

**WASHOE COUNTY DEBT MANAGEMENT COMMISSION
ANNUAL MEETING**

FRIDAY

1:00 P.M.

AUGUST 15, 2025

PRESENT:

Naomi Duerr, Reno City Council, Chair
Jeanne Herman, Washoe County Commissioner, Member (by Zoom)
Christine Hull, Washoe County School District, Member (by Zoom)
Susan Severt, GID Representative, Member
Brian Erbis, At-Large Member

Catherine Smith, County Clerk
Jennifer Gustafson, Deputy District Attorney

ABSENT:

Eugenia Bonnenfant, At-Large Member, Vice Chair
Joe Rodriguez, Sparks City Council, Member

The Washoe County Debt Management Commission convened at 1:00 p.m. in regular session in the Caucus Room of the Washoe County Administration Complex, 1001 East Ninth Street, Reno, Nevada, and via the Zoom application. Following the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of our Country, County Clerk Jan Galassini called roll, and the Board conducted the following business:

25-030D **AGENDA ITEM 3** Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

25-031D **AGENDA ITEM 4** Presentation of the City of Reno's debt position.

Chair Duerr introduced City of Reno Director of Finance Vicki Van Buren and asked her to provide a brief overview to help the Debt Management Commission (DMC) understand the debt position of the city. Chair Duerr noted that a clear understanding of the debt position would help the DMC establish the priorities outlined in Agenda Item 5.

Ms. Van Buren advised that she based her presentation format on the overview provided by the City of Sparks Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Jeff Cronk at the prior DMC meeting, which she reasoned would now be familiar to DMC members. She referred to her *City of Reno & Redevelopment Agency Issued Debt and Long-Term Employee Benefit Liabilities* document and described that the first page titled *City of Reno & Redevelopment Agency Issued Debt by Bond or Loan Type*, showed all debt held by the City of Reno, broken down by type of bond or loan. She displayed the document and indicated that the top section contained General Obligation Debt, which she explained was secured by the full faith and credit of the city and by pledged revenues. She noted that the section also showed sewer bonds, which were revenues pledged to General Obligation Debt through sewer user fees. She reviewed that General Purpose

Bonds were issued for the Public Safety Center and the Moana Springs Community Aquatics and Fitness Center. General Purpose Bonds were only issued for a portion of the total cost of those projects due to the availability of other funding sources. Ms. Van Buren revealed that the 2024 General Obligation Capital Improvement Refunding Bonds were recently refinanced to obtain a lower rate. She added that the refinance did not extend the term, and she stated that the city pursued opportunities to generate savings through refinancing or restructuring debt when possible. She mentioned that consolidated tax (c-tax) revenues were additional, secured pledged revenues, and were included in the figures she presented. She specified that the next section of the document delineated revenue bonds, which were secured by room tax, sales tax, c-tax, or some combination of the three. She said that section included several items, some of which reflected multiple debt issuances related to the same issue or project.

Ms. Duerr interjected to ensure that members attending via Zoom teleconference could access the materials shared by Ms. Van Buren. Member Hull responded that she had the presentation because it was included with the agenda attachments.

Ms. Van Buren described that the city had several large projects in progress. She explained that ReTrac was an extensive, costly project initiated many years prior that lowered a portion of the train tracks in Reno from ground level to below the roads. She noted that there were many debt issuances related to that project. She reviewed issuances related to the Reno Events Center, the Reno Ballroom, and the National Bowling Stadium, which she disclosed were refinanced or restructured multiple times over several years to obtain better rates and terms. She informed that ReTrac had a total of five issuances, and the Reno Events Center, the National Bowling Stadium, and the Reno Ballroom had four related issuances, all of which were displayed on her document. She pointed out that two issuances related to Cabela's were listed, which she advised were sales tax and revenue (STAR) bonds that were not technically an obligation of the city. She showed the *City of Reno & Redevelopment Agency Issued Debt by Project or Use* document, which she said provided a breakdown by project. She commented that she liked sharing that document because it provided a comprehensive view of all projects. She theorized that people could refer to the prior page to get more details, but she liked that the charts on the current document combined numbers in each project, showed what was outstanding on each, and listed what the project's funding source was. She noted that the figures across both pages were the same, but the second page showed information grouped by project, whereas the first page was grouped by bond type. She divulged that the city had approximately \$630,000,000 in outstanding principal in 2009 which they worked to pay down over the past 15 years to the current amount of approximately \$468,000,000. She acknowledged that there were a couple of new issuances during that time alongside efforts to pay down debt. She highlighted that \$215 million of outstanding principal remained from an original \$470 million debt for ReTrac. She added that the ReTrac debt accounted for approximately 46 percent of the city's total outstanding debt. 23 percent was for the Reno Events Center, National Bowling Stadium, and the Reno Ballroom. 12 percent was for the Public Safety Center, the Moana Springs Community Aquatics and Fitness Center, and design for the new fire station. She noted that those projects and an issuance related to sewer line work accounted for over 90 percent of the outstanding debt. She said other debt was a small proportion of the total outstanding debt.

