do this. He reported that they started considering a separate occupational high school, which would be quite expensive, but it may be most efficient; that they then looked at satellite schools like Las Vegas's technology center; and that today's presentation to the Debt Management Commission is a very scaled down version of school needs in occupational education in order to catch up with other areas in providing skills to young students. He advised that in his 32 years of teaching in this County, he has found that there are really sharp students graduating from high school who are not going on to higher education for whatever reason, but have had no job skills. Realizing that perhaps the funding will be down to "bare bones," he advised that the hope is to increase the middle school program, upgrade the Glenn Hare occupational center, which is the District's only one; that the goal is to see that all students have a competency exam skill area, even if it is academic; and that he never taught a student that did not have a certain talent.

He commented that he also realizes that if this is before the voters, it may not come about as taxpayers do not realize or accept the fact that they are paying for the privilege of living in this County, that nothing comes freely, and that this proposal has been studied and revisited and people should be assured that it has been in all essence thoroughly considered. He added that to think taxes will not go up is really naive and commented about the growth in the County which should be seen as a positive effect. He then made some personal comments where the passage of this proposal will influence his life and his family. He closed by stating that this reflects real needs and the School District has reduced their request for the very least they can.

Dede Goodnight, member of the Washoe County School District Board of Trustees, ad-

dressed the issue of year-round education as experienced by the School Board, advising that the School Board is not philosophically opposed to year-round education; that there are 3 schools presently in the District on this schedule; that there is a site-based decision-making policy which allows any individual school that wants to move to a year-round schedule to do so in collaboration with the parents and the staff, but to date, no such proposal has been submitted to the School Board; that the Board does know that capacity of a school can be increased through multi-track year-round scheduling; that on a multi-track system, students and teachers are grouped together in the same track, while one track is on vacation, another track uses the space; that the year-round Task Force studied a four-track calendar which provides for a 33% increase in capacity, which means that a school with a 600-student capacity could accommodate 800 students; that this Committee met for ten weeks and studied the year-round issue and were charged with creating a blue print, an implementation plan of how to move to such a calendar and to determine what year-round education would be like under this calendar; but that they were not asked to recommend whether or not the District should go to a year-round calendar as that decision would come after public input and analysis of the information. She stated that the nine recommendations of the Task Force are in the written material which includes recommendation number 5 as follows: "It is imperative that multi-track and single-track year-round schools receive the same services as those provided to schools on a traditional schedule, specifically, it is critical that schools implementing a multi-track year-round class schedule be provided with a vice principal and an additional secretary so those schools are adequately administered for all the days they are in operation." She stated that in analyzing operational costs, there is no doubt that a multi-track year-round educational system saves on capital costs, but that the Board looked also at operational costs in direct relation to services provided to address the needs in this school district. She advised that the analysis was reviewed by the accounting firm of Lloyd & Tousch and found to be sound in the computation and rationale, and the added operational cost of \$91.80 was directly attributable to the year-round school multi-track schedule, which amounts to \$73,440 per school; that additional operating costs of \$91.80 are dollars that are not available; that the District cannot raise its operating money and does not anticipate additional funds from the legislature to cover these costs; and that therefore the only option is to reduce services. In summary, she advised that there were four overriding reasons why the District was reluctant to enter into the multi-track arena: first, there was strong opposition by a significant number of parents, and although there was a rapid survey done which showed support for the multi-track schedule, a survey of parents taken after 90 informational meetings showed that only 25% of the parents would have supported this schedule; second, the likelihood of added operational costs; and third, several unresolved issues. She advised, as an aside comment, that the teachers also conducted a survey and they found that that 50% of the teachers were in favor and 50% were not, consequently, the teachers did not take a position on this schedule.

She added that many people in the community were very concerned about availability of child care, latchkey programs, and camp programs during breaks, and others were concerned about sports programs, such as Little League and Pop Warner, particularly they were concerned about the lack of playing fields and the dates of national tournaments.

She commented that many agencies and organizations were willing to help develop alternate options, but, the reality is that until a certain number of students on the year-round calendar reaches a critical mass, child care and recreational offerings will be a problem. She stated that the City of Sparks came forward from their recreation and parks department and felt that the increased activities throughout the year would reduce maintenance opportunities for turf areas and were also concerned that 25% of the children during the summer months would make it difficult to cover operational costs of running the swimming pools, as well as restricting the use of school buses for recreational activities during the summer if schools would be in operation for 12 months of the year. She stated that the Reno Recreation Department reported that they rely on high school and UNR students to work in recreational programs and that these students would not be available throughout the calendar year. She added that at about this same time, Mr. Pilzner and she served on a Child Care Research Committee for the Washoe County School Services Master Plan to address concerns about the lack of child care services in facilities; that the committee suggested and included in their report that, if the School District proceeded with multi-track schedule, that "it should consider providing funding in the bond to finance modular buildings on school sites for child care for on-track and off-track students," and because of several reasons, the effort was abandoned. She pointed out that there has been a recent trend for school districts to return to traditional calendars, and then cited an experience by Seminole County, Florida, where they are moving schools back to the traditional calendar because, "the destruction of family life is what everyone was complaining about," according to a spokeswoman for the school district; and that Orange County, Florida, is also moving toward a common more traditional calendar looking toward giving more time to families. She then cited schools in Los Angeles doing the same and statistics on national schools regarding the year-round calendar. She noted that a change in the calendar of this school district would mean a change for the entire community in many areas, including child care, recreational events, and a change in employee vacation schedules; and advising that philosophically speaking, the School Board is not opposed to year-round schools but that whether or not it fits a particular community is what is of concern; but that they have some serious concerns as to what effect a multi-track year-round school would have on the District's operating budget and also on the entire community.

