

**MINUTES
CITY OF FARMINGTON HILLS
FARMINGTON HILLS CITY COUNCIL
STUDY SESSION
THE HAWK – AUDITORIUM
29995 TWELVE MILE ROAD
JUNE 23, 2025 – 5:00PM**

The study session meeting of the Farmington Hills City Council was called to order by Mayor Rich at 5:00pm.

Councilmembers Present: Aldred, Boleware, Bridges, Bruce, Dwyer, Knol and Rich

Councilmembers Absent: None

Others Present: City Manager Mekjian, City Clerk Lindahl, Directors Schnackel and Skrobola, and City Attorney Joppich

PRESENTATION ON THE FARMINGTON HILLS ACTIVITY CENTER STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT BY THE SPORTS FACILITIES COMPANIES

Mayor Rich welcomed attendees and introduced the evening's presentation on the Farmington Hills Activity Center Strategic Assessment conducted by Sports Facilities Companies. No decisions would be made during this session, as City Council does not vote during study sessions. The purpose was to receive the report findings, discuss internally, and allow time for public comment.

City Manager Mekjian provided background on the strategic assessment, which is part of the Phase II evaluation of the Special Services Department by Sports Facilities Management Company. This phase builds on the Phase I assessment and includes facilities review, strategic planning, and implementation support. The goal is to provide City Council with a comprehensive financial analysis by June 30, 2025, specifically focusing on potential Costick Center replacement options. Factors in the evaluation included construction costs, operational expenses, staffing requirements, and capital improvement planning. City Manager Mekjian stressed the importance of ensuring long-term viability and avoiding future infrastructure deterioration due to underfunding. Tonight's presentation represents part one of a two-part financial overview, with part two to address the department's \$4 million annual deficit and unmet capital improvement needs. The goal is to deliver part two by year end.

Utilizing a PowerPoint presentation, Evan Eleff, Sports Facilities Companies (SFC), provided an overview of SFC, the process followed in the Farmington Hills study, financial performance projections, and key considerations and next steps.

Background and Purpose

SFC's assessment is one segment of a broader initiative with three main objectives: 1) maintaining access to high-quality programs for residents, 2) enhancing Farmington Hills' reputation as a desirable place to live and recreate, and 3) improving fiscal responsibility by addressing the \$4 million annual operating deficit within the Special Services Division. The goal is to develop a financially viable long-term strategy for maintaining and expanding senior services.

- The Costick Center, the current facility serving residents aged 50 and better, is approaching the end of its operational viability. The Center faces serious challenges related to safety, utility, and operating costs. Previous assessments indicated that keeping the facility operational would require a minimum of \$13.5 million in capital improvements in the near and mid-term, with further costs expected over the next 3–5 years. Renovations would likely cause interruptions to service.
- In any future scenario, whether renovation or replacement of the Costick Center, it is essential to maintain uninterrupted access to senior services and facilities.
- The findings and options presented tonight are not final and additional opportunities and feedback could emerge following tonight’s meeting. No consensus or decision was expected at this session.

Community Engagement and Data Collection – 2024-2025

Mr. Eleff described the multi-pronged community engagement strategy used to gather input, including public listening sessions, focus group interviews (both formal and informal), a dedicated project website and survey, ongoing staff and commission feedback, and analysis of historical usage data from the last four years (post-pandemic). Listening sessions occurred in December, February, and April. The project website was live in February and March, and a feedback loop was maintained since February.

- 586 individuals responded to the engagement survey. The vast majority (98%) were from the 50 and better age group. Over 25% of respondents were not current users of the Costick Center, a valuable insight for planning future offerings. Despite this, only 2% indicated they would not use an activity center at all, suggesting strong potential interest in expanded services.
- Respondents identified their priorities for physical features and programming. The most requested features included an indoor walking track, group exercise space, and indoor aquatics, followed closely by multi-use courts suitable for both recreational and community events. Flexibility in facility design was emphasized to support a wide range of activities.
- Transportation needs were also considered. Only about 5% of respondents indicated they required transportation to access the center, suggesting general accessibility by most users.
- The survey also asked what would make respondents more likely to visit a senior-focused activity center. Top responses included a greater variety of activities, affordability, proximity, and opportunities for social interaction.
- Beyond quantitative results, the team collected 272 qualitative comments from survey responses, listening sessions, and verbatim entries. These comments were broken down into four categories:
 1. Strong support for retaining the current Costick Center location and opposition to co-locating a replacement facility at The Hawk, due to The Hawk’s busy nature and reduced sense of dedicated senior space.
 2. Desire for updated physical assets, including a pool, pickleball courts, indoor walking track, group exercise rooms, and flexible gathering spaces with social amenities like a coffee bar. A single-story layout was widely preferred.
 3. Strong appreciation for the current staff at the Costick Center and the relationships formed with participants; continuity in staffing was seen as vital.
 4. Requests for extended hours, especially weekends and evenings, to accommodate working adults in the 50+ population.

Additionally, there were concerns about affordability and a preference for fees lower than those at The Hawk. Sensitivity to tax increases was mentioned frequently, along with requests for financial clarity.