Ms. Van Buren pointed out the column containing information on the funding sources for each project. As an example, she reviewed the source for the ReTrac project, which was primarily funded by a Countywide one-eighth cent sales tax and supplemented by room tax and special assessments. She explained that special assessments, some of which extended to 2058, paid towards various bonds. She noted that the sewer project had two bonds outstanding as of July 1, 2025, which were listed on the first page she showed. She revealed that one of the sewer bonds was recently paid off, which left one sewer project bond outstanding. She added that the project was to increase the reservoir plant's processing capacity to 4 million gallons per day (MGD). She explained that the police equipment project was tied to a medium-term obligation, meaning the term was ten years or less. She said those funds were used for body cameras, vehicle dashboard cameras, and tasers. She shared that a bond was issued for an installment purchase agreement for assorted clean energy projects, which was paid for by energy rebates and the general fund. Ms. Van Buren informed that the fire apparatus project was underway and funded with a medium-term loan that would be paid off in 2029. She noted that there were a couple of small special assessment districts, including a seven-year assessment for the purchase of the Lear Theater.

Ms. Van Buren stated that the Reno Redevelopment Agency had multiple large outstanding bonds for a time, but the two large bonds that were currently outstanding for Reno Redevelopment 1 would be paid off in 2027. She mentioned that there was a small bond associated with Reno Redevelopment Agency 2, which would be paid off in 2035. She explained that Reno Redevelopment Agency 1 was created in 1983 for a period of 60 years. Reno Redevelopment Agency 2 began in 2005 and was created for a 30-year period. She described that the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) changed during the period between the establishment of the two redevelopment agencies. Reno Redevelopment Agency 1 was able to operate for 60 years with extensions, whereas Reno Redevelopment Agency 2 could only operate for 30 years. She pointed out that the second page of her document listed the most significant projects at the top, which accounted for the majority of the city's outstanding debt. She observed that the projects listed further down the page had final payment dates spread over the next two to five years.

Ms. Van Buren said the third and final page of her document gave a visual representation of the figures presented on the first page. It showed the type of debt issuance, the original amount of the issuance, the amount of the remaining principal, and the debt service payment. She mentioned that the picture of employee benefit liabilities was similar to what Mr. Cronk previously provided to the DMC. She clarified that the graph shown represented numbers through June 30, 2024, because the city was still closing out fiscal year (FY) 2025 and finalizing actuarials and reports. She indicated that net pension liability was the largest segment of liability the city booked, and it represented the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS) component of employee benefits. She stated that about half of the \$572 million total liability reported was for PERS, and as such was not truly an obligation of the city. The city was required to book those expenses by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) accounting rules. Ms. Van Buren said the next-largest piece was other post-employment benefits (OPEB), shown in yellow on her document and representing approximately 28 percent of the outstanding liability the city had for its employees. She revealed that the figure was \$162 million at the end of FY 2024. She disclosed that the city had established a trust to support OPEB liabilities. She informed that the trust currently had \$32 million, and the city continued to contribute to it with the goal of reaching \$90 million. \$90 million represented a 60 percent funding level, which would allow the city to

fund future OPEB obligations exclusively from the trust. She noted that the city had observed an increase in workers' compensation claims; specifically, a rise in post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) claims. She said city staff were working to address the trend, but she noted that the increase would affect the workers' compensation figures. She asked if there were any questions.

