

JENIFER DAVIDON
County Manager

SCOTT MORGAN
Acting Assistant County Manager



1594 Esmeralda Avenue
Minden, Nevada 89423

www.douglascountynv.gov
775-782-9821

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY MANAGER

STAFF REPORT

To: Douglas County Board of Commissioners

From: Jenifer Davidson, County Manager
Scott Morgan, Acting Assistant County Manager
Terri Willoughby, Chief Financial Officer
Scott McCullough, Project Manager
Marty Johnson, JNA Consulting Group, LLC

Subject: Justice Center Project Overview and Discussion

Date: November 2, 2023

I. PURPOSE

For presentation only. Presentation regarding the Douglas County Judicial Law Enforcement Center (JLEC) and the Douglas County Justice Center project. The presentation may include a discussion of the history of the Justice Center project, the current space and operational deficiencies of the JLEC building and the justification for the Justice Center, an overview and status of the Design and Construction Manager-At-Risk (CMAR) process which is currently underway, the approximate budget and current expenses related to the project, as well as an overview of the financing options available to the County for funding.

II. JUSTIFICATION AND NEED FOR THE JUSTICE CENTER PROJECT

In 1980, Douglas County, with a growing population of approximately 19,400 residents, relocated a number of County Departments to a newly constructed two-story Justice & Law Enforcement Center located at 1038 Buckeye Road, Minden, Nevada. The new two-story facility centralized the expanding Douglas County Courts functions, District Attorney, Constable, and Sheriff's Offices. The JLEC provides approximately 48,380 square feet in its two stories.

In 1982, the County constructed a new jail of approximately 18,000 square feet and directly attached it to the JLEC to consolidate operations. Since its dedication in 1981, the JLEC has undergone a number of renovations. Modifications have primarily occurred to accommodate new programs such as Juvenile Probation, Alternative Sentencing, and to incorporate new technology within the Courts, Sheriff's Department, and District Attorney's Office. Spaces that were originally designed to be open daylight lobbies or Sheriff Department exercise areas have been converted to additional storage rooms, small offices, copy areas, and security scanners.

In 2011, the jail facility was expanded by 35,000 sq. ft. to include additional housing units bringing the jail total to 100,500/ s.f. Also, in 2011, an addition was made that included a new jail kitchen structure. The most recent facility addition in 2017 provided an emergency generator for the facility.

Currently, the JLEC houses the Sheriff's Department (including the jail and former Constable functions), Alternative Sentencing, Building Security, two District Courtrooms, one East Fork Justice Courtroom, the District Attorney, Juvenile Probation, and Court Administration. The building was designed to meet needs for 20 years. Now, 40 years later, it has exceeded its design capacity, is inadequate to meet the existing needs of these services, and will be unable to accommodate growth in the future. The following represents the immediate deficiencies of all agencies in the JLEC building:

- The District Attorney's Office has inadequate office space on-site for its support and professional staff and inadequate conference areas for conferences, meetings, witness preparation, and victim support and preparation.
- There is no secure access to the facility for judicial officers.
- There is no separation for victims and perpetrators of criminal offenses. There are no private meeting spaces for attorneys and clients. The courtrooms, hallways, and clerk's offices are overcrowded.
- The Sheriff's Department has inadequate space for the patrol, administration, records, and investigations divisions. The street enforcement team is off-site. The Investigations Division does not have adequate working space or interview facilities.
- The Alternative Sentencing Department does not have a secure waiting area, adequate space, or adequate separation between offices and laboratory facilities.
- Building security has a design bottleneck at the entrance to the facility.
- The Constable's Office, administered by the Sheriff's Department, has minimal, inadequate office space.
- An additional courtroom and space for associated support staff is needed. This facility would provide room for an additional Justice of the Peace or for support staffing by the Tahoe Justice of the Peace. It would also provide space for specialty courts, child support enforcement, and other quasi-judicial and administrative proceedings.

III. BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF THE PROJECT

An assessment for the future needs of the entire facility was undertaken to evaluate expansion on the existing JLEC site, if possible. In the Fall of 2014, the professional services of TSK Architects were engaged, as the firm's past and current projects involve the same type of facilities. Douglas County contracted with TSK in November 2014 for phase one of the studies, a needs assessment. As a part of that process, interviews with departments were held in December 2014.