Marilyn Fendelander addressed the bond structure process advising that there have been a lot of public meetings, a lot of input from the Committee and others on the proposal that is before the DMC today; and noting that the request has been cut to 196 million dollars, 28 million dollars lower than the original request which amounts to a 15% cut in the original cost from 13.65 cents to 11.07 cents, and it may become even lower after the revised assessment values are completed. She explained that the bond has been structured to be sold in four issues as the DMC is aware; that the advantage of this structure is that it lowers the tax rate while maintaining the construction time line and at the same time enabling additional schools as they are needed; that the District cannot start to build a school until they have the money in hand to do so; that the disadvantage is that they do not expect to reap as much in interest money and the cost of bond implementation is higher; and that however, the decision was made by this Board to forego the interest

money and pay a little more in order to keep that tax impact down as low as possible. She pointed out that interest money is slated to pay for bond administration. She stated that it is necessary for the School District to pursue this before the Debt Management Commission because of the overlapping tax rate and because Sparks is above the 90% level of the statutory cap of \$3.64, but is not yet above the 90% level in either Reno or the County. She noted, however, that the City of Sparks has committed to supporting the bond request and are willing to restructure their debt to meet the School District needs; that unlike city and county governments, the school district does not have the ability to charge for its services and therefore cannot raise funds on their own nor can they increase their operating rate, which is set by the State; and that, thus, this bonding process is the District's only means of providing for capital improvements, specifically, building schools. She urged that the Commission adopt this and provide the opportunity to do so by taking this bond proposal forward.

Bob Bentley, President of the School Board, thanked the Board for the opportunity to be before them and stated that the character, heart and the soul of a nation, a state, a community is the commitment to its children--not the rhetoric, but the commitment; that there are children in this community that need the commitment; that the School Board members have been elected to serve the people but none of those votes were from children; that the School Board is their voice and it is our experience, our expertise, and our charge to do for them what we think is best for those children; that the Washoe County School District is the largest employer of the entire County, public or private; that there are a lot of people they are responsible for and also a lot of children they are responsible for; and that this is the reason this bond is in a large number. He then talked about differences of opinion and the fact that a consensus will not be reached; that every item in the proposal is needed; but that he would urge the Board to not turn this down because they feel one item is not needed or appropriate. He requested that each Board member ask themselves if in the intent of the Legislature to change the authority of this Commission it has led to one entity micromanaging other entities, and gave an example to illustrate this meaning. He said that if one entity could prevent another from pursuing what they feel to be important, he would see this as a dangerous precedent. He then returned to the school situation and explained that there is a lot riding on this bond, and that if not allowed to go forward, the children who will become adults will not be provided as much opportunity to go forward, as it has been experienced that when children are not educated properly, everyone suffers. He advised that he has been able to tell interested persons that our education program has been terrific. He concluded by emphasizing the right of the voters to make the decision on the school bond request and pointing out that this will provide for a chance to make a difference and asked if the Board members believe that the voters have the intelligence to make a decision and also the experience, but more importantly, do they have the right to make that decision.

Commissioner Sims commended the School District on their report and the elaboration on the justification for the request for taxes.

Chairman Johnson opened the meeting to public discussion.

Dorothy McAlinden, Chairman of the Stead District Council, read a letter into the record dated December 13, 1995, in support of the School District proposal because of additional schools for her district particularly as it involves children crossing the streets which has proven to be dangerous.

Bill Seidler advised that he is for education as democracy needs an educated citizenry, pointed out that the effect of this bond issue will put us too close to the cap for comfort, and spoke against the additional tax citing his opinion of the adverse effect against them and the still high cost, and speaking in favor of multi-track schools, he cited areas where this is successful. He then raised other matters entailed in building schools, such as checks and balances, and contended that it is not proper to put this to the voters at the primary election, and would rather have this as a question at the general election when more people vote, if this is approved.