Chair Duerr said the presentation was well done and she loved the format. She commented that it was exactly the type of snapshot the DMC was looking for. She asked Ms. Van Buren if there were any things the DMC should be aware of that could affect debt or liabilities. She theorized that the Commission was in an educational mode, and everything Ms. Van Buren could share would help them learn more.

Ms. Van Buren responded that the city had made good progress towards funding the OPEB trust. She explained that OPEB referred to medical, dental, and vision benefits promised to some employees under their collective bargaining agreements based on their hire dates. She related that the city had an obligation to pay some or all of those benefits after the employee retired. She revealed that the total future OPEB liability was \$162 million, and she reminded DMC members that once the city invested \$90 million in the trust dedicated to OPEB funding, they would be able to fund employee payments as individuals retired without having to contribute additional funds towards that liability because the trust would continue to generate interest. She explained that 60 percent of total liability was a generally accepted threshold for fund sustainability.

Chair Duerr asked if the city was still offering OPEB in new employee contracts. Ms. Van Buren advised that police and fire employees still had similar, though reduced, benefits, but other new employees did not. She believed OPEB was phased out for new employees around 2011.

Member Severt asked if OPEB continued until the retired employee started receiving coverage from Social Security, Medicare, or both. Ms. Van Buren confirmed that was correct, and she specified that there were some contracts where individuals received additional matching payments that continued alongside other coverage. She noted that coverage varied depending on when the employee started working for the city.

Chair Duerr opined that many people retired as many as ten years before the federal retirement age, and OPEB provided coverage during that time gap. Ms. Van Buren affirmed that was correct and added that partial coverage continued after the federal retirement age for some individuals, depending on their contract.

Chair Duerr invited a final round of comments or questions from anyone on Zoom or in the room.

Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith mentioned that Washoe County Senior Fiscal Analyst Kari Estrada had joined the meeting on Zoom.

Member Severt remarked that the presentation was very well prepared, and Chair Duerr agreed. Chair Duerr said the city was impressed with Ms. Van Buren and her work. Chair

Duerr expressed her support for the debt refinancing and observed that prior to her time on the Reno City Council, starting in 2014, a lot of debt was incurred by the city. She summarized that, over the 11 years she served on the Reno City Council, the first decade was spent paying down debt rather than doing what the council would have liked to do. She reported that the council opted to postpone projects such as the Public Safety Center, park and trail improvements, and the Moana Springs Community Aquatics and Fitness Center until they felt confident it was reasonable to take on additional modest debt. She mentioned that the council inherited the outcomes of its predecessors, both good and bad, and that it had tried to be a responsible steward of the city's finances in more recent years.

25-032D **AGENDA ITEM 5** Discussion and action to establish priorities among essential and nonessential facilities and services pursuant to NRS 350.0155(2) that shall be considered by the Debt Management Commission if the statutory ceiling established by the Debt Management Commission for the combined tax rate in any of the overlapping entities within the county is exceeded by a proposed debt or a special elective tax, and compare that public need to other public needs that appear on certain filed statements of current and contemplated debt.

Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Jennifer Gustafson provided an overview of the purpose of the item and discussion. She said that Agenda Item 5 served to establish priorities that would guide the Debt Management Commission (DMC) when it was called on to evaluate proposals from entities. She elaborated that proposals were to do one of three things: incur debt, enter into an installment purchase agreement with a term of more than ten years, or levy a special elective tax. She clarified that the DMC considered the proposals but did not determine whether the proposal sought to accomplish a public purpose or satisfy a public need, which she noted was the language found in the Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS). She explained that the DMC did not normally provide an opinion on any underlying merits of the proposal, but if the proposal would result in a combined property tax rate in any of the overlapping entities within Washoe County that exceeded the percentage that the DMC set every August, then the DMC could consider the public need to be served by the debt proposal. She stated that the priorities set in Agenda Item 5 would inform the DMC's consideration of the public need. She described that in August 2024, the DMC established a 90 percent threshold of the \$3.64 per \$100 of assessed valuation limit on the total ad valorem tax levy set in NRS 361.453. She relayed that 90 percent of \$3.64 was \$3.276, and if a proposal went before the DMC that would push the combined property tax rate above \$3.276, the DMC would evaluate the competing public needs in accordance with the priorities set in Agenda Item 5 and outlined in NRS 350.0155. She reported that much of the County was already at the maximum tax rate, which rendered the question largely moot, but she understood that a few small areas of the County had not yet reached the statutory ceiling. She advised that the DMC was required to set the priorities every August. She stated that NRS 350.0155 indicated that facilities and services related to number one, public safety, number two, education, and number three, health, were considered essential. Everything else was considered non-essential. She shared that the DMC had historically decided to designate public safety, health, and education facilities as essential and of equal weight, and to designate all other facilities and services as non-essential. She commented that the DMC was free to continue that tradition or rank the public's needs first, second, and third, in whatever order they decided.