At a November 19, 2015, work session, a presentation was provided to the Board including the status of the assessment and the preliminary findings. The assessment recommended phased renovations and expansion of the JLEC complex. At that meeting, the Board provided direction to staff to work with the Justice of the Peace, Tom Perkins, and others of the Law Enforcement community to further develop a plan and explore funding alternatives for the project.

In 2016, a second phase of the TSK study was initiated with the goal of identifying additional opportunities within the current JLEC site to expand court and public safety operations. The study determined the size of the facility needed at specific Douglas County population milestones: 55,000, 65,000, and 75,000. It was noted that with strategically planned on-site additions, a new multilevel parking structure of approximately 220 spaces with an adjacent 3-story public safety building could accommodate a number of departments and allow the existing JLEC building to be renovated to include additional court space, expanded court services, and renovated District Attorney Criminal and Civil Divisions. TSK continued its work to determine the current and future square footage needs for

the building at different population and caseload levels and developed site recommendations to meet projected needs.

On March 2, 2017, an update was provided to the Board regarding the needs assessment and a rough conceptual layout and cost estimate to expand and remodel JLEC was presented to the Board at the December 7, 2017, meeting. The cost estimate for this rough conceptual design was \$31.6 million at that time. The Board requested further information on possible funding options for the project prior to proceeding with a more detailed 10% design.

Funding options for the project were presented to the Board on January 4, 2018, and direction was provided to staff at that time to place an advisory question on the General Election ballot in November 2018 asking the public whether to impose a quarter-cent sales tax to fund the Judicial & Law Enforcement Center expansion project.

On March 1, 2018, staff provided a presentation to the Board regarding alternative options to address building deficiencies and space constraints at the JLEC and discussed the status of a possible advisory ballot question regarding the funding of the JLEC expansion project. Based on the presentation, the Board withdrew its previous direction to initiate the ballot question process and instructed the County Manager to work with staff to bring forward “practical alternatives to the situation.”

On November 15, 2018, the Board approved a lease for professional office space between Douglas County and Peapeg, LLC, at an initial rate of \$2,175 per month for five years, for the District Attorney's Office Civil Division.

On April 18, 2019, the Board heard a presentation regarding the possibility of leasing the Wool Building and relocating the Sheriff's Department into the leased space for ten years. It was believed the additional time would allow staff to phase in the construction contemplated by the JLEC Expansion Project. The estimated cost to pursue the Wool Building Option was between approximately \$4 million and \$5 million in lease payments and tenant improvements that would not be recovered by the County once the lease term expired. It was estimated pursuing the Wool Building Option would increase the cost of the project by approximately 15% from \$32 million to \$36 million or \$37 million. The Board continued the discussion to May 16, 2019. The Chief Civil Deputy District Attorney, Doug Ritchie, indicated he would bring back a lease agreement to that meeting for consideration and he continued to work with legal counsel for the property owner. However, prior to the May 16, 2019, Board meeting, the property owner indicated he was no longer interested in pursuing a lease agreement with the County.

On October 17, 2019, staff brought forward a request to approve a \$259,300 contract with TSK Architects for a 10% design and cost estimate for the proposed Judicial Law Enforcement Center Expansion, Remodel, and Parking Structure Improvements project. The 10% percent design would provide sufficient details to ensure project success and provide the public and the County Commissioners with a better idea of the scope of the project. Additionally, the cost estimate based on this more detailed design would provide the County with a more accurate assessment of the probable cost.

In 2020, the 10% design was produced by TSK Architects which included renovating the existing square footage of approximately 40,000 sq. ft, adding new construction for an additional 46,000 sq.

ft, plus a parking garage to compensate for the loss of existing parking. The total cost estimate at that time was \$47,351,986.

Based on his experience with the State Public Works Board, County Manager Patrick Cates expressed concern about the cost of constructing a parking garage, as well as ongoing disruption to operations during construction. Mr. Cates noted conducting business, including court hearings, in the same facility while construction was underway would likely drive costs higher than estimated. Working with the stakeholders, an alternative plan was proposed to secure land offsite and construct a separate judicial building. It was proposed the County would subsequently renovate the existing JLEC for use by the Sheriff and other related programs. The cost estimate for the construction of the new Justice Center was estimated to be \$41,484,541 in July 2021. The purchase of land was estimated at \$5 million. The cost estimate for renovating the current judicial building was estimated to be between \$3 and \$4 million at that time.