He presented calculations which showed that this will put the entities in a precarious situation by placing them above the cap rate in the not so distant future and close to 29 cents, and responding to Commissioner Pugh, advised that he arrived at 29 cents by using a straight interest amortization, noting that anybody that does anything with interest or real estate, or otherwise, knows that 6% assumption, 20 year payment, comes out to 29 cents, and the School District could not put it out that way, and so Bond Counsel, who is getting a nice fee, came up with some way that they can present it to the public at a more amenable rate.

In response, Mr. Nash stated that the bond proposal as submitted by the District is based on 20-year issuances and principal payments can occur in June of each year and the bonds will be dated in November or December of each year; that the School District proposal is to issue four pieces of bond over a multi-year period, and the reason to do that is to keep the tax rate down, so there are essentially four 20-year issuances laid on top of each other over a twelve-year period of time. He advised that the School District did realize that doing everything all up front would cause a higher tax rate and would be giving up the ability to build schools gradually, and in addition to that, give up interest earnings, and that is the reason why they are spreading it out, in order to keep the tax rate down as much as possible.

Ted Harris, a relatively new resident, residing in Washoe County seven to eight years, advised that he is here to voice strong objections to placing this bond issue on the ballot at all, as he feels the issue of multi-tracking has not been satisfactorily responded to in light of the demands to build new classrooms in the amount of 196 million dollars and to have 33% of the space, as stated her today, sitting idle for one-third of the year. He stated that this makes no sense businesswise, and he does not see how a cost \$91.80 per student in additional expenditure can be compared with a taxpayer debt of 196 million dollars; and that he also believes that those responsible for the growth in the County should participate in paying for the effect of additional needs and should be asked to do so. He explained that in Sacramento County, in order to get a building permit, you are required to

pay a mitigation fee for schools of \$3.25 per square foot, and he questioned why that is not being done here. He stated his belief that the schools should be utilized 12 months out of the year, realizing that it will not be convenient for everyone, and continued with his comments regarding the 196 million dollars bond proposal, noting it as ridiculous, and reiterated the need for the mitigation fee in connection with a building permit for those people responsible for generating the growth.

Commissioner Broderick interjected advising that the Trustees are not opposed to year-round schools, but that they believe for this community that effective education for young people is not necessarily bottom line a market driven response to only the dollars--there are other issues in designing quality education, and cannot be compared to cutting off a few floors of a casino tower; and that our reluctance and philosophy in moving immediately toward year-round schools deals with providing effective education. She then responded to Mr. Harris's comment as to what difference it makes the \$91.80 per student or \$73,000 per school, noting that there are over 50 elementary schools and 10 or 11 middle schools and that can add up to a lot of money for the operating budget and if several million dollars per year has to be used for additional costs of year round, there would have to be a cut in programs and a decision would have to be made which programs would have to be cut and she cited some areas that would have to be considered. She advised that they prefer the alternative of asking voters to support the School District in building facilities so services and programs can be maintained. Mr. Harris said that the voters need to know that the facilities will be used to their absolute maximum best, and that year-round use would assure that they are.

Joy Gumz, resident of Washoe County and Certified Public Accountant, advised that Douglas County is using multi-track and if it does cost \$91.80 more how soon does it take to reach the point where you have actually recovered 8 million dollars you have spent for an elementary school, and the answer is, if you apply the interest, it is over 72 years; that she believes it is inexcusable to say we cannot spend a little more operationally, we have to spend a lot on capital, and that we need to look at that; that as far as Douglas County using it, we could see how they are using it; that Orange County had major problems with their implementation in that of the nine points their task force recommended, they did not follow five of them; that she does not believe the Trustees have done their homework as far as getting to people as there were meetings with Reno, Sparks and Washoe County to make sure the tax rate did not overlap and these meetings were not noticed as public meetings; and that she believes this is not fair.. In her comments, Ms. Gumz referred to the White Pine dire financial situation indicating her opinion that she believes the choice should be to restructure the proposal in order to achieve a lower tax on the people as there is no rush, and cited conversations she has had with people outside of Washoe County who have no interest whatsoever who have responded negatively to this bond proposal. She then went into some statistical data concerning the bond issue in alleging that people need to be assured that what is being asked for makes sense and again stated the positive aspect of multi-track schools.

James Clark, resident of Washoe County, advised that there is a fiduciary obligation of

the members who have been appointed to the Debt Management Commission to all voters of Washoe County, and when there is 11 million dollars in deferred maintenance, there would be a presumption that another bond issue would be forthcoming in the year 2000, and this makes him wonder if potholes in streets will continue, if the anti-gang violence task force will be able to do their job; whether the fire department buildings in Reno will be adequate, etc., and that the entire constituency of Washoe County must be considered, and he has not heard of any independent analysis of this bond projection, and if the one that has been done is wrong, the taxpayers will be in trouble. He urged the Commission to think of the voters in Washoe County in their decision. Janet Pozarski, advised that she would like this Commission to give the voters an opportunity to make up their own mind as long as the proposal comes within the guidelines of what this Commission was set up for.