Chair Duerr asked whether the recreation examples provided by City of Reno Director of Finance Vicki Van Buren in Agenda Item 4 would be instances in which a proposal might not be approved by the DMC, depending on the priorities set for that year. DDA Gustafson affirmed that was her understanding. She added that if there were competing proposals from different entities, for example, one for education and another for recreation, the education proposal would be prioritized because it was considered essential. Chair Duerr wondered what would happen if there were a public safety proposal and an education proposal of equal priority. DDA Gustafson responded that either the DMC would make a determination, or the entities could negotiate with each other directly. She explained that it would not go before arbitration per se, but rather, a proceeding in front of the DMC would be similar to arbitration.

Member Severt asked if the DMC was required to rank priorities at the meeting. DDA Gustafson replied that the DMC was required to set priorities at the August meeting. She restated that it would be rare for the priorities to be called upon, as they would only occur in areas of the County with room to increase taxes.

Chair Duerr recalled hearing about a contentious DMC meeting related to the evaluation of competing proposals, but she observed that it was a number of years prior and would probably not happen at present because most entities had reached the \$3.64 cap, though she understood that an override was in place on some of the caps. She stated that she was looking for either a discussion or a motion.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Severt, seconded by Member Erbis, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote with Vice Chair Bonnenfant and Member Rodriguez absent, it was ordered that the Debt Management Commission establish education, health, and public safety as essential and all having priority as equal to each other.

Chair Duerr requested a summary of how the DMC-established percentage threshold would affect the evaluation of proposals from entities. DDA Gustafson advised that the DMC was tasked with setting a percentage threshold. If one or more proposals from entities would push the combined tax rate above the set percentage, the DMC-established priorities would be used to evaluate them.

Chair Duerr asked if a percentage was needed as part of the motion for Agenda Item 5. DDA Gustafson responded that no percentage was needed for Agenda Item 5, but it would be considered in Agenda Item 6.

25-033D **AGENDA ITEM 6** Discussion and action to specify a threshold percentage of the statutory ceiling for the combined tax rate in any of the overlapping entities within the county, which if exceeded permits the Debt Management Commission to inquire into the public need to be served by proposed debt or a special elective tax based on established priorities among essential and nonessential facilities and services, and compare that public need to other public needs that appear on certain filed statements of current and contemplated debt.

Deputy District Attorney (DDA) Jennifer Gustafson advised that Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 350.0155(1) requires the Debt Management Commission (DMC) to specify a percentage threshold that cannot be set at less than 75 percent at the annual meeting in August. If the established percentage threshold of the combined property tax rate was exceeded, it triggered the DMC's duty to weigh the public need to be served by the proposals, which they would evaluate based on the DMC's separately established priorities. She stated that the DMC could set the percentage between 75 percent and 100 percent, and she understood that the DMC had established a 90 percent threshold since 2001.

Member Severt asked for confirmation that the DMC had been called on to serve in that evaluative role in the past, which Chair Duerr confirmed, noting that the circumstance occurred 20 years prior. Chair Duerr conveyed that the situation was difficult, but the rules were followed to resolve the conflict.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Severt, seconded by Member Erbis, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote with Vice Chair Bonnenfant and Member Rodriguez absent, it was ordered that the percentage called for in NRS 350.0155(1) be maintained at 90 percent.

