

**CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS  
SPECIAL CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES**

February 15, 2006

**CALL TO ORDER:** 4:33 P.M.

**ROLL CALL:** **COUNCIL PRESENT:**

Mayor Michael L. Montandon  
Mayor Pro Tempore William E. Robinson  
Councilwoman Stephanie S. Smith  
Councilman Shari Buck  
Councilman Robert L. Eliason

**STAFF PRESENT:**

City Manager Gregory Rose  
Assistant City Manager Sam Chambers  
Assistant City Manager Maryann Ustick  
Acting City Attorney Carie Torrence  
City Clerk Karen L. Storms  
Communications Director Brenda Johnson  
Economic Development Director Mike Majewski  
Finance Director Phil Stoeckinger  
Fire Chief Al Gillespie  
General Services Director Eric Dabney  
Information Technology Director Steve Chapin  
Planning and Zoning Director Jory Stewart  
Police Chief Mark Paresi  
Public Works Director Jim Bell  
Chief Deputy City Clerk Anita Sheldon

**VERIFICATION:** Karen L. Storms, CMC  
City Clerk

**BUSINESS:**

**1. DISCUSSION AND/OR DIRECTION REGARDING CITY HALL SITE SELECTION.**

City Manager Gregory Rose advised six potential sites had been selected as possible locations for the new City Hall. No appraisals were secured for the sites; therefore, there were no costs identified for any of the sites. He requested the sites be ranked by Council in order of preference from most to least.

Principal Engineer Tom Brady advised the proposed site selection project was coordinated by Public Works, Economic Development and the City Manager's Office. Based on space and staffing needs over the next 20 years, provided by the City departments, it was determined a facility that would house approximately 1000 employees would be needed within a 20-year time frame. Based on this information and office space standards, a 220,000 square-foot facility would be required. The current City Hall was approximately 80,000 square feet and housed 300 employees. Based on a 220,000 square-foot facility, Mr. Brady advised a 20-acre parcel would be required.

Mr. Brady stated after a site priority list was established, Staff would secure appraisals and associated costs and provide that information to Council. He explained there were five sites and one alternative selected by Staff which were all located in the downtown area.

Site A was a 24-acre parcel located at the northeast corner of Owens Avenue and Las Vegas Boulevard and provided an aesthetic entry point into the City. This site was positioned on several major corridors, including North 5<sup>th</sup> Street, Las Vegas Boulevard and Main Street and at the heart of the starting point or termination point of the North 5<sup>th</sup> Street Super Arterial. As a result, the site was accessible to vehicular and pedestrian traffic and, because of its size, it would be possible to co-locate multiple facilities. Mr. Brady advised the Regional Transportation Commission (RTC) was in the final stages of planning for their North Las Vegas Transit Terminal and had approached the City on some alternatives if the City would consider sites in the area.

Some of the challenges to Site A would be the proximity to gentlemen's clubs along Las Vegas Boulevard and the cemetery on Owens. There was also the potential problem of the homeless trying to use the public restrooms and public services located in the area.

Site B was the Silver Nugget Recreational Park and the vacant parcel behind it at Hunkins Drive and McDaniel Street which made up approximately 17 acres. This site would serve to upgrade Las Vegas Boulevard by removing the recreational vehicles present in the area. It would also be in close proximity to the existing City Hall campus and would provide some synergy with the proposed development on the other side of Las Vegas Boulevard.

The down side of this site would be the cost of acquiring the property as the park was a major producer of revenue for the Silver Nugget Casino. Mr. Brady expressed some concern about the size of the parcel and the inability to co-locate additional facilities in the future, as well as the need for on-site parking.

Site C, the Paradise Trailer Park, was made up of approximately 17 acres when the vacant parcels to the southwest were included. The site was located in the core redevelopment area on Las Vegas Boulevard which currently exhibited some blight and deterioration. However, Mr. Brady felt this site could possibly serve to leverage private investment for future development.

A major challenge with Site C would be the relocation of tenants which would involve extensive time and expense, in addition to the cost of acquisition. Another major consideration would be vehicular accessibility to the facility and traffic congestion.