Hugh Carson expressed dismay with previous speakers who do not understand that programs have been cut to the bare bones in this County and would challenge them to shadow his child as she goes through Pine Middle School each day and deals with overcrowded classrooms and lack of educational materials; that the gentleman who says it is easy to impose impact fees on developments should have been in his position in getting an education on the legislative system in Nevada four years ago and cited a law on the books stating it is illegal to impose a development impact fee in Clark and Washoe Counties, and invited him to attend the next session with him. He then advised that this Commission has a difficult task, because if they approve this, they will be accused of fiduciary irresponsibility, and if they don't, will be noted as anti-education in the minds of a lot of people. He sympathized with their position, saying that he does not totally agree that the School System in Washoe County is as good as it could be, but that it is going to get worse unless we do something, and that the school system needs to be excellent to attract business as this is critical as there are major corporations, high technology, who have not come to this County because of a number of factors that have developed in Nevada, i.e., high suicide rate, high divorce rate, high drug and alcohol use--all indicators of a society that is disintegrating, and an excellent educational system will help deter some of these factors. He then summarized, stating that the quality of education, as Mr. Bentley so eloquently stated, is an indicator of the quality of our society which Mr. Carson stated he believes strongly. He expressed disagreement that the taxes in Washoe County are out of sight, citing the high ones in New York and Oregon, as the State of Nevada has one of the best business climates in the United States and is one of the states where taxes are not out of control, yet the citizens want their potholes fixed, the children educated, and everything, and do not want to pay for it, and that he is one person that is willing to pay that extra \$65 per year.

Anne Buckley, who was a member of the Task Force, stated that this was pursued very thoroughly and was reached by consensus; that there are some items of importance in her estimation that were not included that she would like to see there, and stating that if any member of the Commission had been on that Task Force, he would have seen a lot of dialogue and many of the things discussed that you have heard tonight. She stated that they also talked about alternate ways of raising the money, and that the Legislature de-

cided they wanted the class size reduction in the third grade, and because of that, the School district tagged on the other three elementary schools that the task force did not have on their recommendations, and she does not particularly agree to bringing down the numbers in the first, second, and third grades, but it was an administrative decision; that the parents of Washoe County are not in favor of year-round schools and the District is looking for parent support throughout the school system; that this bond will not cover needs through the year 1999 as far as numbers of students and perhaps the parents of Washoe County will then have to go to year-round schools even with this bond issue; and that the point is that in six - seven years time, if this bond issue does not pass, the students in this County will receive a substandard education as they will be in crowded schools, will have no extra curricular activities, and because there will not be room for it. She urged the approval of this Commission of the bond issue to help assure a good education for Washoe County students in the years to come.

Anne Loring, advised that she is here today as a geologist in Reno's mining community, a parent of a student in the Washoe County School System, a holder and possibly future holder of Washoe County School District bonds, a resident of Northwest Reno, and a member of McQueen High School's overcrowding committee for the past two years, and expressed two concerns regarding the Commission's action today; stating that during the past year, the Reno City Council, including Commissioner Pilzner, approved construction of 700 new apartment units in the immediate vicinity of McQueen High School, in addition to the extensive single-family home construction that is going on north and west of McCarran Boulevard; that during the period of the City Council's decision making process, she had asked a number of people in the Washoe County School system if they intended to speak at your public hearing regarding the already overcrowded condition in the McQueen High School and urge restraint of growth until new schools are built, and the District's response was that they did not interfere in your decision-making process; that she is incredulous that this Commission as a group and City Council member Commissioner Pilzner venture around and refuse to allow the District to build adequate school sites to accommodate the growth that they have already approved, and the Washoe County Commission has already done the same thing; that the School District has already cut one of its proposed high schools to try to meet this Commission's objection, which she stated she feels was a serious mistake; and that she trusts that the Commission will now approve this bond in the reduced amount.

She then addressed her other concern which is the image of this community as a result of this Commission's action today as numerous studies by businesses have shown that the quality of the community's schools is one of the highest, if not the highest, priority that industries consider when relocating to a new community, and in part this reflects the concern of business leaders that they get a low educated pool of workers and also reflects a concern of business leaders that their present workers who will be relocated here will find the new community desirable. She advised that she and her husband were in this position fourteen years ago when they were transferred here with Continental Oil Company. She stressed that it is schools that will make this area attractive to business, not a brand new city hall for the City of Reno, not the size of the Juvenile Detention Center and the