- 25-034D** **AGENDA ITEM 7** Review and acceptance of the following 2025 Annual Reports from all Washoe County political subdivisions.
- a. Debt Management Plans
 - b. Indebtedness Reports
 - c. Capital Improvement Plans

Chair Duerr understood that all Debt Management Commission (DMC) members had the opportunity to review the materials electronically in advance. She noted that there was one printed copy of the materials available for review at the meeting. She recalled that there were 21 entities, and she asked whether materials from any entity were missing.

Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith stated that no materials were missing.

Chair Duerr thought that was unprecedented. She remembered that on several occasions in the past, some entities were late in providing their materials or failed to submit entirely. She thanked staff for their persistence in obtaining reports from all entities in a timely manner.

Ms. Smith recognized the work of staff who ensured all reports were received and made available to the DMC.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Erbis, seconded by Member Hull, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote with Vice Chair Bonnenfant and Member Rodriguez absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 7 be accepted.

25-035D **AGENDA ITEM 8** Discussion and possible action to set dates/times for Debt Management Commission meetings for 2025/26, which must be held at least quarterly pursuant to NRS 350.012(3). Suggested dates are set forth below, and the suggested time for the meetings is 1:00 p.m.

Friday, November 14, 2025

Friday, February 6, 2026

Friday, May 8, 2026

Friday, August 14, 2026

Chair Duerr asked whether the suggested dates and times worked well for Debt Management Commission (DMC) members, and she commented that they worked well for her because of the coincident timing with meetings of another County board on which she served.

Deputy County Clerk Cathy Smith requested that members communicate any problems with dates to her as soon as possible so appropriate adjustments could be made.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Herman, seconded by Member Severt, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote with Vice Chair Bonnenfant and Member Rodriguez absent, it was ordered that the dates for future Debt Management Commission meetings be set for Friday, November 14, 2025; Friday, February 6, 2026; Friday, May 8, 2026; Friday, August 14, 2026.

25-036D **AGENDA ITEM 9** Approval of the minutes for the DMC meeting of May 16, 2025.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

On motion by Member Erbis, seconded by Member Severt, which motion duly carried on a 5-0 vote with Vice Chair Bonnenfant and Member Rodriguez absent, it was ordered that Agenda Item 9 be approved.

25-037D **AGENDA ITEM 10** Status update from Commission members regarding potential upcoming bond proposals from the entities within the Debt Management Commission's purview.

Chair Duerr said that she was not aware of any new bond proposals from the City of Reno. She asked for verification from City of Reno Director of Finance Vicki Van Buren. Ms. Van Buren pointed out that the Debt Management Commission (DMC) approved \$70 million for the OneWater Advanced Purification Water Facility (APWF), but those bonds had not yet been issued due to project delays.

Member Severt shared that the Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID) did not have any upcoming bond proposals. She added that SVGID planned to pay two bonds off in December for water tanks.

Member Herman expressed that she was not aware of any potential bond proposals from Washoe County.

Member Hull disclosed that she recently met with the Washoe County School District (WCSD) Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Mark Mathers, who indicated that the WCSD was still building schools as part of their facility modernization plan. Member Hull did not believe that the WCSD would present any bond proposals to the DMC in the near future.

25-038D **AGENDA ITEM 11** Board Member Comments.

Member Severt shared that the Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID) was preparing to submit a proposal. She explained that they were building a new pump station to serve the Five Ridges development. She noted that Five Ridges was a Sparks project to which SVGID would provide water service, which she described as a huge benefit for the new community. She revealed that the current SVGID pump station was 65 years old, and although most of the pumps had been replaced, the project would extend the serviceability of the pump station by between 65 and 100 years. She shared that the project would also allow SVGID to upgrade security at the pump station, which had always concerned them. She disclosed that the facility was hard to remodel. She expected that SVGID would start the project in January, and she shared that there were already over 200 homes on new service requirements. She related that the increase forced SVGID to reorganize its billing process to prepare for 500 homes being added soon. She said it was exciting, and her staff of 13 put in extensive hours to get the work done. She commented that SVGID received a report the previous night that indicated the work on the pump station was progressing as planned. She added that the SVGID financial obligation was only 25 percent and said she was relieved that SVGID was not solely responsible for the full cost.