An added benefit of purchasing the land was that it could also be used for future County facilities to meet the evolving needs of the organization. When the alternative option was presented to the Board in 2021, the Board approved the new project, added it to the County Capital Improvement Plan, and budgeted funds for the purchase of land as a part of the Fiscal Year 2021-22 Adopted budget.

On May 19, 2022, the Board received an overview of the history of the plans to remodel the existing JLEC building to meet the needs of the judicial branch and associated executive branch offices versus the current alternative plan to construct a separate Justice Center and subsequent renovation of the existing JLEC for the Sheriff's Department and other executive branch offices (agenda item 5). At that meeting, Mr. Cates again reiterated to the Board his concerns regarding the cost of a remodel vs. building on the new site and reminded the Board why the purchase of land was preferable. Mr. Cates advised the Board the 10% design created in 2020 was \$47.3 million and the alternate preliminary design to construct on a new site using the same design parameters used in 2021 was approximately \$41.5 million or an estimated savings of nearly six million dollars.

The Board subsequently approved the purchase of 57 acres located on the north side of Buckeye Road east of the Minden Town Maintenance Facility, Assessor's Parcel Number 1320- 28-000-033, for the purpose of constructing a new Justice Center and future County facilities for \$5 million on May 19, 2022 (agenda item 6).

Also, on May 19, 2022 (agenda item 8), the Board received a presentation on potential financing options for the construction of the Justice Center by CFO Terri Willoughby and Holman Capital. Although no action was taken at the time, staff made it clear to the Board that this was one of many funding options that could be considered by the Board. The intent of the agenda item was to present an option and to provide the County Commissioners with a status update regarding rising construction costs and interest rates impacting potential funding options for the project.

On November 3, 2022, the Board adopted Resolution 2022R-110 to allow the reimbursement of Douglas County expenditures incurred for the Judicial Center Project from the proceeds of any future tax-exempt financing issued for the project. By adopting Resolution 2022R-110, Douglas County indicated it expected to incur certain initial costs related to the Judicial Center Project, including architect design costs and Construction Manager-at-Risk (CMAR) pre-construction services costs, among possible other related expenses, *prior* to the issuance of tax-exempt financing for the Judicial Center Project. For the County to recoup these initial costs from the proceeds of any future tax-exempt financing issuance, applicable law requires that the Board of County Commissioners adopt a

resolution stating its intention to do so. Resolution 2022R-110 memorialized Douglas County's intention to recoup these initial Judicial Center Project costs from any future tax-exempt financing issued to construct the Judicial Center.

On April 20, 2023, the Board approved a \$145,000 Construction Manager-at-Risk (CMAR) contract with CORE Construction for Pre-Construction Services for the Douglas County Courthouse Project. The County selected the CMAR method for the project because this method is collaborative in nature and brings the designer (Tate Snyder Kimsey Architects), the potential builder, and the owner (Douglas County) together to find the best value approach to meet the project objectives. The County advertised a Request for Proposals in accordance with NRS 338.1685, *et. seq.* beginning in December 2022. Two proposals were received, one from CORE Construction, and one from Plenum Builders. The CMAR contractors were evaluated on five criteria: staff qualifications, project experience, project management and quality control, compensation, and eligibility based on State Contractors Board certification. Both companies were exceptional and had delivered projects via the CMAR delivery method locally, regionally, and nationally. Ultimately, the five-person interview panel recommended awarding a contract for Pre-Construction Services to CORE Construction for the Douglas County Courthouse Project. CORE Construction had successfully assisted the County with the construction of the Douglas County Community & Senior Center.

Once the CMAR contract was awarded, CORE Construction quickly went to work with TSK to meet with project stakeholders to further refine the 10% design. The team knew they would need to address many of the challenges facing the project since the last design was put together in 2020/2021.

On July 20, 2023, the Board received a presentation including a discussion of the proposed financing plan, procedure, and timeline for the Douglas County Judicial Center project. Immediately following the presentation, the Board adopted Resolution 2023R-071, a resolution concerning the financing of a building project for Douglas County; directing the Clerk-Treasurer to notify the Douglas County Debt Management Commission of the County's proposal to issue general obligations therefore; providing certain details in connection therewith; and providing the effective date hereof relating to the Judicial Center project. The anticipated amount of the proposed general obligation bonds portion of the Judicial Center financing was up to \$43,300,000.