County jail, not the Social Welfare services or the presence or absence of a homeless shelter, as important as all of those things are; and yet this Commission has said once that schools are less important than these other needs; and that double sessions and year-round schools may seem smart from a business frame of mind, but many parents in this community have already made it clear they are a major inconvenience for families. She stated that just this past month, the overcrowding committee at McQueen has been dealing, as yet unsuccessfully, with a major problem of just extending the school date to accommodate overcrowding, and addressing whether we want students to participate in sports, band, and theater, or just to take classes, as for many students that is the choice they are going to have to make. She responded to a previous person's remark that there is no need to rush, and in addressing her indirectly, stated that if she would meet her at McQueen High School she could see first hand that when classes are changing, it is impossible to move in the halls between classes. She advised that in the next four years, even if this is approved tonight and is on the ballot in the fall, there will still be a need to deal with additional students, possibly even as many as 500 more students at a school that is already over capacity, and when those students come, the school will also get teachers, which is part of the legislative regulation, but there is literally no place to put those teachers and kids at the present time not to mention until four years when the new schools open. She said there is a rush now, it does not need further study, and added that she loves the Truckee Meadows and urged the Board to not send the message that this community's highest priority is not providing a high quality education.

Virginia Duran, Executive Director, Washoe County Teachers Association, requested on behalf of the membership, that the bond proposal be approved. She stated that Board members and others who are charged every day with the education of students request support of this bond proposal pointing out that they are all also taxpayers of this community and are concerned about the tax structure; but that as teachers, they also see the state of the schools and the need for space; that some teachers are currently operating in storage space or do not have rooms at all and are in the front foyers; and that sometimes they are told by the fire marshals that they have to move the students because it is not an appropriate place to teach children. She said further that once a child misses a year by being taught in a storage room or in a hallway, this Commission cannot regain that year for that child; and therefore it is essential to be are concerned with the learning conditions provided for our students.

She then addressed the issue of growth stating that this is enough impact to necessitate more schools and programs for students. She referred to the different methods professed to make use of our schools and noted that this is a site based decision and a demand cannot be made for year-round schools if that community does not elect to do so, and at one of our previous meetings, a speaker from Incline suggested at the Incline School Board meeting that we consider year-round schools in the Valley only, because we have at-risk kids here. She stated that the Teachers Association believes that the educators and Boards of Trustees are best capable of determining the education process of our students, as they would not begin to venture to tell representatives of different government entities how to build buildings, run police departments, etc., and they expect the same considera-

tion. She stated that they are requesting that the DMC allows the District this chance to perform the jobs at hand and give students the opportunity to learn in a safe and comfortable environment. She advised that all they are asking for is to allow the voters to decide.

Debbie Smith, Sparks resident, advised that she has been a Sparks resident for 14 years; that she has 3 children in school; that the Debt Management Commission has a tremendous responsibility to this community today, regardless of views on various types of calendars and ideas about what the School District should do; that many more buildings are needed to provide proper education for the children in this system now and for many more that will come, based on the community's growing needs; that research and planning in changing the District's calendars takes time, and that action now is needed and the voters must be given the opportunity to approve more schools; that several people today have commented on the seemingly need to rush; that to address this, she will tell the following story:

"Several years ago she was a school board member and a bond commission member in a rural county in Northern Nevada. The school board went to the voters to build a new high school and the voters narrowly rejected it. The School Board went back to the bond commission and went back to the voters and we gave voters a choice of what they wanted to do and they approved a high school without a gymnasium. Well, in the amount of time it took to do this, we built a high school without a gymnasium for the same price we could have built the entire facility. And guess what, just a few years ago, the School Board had to go back to the voters for another bond issue to build that gymnasium, and they paid almost as much for that gymnasium as they would have for the entire facility, and that is why we need to act now."

She stated that her point here is to be fiscally responsible, and in order to be fiscally responsible to this community and the needs of our children, this bond proposal has to be approved by the Debt Management Commission now; so that the voters can decide and the needs can be addressed. She added that more buildings are needed regardless of what calendar we are on--and the longer we wait to build, the more it will cost. She said that if this issue does not go before the voters because of the DMC disallowance, the DMC will bear the responsibility, and it is very important to let the voters bear that responsibility.

Barbara Clark, President of the Sierra Parent Teachers Association Council, advised that this group is responsible for all the leadership and training for all the PTA's in Washoe County, Fernley, and Virginia City, and also act as liaison between parents, the PTA's, the school districts and other governmental entities. She stated their support of this bond issue and advised that they know more about the school district and its workings at the present time than any other group of parents in the District; that they have spent hundreds of hours determining all of the variables involved and most of the decision making processes that go on in the District, including their budget, the general fund, bond issues, etc.; that they have not always agreed with the school district's policies and have been in an

adversarial position more than once, but on this issue they are in agreement; that the school district's constituents are the parents and their children, and any parent that has been in the classroom in this school district understands the need for upgrading; that it has been eloquently stated that this needs to go before the voters and the Sierra Parent Teachers Association Council respectfully requests that the School Board's bond proposal be granted as they are the ultimate authority and the base of knowledge in the field of education. She requested that the Debt Management Commission (DMC) allow them to make the decision of what is best for the children, since the parents are down there interfacing with them on a constant basis telling them what is best for their children.