Chair Duerr asked Member Severt to provide more information about the 500 new homes she referenced.

Member Severt described that the development was called Five Ridges and was located on Highland Ranch Parkway and Pyramid Highway. She said it was situated in a former quarry in the hills and was being referred to as a village. She remarked that the location was beautiful, and the development offered a variety of home types, including townhomes and apartments. She expressed her support for that combination of housing styles. She acknowledged that it was currently challenging to get in and out of the area but said the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) would be upgrading the roads. She stated that she did not expect the project to take place and was initially unhappy about it, but later became supportive. She shared that it was a different model of community that included parks rather than just stacked homes. She viewed it as a modern development inspired by community design from the 1950s.

Chair Duerr asked if there was a developer, and Member Severt responded that Lennar was building the homes. Member Severt added that there were quite a few developers in the Five Ridges area, and she thought there was a corporation that oversaw the 14 villages under development.

Member Hull observed that schools were off to a great start that week. She said the Washoe County School District (WCSD) prioritized building schools and was starting several projects. She shared that there would be a community meeting on August 27 at the Pine Middle School campus regarding the new building planned for that site. She encouraged those living in that area to pass along the community meeting information. She noted that there was potential for the new school to encompass a larger area and merge some smaller schools into a single large school in the central Reno area. She revealed that areas as far as Dodson Elementary School and Roger Corbett Elementary School could be included in the zoning net, but it was not yet known.

Member Herman expressed concern that students residing in the Five Ridges development had access only to a school crossing at Midnight Drive, which was far from some houses. She urged that work be done towards getting another school crossing in the area under development.

Chair Duerr thanked Member Herman for raising that point. She surmised that school safety was on everyone's mind and recalled discussing school crossings at the Regional Planning Governing Board (RPGB) the prior day. She mentioned that almost \$2 million in federal grants for school crossings had been approved by the Reno City Council and would affect many areas of the County.

She said that 36 schools were affected by the project and would each get 3 or 5 crossings. She noted the project encompassed existing schools that needed safety improvements, not new schools. She announced that the City of Reno prioritized school crossings, even though they had nothing to do with WCSD or school improvements. She said the city was keenly aware of the importance of school safety and encouraged Member Herman to follow through on her recommendation to add another school crossing in the Highland Ranch Parkway area. Chair Duerr theorized that if the school in question were a new school, they could use Washoe County Question Number One (WC-1) funds for safety improvements, including lights and crossings, which she recalled were recently installed at JWood Raw Elementary School. She noted that the City of Reno worked with the WCSD Board of Trustees on that project and contributed funds toward it. She disclosed that the WCSD Board of Trustees did not originally plan for those improvements, but later determined they were essential. She believed Member Hull could be counted on to convey that message to the relevant parties within the WCSD.

Member Severt understood that the WCSD was involved with plans to improve the number and placement of school crossings. She recalled communicating to the developer that the original proposal was unacceptable when the plans were first shown. Chair Duerr asked what stage Member Severt thought the construction was in. Member Severt reported that the developers broke ground adjacent to Highland Ranch Parkway, and that another project was underway in Sun Valley next to Virginia Palmer Elementary School. She expressed concern about pedestrian crossings on busy roads, including Highland Ranch Parkway. She mentioned that Desert Skies Middle School was also in that area.

Member Hull asked whether residences in the new development were all zoned to Virginia Palmer Elementary School and Desert Skies Middle School, or whether some children in the area would be zoned to attend Alice Taylor Elementary School. Member Severt believed that

they would all be zoned for Virginia Palmer Elementary due to its proximity.

Member Hull said she had a meeting with WCSD Chief Operating Officer Adam Searcy scheduled for Tuesday, August 19, regarding other matters, and she would bring up the school crossing safety issue with him at that time. She added that she would send an email to Member Herman to corroborate the exact intersection that was brought to her attention. Member Herman said it was in Phase 1. Member Hull reiterated that she would send an email to verify the details, bring the concern to Mr. Searcy's attention, and ensure that the WCSD addressed the issue with the appropriate entities.

Chair Duerr advised that the questions and discussion tied back to the DMC because school bonds were being used to build the new schools, and those bonds could be used for any public safety enhancements made necessary by the new schools.