On August 23, 2023, the Debt Management Commission was advised the Douglas County Board of Commissioners adopted Resolution 2023R-071 to initiate the statutorily mandated process to issue the bonds. The Debt Management Commission was obligated to consider the proposed bond issuance for approval based upon the specific criteria stated in Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 350.015. The Commission was provided a memorandum entitled "Financial Information Presented to the Debt Management Commission of Douglas County, Nevada" in support of the proposed bond issuance that discussed the criteria stated in NRS 350.015 and information relevant thereto. Approval of the proposed bond issuance by adoption of Resolution 2023R-080 required a 2/3 affirmative vote of the five members of the Debt Management Commission. Three members of the Debt Management Commission declined to adopt the Resolution citing concerns about the overall cost of the Justice Center project and the proposed method of financing.

On September 21, 2023, the Board approved an engagement letter with JNA Consulting Group to provide financial advisor services for the future financing of the Justice Center project and authorized the County Manager to sign the engagement letter on behalf of Douglas County. JNA Consulting Group, LLC has served as the County's financial advisor for many years and over various financing transactions, including the successful Community Center financing and several utility financings. The

services to be provided include: development of a funding model; preparation of an amortization schedule for both the medium-term and Consolidated Tax bond issuances; preparation and presentation of financial information to the Debt Management Commission; preparation of a document for Department of Taxation approval; preparation of an issuance schedule and oversight of the issuance process; development of the various terms and conditions of the financings; assistance in developing various financing documents; development of rating presentation and assistance with acquiring a bond rating; assistance in the bond pricing process; preparation of final numbers; preparation of closing instructions and attendance at meetings of staff and the Board of County Commission, as requested.

IV. CURRENT AND FUTURE COST ESTIMATES

With the Court and Public Safety Operation building requirements of 50,000 square feet in 2020/2021, the cost estimate for construction of a new building on the Buckeye parcel was estimated to be approximately \$41.5 million. Without modifications to the design to account for changes in building codes, legal requirements, and department operations, the rising costs of construction since 2021 resulted in a cost increase of nearly \$10 million. This significant increase in projected cost can be attributed to:

- Increase in building material prices. This is due to several factors, including tariffs on imported goods and the impact of COVID-19 on global supply chains.
- Inflation due to an increased money supply chasing the same productivity and output which has resulted in some of the highest inflation in 40 years.
- Rising cost of labor as workers demand higher wages in response to the increased cost of living and lack of skilled laborers in the workforce.

The pandemic adversely impacted the construction industry and as a result, the industry as a whole is still experiencing significant challenges. In the short term, many building projects were delayed by the pandemic and are back on track, but that delay caused a major reduction in human capital and significant delays across the board.

This in turn means that the Justice Center project is projected to have a significant increase in cost from the initial cost estimates as a result of three years of delays. Furthermore, the cost of construction materials normally increases annually due to inflation (an issue that contractors faced even prior to the pandemic). However, the inflation that accompanied the pandemic has been significantly different and has largely impacted construction costs on a much bigger scale. The U.S. construction industry is heavily dependent on foreign construction materials such as steel and stone. Because COVID-19 is a global pandemic, it caused closures and delays at international factories that produce these materials. These impacts on both materials and labor will continue to drive costs for the foreseeable future.

The Construction delivery method that Douglas County has selected and the selection of CORE Construction for preconstruction services utilizing the Construction Manager at Risk (CMAR) program has positioned Douglas County to capture as much cost savings and implement innovative construction techniques to reduce cost impacts. Because we are not bound by a standard set of plans and specifications Douglas County has been able to modify its building program to respond to the changing needs of the County and evolving market conditions.

It is important to remember that throughout the process Douglas County has based its estimate on a high-level analysis and based cost on the following parameters: 4.5- acre site development, 50,000

gross square foot 2-story building, and a 20-month construction duration. These projected costs are based on these high-level estimations and conceptual drawings and are not intended to be taken as final contract values. Industry-standard ranges for accuracy of this level of analysis is between <10%> and +15%.

Considering the updated requirements and based on the operational needs of each affected department the cost of constructing the new Justice Center is now estimated to be approximately \$50 million. Each year the project is delayed and if economic conditions stay the same it is anticipated to cost Douglas County an additional \$3 million or approximately 6% annually based on estimated construction projections prepared by CORE Construction.