Gene Hilygus, representing the Washoe County Education Administrators Association, stated that it is his honor to be here; that he has been in education for 38 years in the capacity of teacher, counselor, principal, not counting the 13-14 years in education in order to work in education; that this job before the DMC is extremely important; that he wishes to commend the School Board and staff for their excellent presentations loaded with very significant facts and delineating the needs of the children in this community; that he was on the school board for four years and there were 32,000 to 34,000 children in the schools the whole time and there was not any growth; that the school census is now 47,088--13 years 15,000 kids increase; that knowing the projected enrollments for the year 2000 makes him a little shaky as at that time they will have 58,000 kids; and that he feels that if schools are not built, it will be disastrous. He advised that this school board does not request things that are not necessary nor advocate things for the people that are not warranted, and that he urges the DMC to give the voters a chance to vote on this issue.

Karen Tatomer, Sun Valley resident for 17 years, advised that there are three elementary schools in Sun Valley: Virginia Palmer, whose students go to Billingshurst and Reed; Sun Valley Elementary School, whose students go to Billingshurst and Sparks Middle School and then on to Reed in Sparks; Lois Allen, whose students go to Trainer and Billingshurst, and then on the Sparks and Hug high schools; and that it is extremely hard for the parents of school children to attend or participate in the after school programs or the evening events; that thirteen miles may not seem far, but during snow storms, traveling that distance is extremely difficult; that this year her son has missed the bus five times and it has taken her 40 minutes round trip to get him to school; that she is concerned about parents that do not have cars to get their children to school; that this happens to the children in Sun Valley because there is not a facility large enough to house all of the students, but the School Board has given us hope--a middle school in Sun Valley and possibly a high school in the North Valleys. She invited the DMC to please let the public vote on this issue advising that they do not have sidewalks and streetlights in Sun Valley and have 5-foot v-ditches running through their valley, and she is not willing to let her children walk through there at night, and she has three boys.

Chairman Johnson closed the public hearing.

Commissioner Pilzner advised that for a while, he felt like the only member on the Board here, referring to the comments made Anne Loring, that a new city hall for the City

of Reno would use revenue bonds and it would not be going anywhere for approval and he did not vote for it anyway; and that as far as the approval of the apartment units that Ms. Loring talked about, a letter was sent by the principal, as he recalls, about that one project where the School District short-circuited that letter; that the City Council has many times asked Roger Means of the School District, to give some clarity and talk about schools and growth; and that the only answer ever gotten is that they will serve whatever is built; and that he does realize that this is a circuitous argument that all the entities seem to be caught in. He added that he has a child in the school district and is concerned about proper education, and reminded everyone that this hearing is not over education, it is over a bond issue.

He then asked Superintendent Nebgen if this is approved, will there be another bond issue necessary in four years. She advised that their figures indicate that in four years there will be a need for another high school and the passing of another bond issue to have another high school ready in the year 2002, and in terms of what else may be needed, she cannot speak for the school board, but that the same process will be followed as in the past in getting community input. She then stated in response to Commissioner Piltzner that the School District sent a notice to each school indicating the time and place of the DMC meeting and the need for their support, and that it was paid for by the District.

She then addressed school maintenance and said she cannot speak for the Board of Trustees in saying that there will be a process in place so that there will not need to be another remodel job, roofing job, additional asphalt, etc. She explained that over the years, the Board has made some very difficult decisions in this respect and that all these decisions are not decided in a vacuum, have included extensive public testimony, and that the problem is usually that maintenance is placed second to programs that may be important educationally. She added that there is a five-year maintenance projection budget to take care of many maintenance needs over the next ten years, but the Board has not, however, formally adopted that, and until it is determined whether or not this will go before the voters, there is not a definite answer on this issue. She detailed the process for maintenance in response to Commissioner Piltzner's inquiries.

She then advised that if this bond proposal is approved, they will have to raise funds to promote its passage as they cannot use public funds to do that, and that they have not begun that process.

Commissioner Piltzner then addressed the desire of the School District to present their bond issue to the voters at the primary election because of a greater chance of winning, and asked if they would have any problem doing it in the general election. He said that he believes that would be the time that the greater number of people would be voting. He stated that the RTC in their last issue before the voters had hired an outside consultant to see if there were other ways of funding, and Superintendent Nebgen advised that they do not feel that need as they have an audit committee within the district and they feel they have looked at this carefully.