Regarding safety, Mr. Erbis mentioned that the expansion of parking at South Valleys Regional Park near Reno Ice Way and Wedge Parkway was another area of concern. He described that ingress and egress for the expanded parking were through Reno Ice Way, a dead-end street until recently. Whereas the only ingress and egress route for the South Valleys Regional Park was previously through the South Valleys Library access road. He noted that traffic increased at various times of day due to baseball and soccer games. He informed that the area of concern was on the border between the County and the City of Reno and elaborated that the intersection was unsatisfactory because Wedge Parkway was already widely traveled during the rush hours in the mornings and evenings. He predicted that when the South Valleys Regional Park expansion project was completed, the number of spectators entering and exiting the park would increase. He theorized that, in conjunction with people accessing Reno Ice, traffic and pedestrian safety problems would increase. He was concerned because there was no traffic control. He said that at the intersection where the library was, there was a sign, but no Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon (RRFB). He reported that multiple vehicle accidents had already occurred there, and many families crossed the road into the Meadow Creek Shopping Center, especially when Reno Ice held events. He expected pedestrian traffic to increase during the fall and winter months, and he pointed out that there was a blind curve from Arrowcreek Parkway into the area and no traffic lighting. He added that a 35 mile per hour (MPH) speed limit was in place, but he sometimes observed people driving 65 MPH on that street. He predicted that unless those issues were remedied, there would be a serious injury or a fatality in that intersection.

Chair Duerr disclosed that, as of November 2025, she would no longer be representing South Reno. She offered to provide Member Erbis with contact information for the new Councilmember in that area so he could connect with her. She conveyed that local representatives tried to be respectful of what each person did for the area they represented.

Member Erbis expressed his understanding and recalled a conversation he had with the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) District 2 Commissioner Michael Clark. Member Hull added that she thought the matter would be under Commissioner Clark's jurisdiction, because she believed that area was in unincorporated Washoe County. Chair Duerr advised that Arrowcreek Parkway was within the City of Reno's jurisdiction.

Member Hull contended that the street in question was Wedge Parkway. Member Erbis stated that he was concerned about the building south of Reno Ice Way, which he believed was within the City of Reno. He acknowledged that it was on the cusp between the City of Reno and the County, and Chair Duerr remarked that input was needed from both entities. Member Erbis recalled that when he brought the issue to the County's attention, he was informed that a sphere of influence (SOI) needed to be considered. Chair Duerr confirmed that was correct and suggested Member Erbis speak with Brandi Anderson, the Reno City Councilmember for that area. Chair Duerr said she would provide Councilmember Anderson's contact information to Member Erbis after the meeting.

Chair Duerr remarked that a City of Reno employee was hit in a crosswalk half a block from the employee's office. Chair Duerr reported that the individual was still recovering and disclosed that she had seen her the prior night at a meeting. Chair Duerr spoke about public safety threats and the frequent accidents on McCarran Boulevard. She commented that she and the mayor were in conversation with the Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) about how to improve McCarran Boulevard. She shared that WCSD Board of Trustees Chair Beth Smith reported that a student was hit on Monday and another on Wednesday. Member Severt added that one of those incidents occurred near William O'Brien Middle School. Chair Duerr was concerned that school had just started, and children were already being hurt in crosswalks.

Member Severt pointed out that there was a 15 MPH flasher, the student was in the crosswalk with the lights on, and they still got hit. Member Erbis asked what traffic enforcement was being done and recalled that his son used to go to Marce Herz Middle School, where he frequently traveled on Arrowcreek Parkway. Chair Duerr stated that enforcement was critical but suggested continuing the conversation after the meeting, as it was not quite on topic.

25-039D **AGENDA ITEM 12** Public Comment.

There was no response to the call for public comment.

* * * * * * * * * *

1:52 p.m. There being no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned without objection. Chair Duerr thanked everyone for their attendance and offered that she was happy to stay and talk about any of the topics longer.

NAOMI DUERR, Chair
Debt Management Commission

ATTEST:

JANIS GALASSINI, County Clerk
and Ex Officio Secretary,
Debt Management Commission

*Minutes Prepared by
Heather Gage, Deputy County Clerk*