If we compare the previously proposed remodel of the existing Judicial Center building and new parking structure which was estimated to cost \$47,351,986 in 2020 and if we apply the same escalation percentages that we've experienced with the proposed new building on Buckeye, it is estimated that those costs would be greater than \$60 million in today's dollars by comparison.

V. PROJECT BUDGET AND SUMMARY OF CURRENT EXPENSES

The current budget for the Justice Center totals \$5,658,195 with outstanding encumbrances (contractual obligations for Design and Construction Manager-at-Risk) of \$3,309,528 and total actual costs of \$557,717. This leaves a current available budget of \$1,791,151.

Additionally, funding for the purchase of the Buckeye Land Parcel (\$5,007,758) was budgeted during Fiscal Year 2022-22 with the purchase finalized on July 1, 2022. The cost of construction for the Justice Center is not currently budgeted and will be appropriated at the time of final bond issuance.

VI. FINANCING OPTIONS AND NEXT STEPS

As allowed in NRS Chapter 244A, the County may borrow money to acquire, construct, improve, equip, operate, and maintain public facilities and improvements. Funding options that have been considered by staff in consultation with JNA consulting will be presented to the Board for discussion. These options include:

General Obligation Bonds

NRS 350.0045 "General obligation debt" defined. "General obligation debt" means debt that is legally payable from general revenues, as a primary or secondary source of repayment, and is backed by the full faith and credit of a governmental entity, and if the governmental entity is authorized to levy taxes, by those taxes. The term includes, without limitation, debt represented by local government securities issued pursuant to this chapter and installment-purchase agreements described in subsection 1 of [NRS 350.0055](#). The term does not include, without limitation:

1. Installment-purchase agreements described in subsection 2 of [NRS 350.0055](#);
2. Special obligations; and
3. Obligations with a term of less than 1 year that are payable in full from money appropriated for the same fiscal year in which the obligations are incurred.

(Added to NRS by [2001, 2303](#))

General Obligation - Property Tax Paid

- Bonds are secured by the full faith and credit of the County.
- Must be approved by the County, Debt Management Commission and voters.
- The next available election is November 2024 unless an emergency exists.
- Repaid from the revenues of a specific property tax levy.

- The tax rate must fit within \$3.64 overlapping tax rate limit.
- Term limited to 30 years.
- Provides the lowest rate of interest compared to other options.
- Election is a year away, causing project delays and increases in costs.
- The County is at \$3.64 cap, so no additional tax rate is available. The County would need to redirect the existing operating rate to a debt rate.

General Obligation – Revenue Supported

- Bonds are secured by the full faith and credit of the County and Pledged Revenues.
 - Finding must be made that pledged revenues will be sufficient to pay debt service.
 - Covenant to maintain Pledged Revenues at a level sufficient to pay debt service.
 - If Pledged Revenues are insufficient a tax rate can be levied to repay the bonds
 - Tax rate can be exempt from abatement but not the \$3.64 cap.
- Bonds must be approved by the County Commission and Debt Management Commission.
- Revenue sources that could be pledged:
 - 15% of C-Tax
 - Court Fees
 - ¼% Sales Tax (377B)
- Term limited to 30 years.
- Provides the lowest rate of interest compared to other options.
- Coupled with Medium Term-General Obligations provide the least expensive option for financing.

Revenue Bonds

- Bonds are secured solely by the Pledged Revenues.
- Debt Service Coverage (1.25x's, 1.50x's or higher) is required.
- Depending on the stability of the pledged revenue a reserve fund may be required.
- Bonds are approved by the County Commission.
- Revenue sources that could be pledged:
 - 15% of C-Tax
 - Court Fees
 - ¼% Sales Tax (377B)
- Term limited to 40 years.
- Interest rate is typically higher than GO-backed bonds.
- Due to coverage requirements, the same amount of revenue generates less proceeds for the project.
- Higher interest rate decreases available funding.

Medium Term Obligations

NRS 350.007 “Medium-term obligation” defined. “Medium-term obligation” means an obligation to repay borrowed money evidenced by a note or bond which is authorized to be issued pursuant to [NRS 350.087](#) to [350.095](#), inclusive, and which has a term of 10 years or less. The term does not include an obligation which has a term of less than 1 year and which is payable in full from money appropriated for the same fiscal year that the obligation is incurred.