A general question and answer session followed with the Superintendent of Schools and members of the Board of Trustees responding to questions. Following this, each of the Commission members gave their comments as follows:

Commissioner Mayer advised that the Sparks City Council is supportive of this effort as they realize the need and appreciate the cooperation of the School District in joint meetings they have had with the School Board, and have joined with the School Board in some innovative creative ways of helping the School Board redevelopment area around Sparks High School, and that the cooperation of the School District has helped in the success we have had in dealing with the problems with kids, and there has been a significant effort in Sparks with both Sparks High and Reed High in that effort; that there is no question that the Sparks City Council realizes that the crowding is overwhelming and we do not have to go to McQueen to see that; that the Council as a group went to Reed High School to a leadership class to speak and ask questions and answer questions of students, and that during the changes of the classes, that as large that he and Mayor Breslow are physically, they got shoved around the hall; that he is amazed that there is not more violence in those high schools; and that they are totally in support of the bond proposal and feel that it is the community's responsibility to vote on this; and that they realize that the growth that is expected and the projects that have been approved by all entities have an effect on Sparks as a bedroom community for those projects; and that they are 100% in support of this issue

Commissioner Broderick advised that it has been frustrating to listen to a lot of accusations made against the School District tonight and not have adequate time or the proper opportunity to respond appropriately, but in light of the fact that the charge of this commission is to determine whether this bond proposal meets the four criteria, she thinks it is only proper that the response not be made as that is not the issue here since this is not a referendum today for year-round schools, or the maintenance budget, or whether we hire consultants; that when this is obtained and able to be put on the ballot before the voters, the things on that bond issue than need to be addressed to the public, and then if the School Board can convince the public that those things are necessary for this community, but not tonight; than we will go forward. She continued that these decisions are made by an elected group to have this placed before the voters; that the job of the School Board is to make decisions of policies following the philosophy of the School District; and that if the public doesn't like decisions that the School Board makes, then it is the public's responsibility to defeat the proposal. She added that they also have the responsibility to make that decision at the ballot box and it is not to be done here; and that she would expect that the DMC will only consider if we have met the four criteria needed to put this before the voters.

Commissioner Sims advised that he concurs with the previous statements and explained why he put so much effort into questioning the School District at the previous meeting. He advised that it was simply to help him make the four findings required by the DMC; and that the indication that the current tax rate is within 90% of the cap adds another criteria for consideration. He then stated that it has been found that certainly the public need

exists for this, and that other public needs that appeared on the statements of current and contemplated annual obligation debt and special elective taxes may affect the combined property tax rate; that the intention of that legislation was meant to create a meaningful dialog between different entities as the 3.64 cap is approached; that they just can no longer go on in separate directions; and that it has been stated several times that the entities must work together in terms of joint planning, and more importantly, strategic planning; and that the time has come that we no longer have a choice other than to do that.

He added that approval of projects have to be looked at but that nowhere is it stated that a finding has to be made that this project will make a definite impact on class size or education of the students, although his feeling is that this should be included as a criteria, but that it would certainly be irresponsible for anyone to pretend it is and use that as a basis for their decisions.

He addressed the Chairman in his statement that the School District has come forward and met his demands and caused some serious discussion with the different financial staff members of the four governments concerning contemplating needs, and a lot of good has come out of that. He again stated that the four criteria have been met and it is now up to the voters to determine if this is something they want to pay for, and that unfortunately this has turned into a referendum on our school district, and that he wants assurance that other concerns for kids at risk are being or going to be addressed and expressed his appreciation to the School Board for coming forward with this reduction.

Chairman Johnson noted some of the statistics concerning enrollment in Wooster and Reed high schools and the improvement by moving some middle schools advising that it makes him wonder why this was not done initially. He stated that this is all based on money issues to allow that these things can be done, and that it is unfortunate that a negative vote had to occur to bring about communication concerning the needs and allocation of the funds. He stated his belief that every person on the DMC will have to consider if communication has made a difference in how the money is allocated for this issue, and determine if a second, third, or fourth meeting could do even more.

Superintendent Nebgen advised when rezoning was done for Galena High School, there were some hard decisions for the Board of Trustees to make, and the results of that rezoning in terms of over the past four years has been that Reed has become less crowded and Wooster does still have space; but that if you look two years from now, however, Wooster is within capacity, so if we just spot rezone from Reed to Wooster, two years from now they would also be overcrowded. She cited some other programs which are being practiced to alleviate overcrowding at the high schools.

Commissioner Pugh alleged that in a perfect world, without being a micromanager as Mr. Bentley says, that the School District has elected to dig into the 35 million dollar budget item to reduce the high school enrollment; that as Mr. Pilzner says, there is a dual purpose for these kinds of issues; that his personal feeling is that the four items which are to be considered have been met and the need is there and that the people must be allowed

to decide.