Site D was the existing City Hall complex which provided approximately 10-11 acres of usable property for reconstruction and a parking garage. If the decision were to utilize this site, the existing City Hall structure would be demolished and a multi-story facility constructed which would include the east side parking lot. The major benefits to Site D would be no acquisition costs, the current co-locations of public safety services and the concentrated core City Hall location.

Mr. Brady explained the possibility existed that the current City Hall facility would be the site for the relocation of police headquarters and, therefore, would not be available for the new City Hall. Another challenge to this option would be the relocation of City Hall Staff while the reconstruction of the facility was being completed, as well as locating a site for City Council and Planning Commission meetings.

Site E was the College Park Shopping Center, or Civic Center Plaza, which consisted of approximately 22 acres in size and would serve as an expanded campus to the current site. Because of its size, multiple uses and growth potential would be maximized. Two major corridors would provide good accessibility to the site and there would be sufficient space for parking. The property was held by one owner with the exception of the Big O facility on the corner which would ease the acquisition process.

The major challenge to this site would be the acquisition process and the relocation of the current lessees in the center.

Site F was a combination of the Silver Nugget Recreational Park and the Civic Center Plaza, including the Discount Mall, which was made up of 22 acres. This site would be large enough to accommodate multiple facilities with or without the recreational park. This site would be advantageous in promoting further development and stimulating the redevelopment area.

The challenge to Site F would be the acquisition costs and the problems associated with the purchase of the property from the Silver Nugget. Off-site parking would also present a challenge for this site.

Mr. Brady reiterated Staff would return to Council with appraisals and associated costs for each site when the sites were listed in order of preference. When a location was decided upon, the property would be purchased and a design team selected.

Mayor Montandon expressed concern about displacing the businesses at Civic Center Plaza and felt the Silver Nugget Recreational Park would better serve to revitalize the frontage on Las Vegas Boulevard. However, it was his opinion that the cost for Site F, the alternative site, would be excessive and felt Site B was the preferred option.

Councilman Eliason stated he was also in favor of Site B as his first choice and Site D, the existing City Hall campus, would be his second option.

Mayor Pro Tempore chose Site B as his first option and Site A for his second choice.

Councilman Buck expressed concern about City Hall being located in close proximity to the gentlemen's clubs and the homeless shelters. She selected Site B as her first choice and Site C or D as her second choice, depending on the costs associated with each option and the relocation of employees during construction.

**ACTION:** STAFF DIRECTED TO MOVE FORWARD WITH PRELIMINARY COST ASSESSMENT OF THE SITES IN THE FOLLOWING ORDER OF PRIORITY:

1. SITE B: SILVER NUGGET RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARK
2. SITE C: PARADISE TRAILER PARK
3. SITE D: EXISTING CITY HALL SITE
4. SITE A: OWENS AVENUE AND LAS VEGAS BOULEVARD
5. SITE E: CIVIC CENTER PLAZA
6. SITE F: SILVER NUGGET RECREATIONAL VEHICLE PARK COMBINED WITH DISCOUNT MALL PROPERTY

**MOTION:** Mayor Montandon

**SECOND:** Mayor Pro Tempore Robinson

**AYES:** Mayor Montandon, Mayor Pro Tempore Robinson, Council Members Smith, Buck and Eliason

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**2. PRESENTATION BY MERCURY ASSOCIATES, INC. OF ITS FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE FLEET PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND PERFORMANCE REVIEW.**

General Services Director Eric Dabney advised in August of 2005 the City Council commissioned Mercury Associates, Inc. to conduct an assessment of the City's fleet operations.

**Randy Owen, Mercury Associates, Inc.**, provided an overview of the company and stated his firm had conducted fleet studies on more than 400 organizations. The main objective of the study was to conduct an overall assessment of the fleet practices of the City as compared to industry best practices. A long-range capital financial fleet replacement plan was developed, along with a calculation of the cost charge-back rates for a fleet internal service fund. Functional specifications for a new fleet management information system was also developed during the study.