(Added to NRS by [2001, 2304](#))

Medium Term Obligation-General Obligation

- Medium Term Obligations (“MTO”) can be issued as General Obligations.
 - Secured by the full faith and credit of the County and payable from all legally available funds.
 - No ability to levy specific tax rates other than the County’s operating rate.
 - Repayment term is limited to 10 years.
 - Provides the lowest rate of interest compared to other options.
- Bonds must be approved by the County Commission and Department of Taxation.
- Potential repayment sources (not pledged to MTO):
 - The County’s share of the \$.05 Capital Projects Tax.
 - CPT Revenues are not currently used to support any bond issue.
 - Other available resources as determined by the County.
- When combined with General Obligation-revenue-supported bonds, provide the least expensive options for project financing.

Medium Term Obligation-Lease

NRS 350.0055 “Installment-purchase agreement” defined. “Installment-purchase agreement” means an agreement for the purchase of real or personal property by installment or lease or another transaction that is described in [NRS 350.800](#) which:

1. Is required to be counted against any limit upon the debt of a local government pursuant to subsection 1 of [NRS 350.800](#); or
 2. Is not required to be counted against any limit upon the debt of a local government and:
 - (a) Exceeds \$100,000 for a local government in a county whose population is 100,000 or more; or
 - (b) Exceeds \$50,000 for a local government in a county whose population is less than 100,000.
- ↳ The term “installment-purchase agreement” does not include an obligation to pay rent pursuant to a lease which contains no option or right to purchase or which contains only an option or right to purchase the property without any credit towards the purchase price for lease or rental payments.

(Added to NRS by [2001, 2303](#))

- The “Lease” form of a Medium-Term Obligation is referred to as an Installment Purchase Agreement (NRS 350.091)
- Certificates of Participation (“COPS”) are a form of this financing type.
- The lease is secured by a lien on the property securing the financing.
- Lease approved by County Commission, Taxation, and if the term is longer than 10 years, the Debt Management Commission.
- Financing documents allow for non-appropriation of payment.
- Term limited to 30 years.
- Interest rate higher than GO-backed bonds.
- Potential repayment sources (not *pledged* to MTO)
 - County’s share of the \$.05 Capital Projects Tax.
 - CPT Revenues are not currently used to support any bond issue.

- Other available resources as determined by the County.
- A higher interest rate decreases the amount of proceeds available for the project.

Other Financing Options

Public Private Partnership (P3)

- Private entity builds facility and leases it to County.
- Typically involves private financing which has a higher rate than tax-exempt financing.
- If structured to be financed tax-exempt, done as a lease/COP with similar interest rates.
- Question of if property taxes are due.
- Potential loss of direct control of the asset.
- Need strong contracts to ensure roles and responsibilities are clear.

Rent/Lease Private Building

- County rents/leases space in a private building.
- Rental agreement determined by mutual consent.
- Property taxes are likely due in this scenario, increasing the cost.

Based on the prior direction of the Board of County Commissioners, it is the County's intent to issue general obligation revenue-supported bonds to finance the construction of the Judicial Center as well as reimburse the County for funds previously expended for the Judicial Center project (pursuant to prior Board action on November 3, 2022, which adopted Reimbursement Resolution 2022R-110).

Although there are many ways to finance the construction of the Justice Center, the issuance of general obligation bonds will result in the lowest financing costs, and it is recommended that the County proceed with securing funding as soon as possible. The County has used this financing method previously for the construction of the Community & Senior Center.

Since July 2023, when the Board adopted Resolution 2023R-071 initiating the financing process, interest rates have increased, and the County's bonding capacity has decreased. Simply stated, as time passes the cost to construct and finance the Justice Center increases which requires compromises and cuts in the design and construction of the future Justice Center.

The County's general obligation bonds will be secured by a pledge of the revenues derived from fifteen (15) percent of the proceeds from the various consolidated taxes received by the County (liquor, tobacco, real property transfer, government services, and basic and supplemental sales taxes). The general revenues of the County will also be used to ensure repayment of the bonds, which will lower the County's borrowing costs.

A proposed Resolution 2023R-106 has been placed on the agenda immediately following this presentation. Resolution 2023R-106 again initiates the statutorily mandated process to issue the bonds by notifying the Douglas County Debt Management Commission of the proposed bond issuance. The information shared with the Board of County Commissioners today will be provided to the members of the Debt Management Commission for their information. Resolution 2023R-106 will be considered for approval by the Debt Management Commission at its next scheduled meeting.