Commissioner Pilzner advised that he can see the value of engaging in these kinds of exercises, although it is not helpful when issues are cloaked in the ideas that everyone is for the education and Mom and apple pie, which all fit in there; in order to find a way to support this. He advised that at the City of Reno Council Meeting, he placed an item on the agenda concerning this it received unanimous support, although there is a lot of concern there about multi-track and the proper spending of money; that he can make the four findings; but that he would prefer this be placed on the General Election Ballot rather than the Primary Election.

It was reported and confirmed by Legal Counsel Jim Barnes that it is not the purview of this Board to determine what election this should be placed before the Board and therefore that is not an issue to be considered nor a recommendation to be made. Commissioner Broderick stated that she will pose this as a matter of discussion before the School Board.

Commissioner Sims advised that he spoke with Mr. Bentley today and offered conferring with the School District in an attempt to continue working together in legislative amendments as a united front.

Commissioner Sims moved, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, that the following Resolution be adopted. Upon roll call vote, the results were

Grant Sims	YES	Robert Seach	NO
Richard Pugh	YES	Jim Pilzner	YES
John Mayer	YES	Margie Broderick	YES
Chairman Johnson	NO		

The following Resolution was then adopted:

A RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE SUBMISSION TO THE WASHOE COUNTY DEBT MANAGEMENT COMMISSION BY WASHOE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT, NEVADA, OF A PROPOSAL TO ISSUE GENERAL OBLIGATIONS; CONCERNING ACTION TAKEN THEREON BY THE COMMISSION; AND APPROVING CERTAIN DETAILS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Subsections 350.001 through 350.006, Nevada Revised Statutes ("NRS"), the Board of Trustees ("Board") of the Washoe County School District, Nevada ("District"), notified the secretary of the Debt Management Commission of Washoe County (the "Secretary" and the "Commission," respectively) of the District's proposal to issue general obligations and submitted a statement of the District's proposal in sufficient number of copies for each member of the Commission; and

WHEREAS, the Board (subject to the approval of the proposal to issue general obligations by the Commission), proposes to submit to the qualified electors of the District for their approval or disapproval, the following proposal:

GENERAL OBLIGATION SCHOOL BOND PROPOSAL:

Shall the Board of Trustees of the Washoe County School District, Nevada be authorized to incur a general obligation indebtedness on behalf of the District by the issuance at one time, or from time to time, of the District's general obligation school bonds, in one series or more, in the aggregate principal amount of not exceeding \$196,000,000 for the purpose of acquiring, constructing, and improving school facilities within the District by constructing or purchasing new buildings for schools, enlarging, remodeling, or repairing existing buildings or grounds, acquiring sites for building schools or additional real property for necessary purposes related to schools, and purchasing necessary furniture and equipment for schools, such bonds to mature serially commencing not later than five (5) years from the date or respective dates of the bonds and ending not later than thirty (30) years therefrom, payable from general (ad valorem) taxes, and to be issued and sold at, above, or below par at an effective interest rate (including any sale discount) not exceeding the statutory maximum rate, if any, as shall be determined at the time of the sale, thereof, and otherwise to be issued in such manner, upon such terms and conditions, with such covenants and agreements, and with such other detail as the Board of Trustees may determine, including at its option, but not necessarily limited to, provisions for the redemption of bonds prior to maturity without or with the payment of a premium?

(the "Proposal"); and

WHEREAS, pursuant to NRS 350.005, the Secretary, with the approval of the Chairman of the Commission, thereupon, within ten days from the receipt of the proposal, gave notice of a meeting to be held not more than twenty days thereafter, and provided a copy of the proposal to each member of the Commission with the notice of the meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has heard anyone desiring to be heard and has taken other evidence relevant to its approving or disapproving the proposal; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has considered all matters in the premises.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE DEBT MANAGEMENT COMMISSION OF WASHOE COUNTY, NEVADA:

Section 1. This resolution shall be known as the "1995 Washoe County School District DMC Approval Resolution."

Section 2. The provisions of NRS 350.0035 to 350.0051 have been met, and therefore the Proposal for the issuance of general obligation school bonds proposed by the District hereby is approved.

Section 3. The Commission and the officers thereof hereby are authorized and directed to take all action necessary or appropriate to effectuate the provisions of this resolution.

Section 4. All bylaws, orders, resolutions or parts thereof in conflict with this resolution are hereby repealed. This repealer shall not be construed to revive any bylaw, order, resolution, or part thereof heretofore repealed.

Section 5. If any section, paragraph, clause, clause, or provision of this resolution shall for any reason be held to be invalid or unenforceable, the invalidity or unenforceability of the section, paragraph, clause, or provision, shall not affect any of the remaining provisions of this resolution.

Section 6. This resolution shall become effective and be in force immediately upon its adoption.

BOARD MEMBER AND PUBLIC COMMENTS

There were no Board member or public comments.

ADJOURNMENT

4:40 P.M.

The meeting adjourned.

ARTHUR JOHNSON, Chairman
Debt Management Commission

ATTEST: JUDI BAILEY, County Clerk