The City's current Fleet Operations Division employed 17 staff members and provided centralized fleet services to all City departments at an operating budget of \$8.4 million. There were currently 639 vehicles in the City's fleet which had a replacement value of \$21.5 million. Mr. Owen stated, based on the City's current growth rate, additional vehicles would be required in next year's budget to support the additional staff. He advised the major percentage of vehicles were assigned to five departments which included Police, Fire, Utilities, Parks and Public Works. Emergency vehicles comprised the bulk of the vehicle fleet, followed by pickup trucks.

Mr. Owen advised the fleet operations staff were knowledgeable, dedicated and hard working but were faced with a number of challenges. He stated as the size of the fleet and the scope of its operations increased, the fleet operations' infrastructure, resources, systems and operating procedures were not able to keep pace. Mr. Owen felt the current fleet operations system could not respond to all the City's needs. Another challenge faced by the current fleet operations system was a lack of formalized policies and procedures.

Mr. Owen stated the move from Public Works to General Services would move the focus of the organization to serving its internal customers. It was recommended a Fiscal Analyst be added to manage the financial activities of the fleet operations. It was also recommended additional staff be hired to support the requirements of the Police, Fire, Public Works and Utilities Departments. There were currently too many disabled vehicles in the shop due to a lack of mechanics to work on them.

It was also recommended to move the budget for new replacement vehicles from the budget of each individual department to the Fleet Internal Service Fund and each department charged a lease fee for each vehicle. These fees would be placed into a reserve fund which would be used to fund the replacement vehicles.

The study also recommended the structure of how departments are charged back for maintenance repair and fuel be improved based on consumption-based rates.

Mr. Owen stressed the implementation of an improved system for financial management was necessary to optimize the financial activities of the fleet operations.

During the study several customer service issues were identified as needing improvement, such as vehicle down time. It was recommended a new state-of-the-art fleet management information system be implemented to better plan maintenance activities, streamline workflow processes and match resources to demand.

Mr. Owen stated many employees also complained that obtaining fuel for their vehicles was a long and tedious process and it was recommended access to more fueling locations be provided. It was also recommended that written service level agreements be established with all major customer groups. Mr. Owen also suggested a Fleet Advisory Board be created consisting of employees who utilize City vehicles to provide guidance and suggestions to fleet operations staff.

Mr. Owen stated it was recognized there were challenges faced by Fleet Operations in securing vehicles at a prohibitive cost. A 20-year vehicle capital replacement plan was developed by his company with recommendations for financing. Mr. Owen advised the average age of the City's fleet was seven years which implied an average replacement cycle of 14 years. He stated the fleet age should be approximately three and a half to four years which indicated there was not enough funding allocated for fleet replacement.

Mr. Owen advised his Staff worked with City Staff to develop conservative replacement cycles to incorporate into the replacement plan. The recommendation was to replace even more vehicles than indicated in the plan; however, the funding was not available to replace all the vehicles. It was recommended a reserve fund be utilized to finance the replacement vehicles.

Mayor Montandon inquired as to the possibility of outsourcing the fleet management process to an outside company. Mr. Owen responded outsourcing was examined during the study but it was not recommended. It was felt the on-site fleet operations process was more conducive to the emergency vehicle function for day-to-day maintenance; however, larger repair problems should be outsourced to commercial vendors.

In response to a question by Councilman Buck, Mr. Owen stated the outfitting of the police vehicles would be completed by an outside vendor.

City Manager Rose advised it was not his intention to immediately expand fleet operations; however, when it became necessary to increase the fleet, the current facility would not be large enough and outsourcing would be considered at that time. City Manager Rose stated several options would be addressed at the appropriate time.

**ACTION:** PRESENTATION MADE

### **PUBLIC FORUM**

There was no public participation.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

**ACTION:** THE MEETING ADJOURNED AT 5:29 P.M.

**MOTION:** Mayor Montandon

**SECOND:** Mayor Pro Tempore Robinson

**AYES:** Mayor Montandon, Mayor Pro Tempore Robinson, Council Members Smith, Buck and Eliason

**NAYS:** None

**ABSTAIN:** None

**APPROVED: April 5, 2006**

---

Mayor Michael L. Montandon

### **ATTEST:**

---

Karen L. Storms, CMC  
City Clerk