Site Options Overview

Mr. Eleff introduced three possible sites for a future activity center: the current Costick Center site, The Hawk, and a potential site at Oakland Community College (OCC). Each was evaluated based on proximity to population, infrastructure, and operational considerations. Using a 10-minute drive time radius as a baseline, demographic analyses were as follows:

- a) Current Costick site: ~63,000 people, median income ~\$74,000
- b) The Hawk site: ~80,643 people, median income \$87,046
- c) OCC site: ~91,000 people, median income ~\$93,000

These figures were derived from Esri (Environmental Systems Research Institute) demographic data and helped determine accessibility and potential revenue generation opportunities at each site.

Each site was discussed relative to opportunities and challenges.

- While The Hawk offers potential for significant operational efficiency, residents strongly opposed co-locating with The Hawk due to concerns about congestion, loss of a dedicated feel, and lack of overall comfort and accessibility for the 50 and better demographic.
- Strengths of the current Costick site include its popularity with respondents, existing infrastructure, and potential partnerships with Rose Senior Living. Challenges include building or retrofitting on-site, which would also preclude possible land sale and associated tax revenue from new residential development.
- The OCC Site offered the potential for a no-cost or low-cost land partnership with the College, and included existing infrastructure such as parking, utilities, and a traffic signal. There was strong potential to recreate the “dedicated space” feel desired by the senior population. Using this site would also provide the opportunity to convert the current Costick site into taxable residential development.

Recommended facility components, costs, and financial performance projections

Recommended facility components included:

1. A multifunction space (~11,000sf) to accommodate large gatherings, events, and recreational programming such as pickleball.
2. Aquatics (~9,000sf): A 25-yard, six-lane aquatics center for fitness swimming, exercise classes, swim lessons, and potential team practices. It would also include wet-dry program space.
3. Flex space (~14,000sf) for walking tracks, a commercial kitchen, administrative offices, and private changing rooms in addition to traditional locker rooms.

Total construction cost estimates: \$19.2M (low) to \$23.5M (high)

- Land Cost assume to be minimal or zero
- Hard costs (building structure, sports equipment, furniture and fixtures)
- Soft costs (design and construction services, staffing and operations)
- A 10% contingency and a 9% inflation escalation were built into the estimates.

Financial performance projections were outlined in detail.

- Net operating income/(loss) was projected to be -\$775,456 in year 1 to -\$655,795 in year 5, representing a cost recovery of 56% in year 1 to 68% in year 5.
- The balance of cost recovery would come from debt service, existing city millage – activities center allocation, allocation of new city millage, and the capital improvement fund, with a 109% (\$401,373) cost recovery by year 5.

- The goal is to achieve cost neutrality by year one through a combination of revenue, millage funding, and capital reserves. By year three, the facility could fully fund its capital improvement needs, contingent on the implementation of a dedicated millage.

Strategic Outlook and Broader Recommendations

Mr. Eleff emphasized that all three proposed sites have trade-offs that must be carefully evaluated. The new facility – called Activity Center – would need to be used beyond 50 and Better programming, functioning as a broader community activity center during non-senior hours. For instance, the pool could be used for swim meets on evenings and weekends.

Strategies to reduce the broader \$4 million special services financial gap include:

- Expanding and establishing new partnerships
- Implementing ongoing operational efficiencies
- Evaluating programs that run at a subsidy
- Finalizing a strategic plan by fall 2025
- Expanding the city's parks millage to help fund long-term debt service and capital improvements

Proposed Parks Millage Structure

Mr. Eleff outlined the current and proposed parks millage impacts:

- The current parks millage is 0.4511, averaging \$56 per household annually
- A new millage to fund the activity center would require 0.39 to 0.48 mills, or approximately \$49 to \$60 per household
- This doubled millage rate, plus additional allocations for parks and capital improvements, may be necessary to support future services and infrastructure
- The goal of these proposals is to reduce reliance on the general fund and introduce a structured funding model for facility upkeep, as well as support for ongoing and expanded services.

Council questions and discussion

In response to questions from Council, Mr. Eleff provided the following information:

- While the analysis just presented did not include the new Oakland County parks and recreation millage, separate discussions and strategies related to that millage are ongoing.
- Millage funding was recommended over bonding due to concerns about increasing annual debt service obligations and limiting financial flexibility within the City budget.
- SFC had worked very closely with the City's finance officials. The fund balance – currently 60-65% of general revenue, was not referenced in the proposal because the presentation was focused specifically on the new activity center. Broader financial strategies involving the fund balance would be addressed through the ongoing strategic planning process.
- Aquatic space construction is significantly more expensive than dry space, costing approximately \$815 per square foot versus \$300–350 per square foot for dry space.
- Having the same pool available for seniors during the day and for competition swims at night and on weekends faced the challenge of pool temperature. Pool temperatures for competition typically run around 78°F, while warm water recreation pools for seniors are usually kept at 86–87°F. A compromise of 82 degrees was possible, but not optimum.
- The proposed pool design for the Activity Center reflects current demand and financial limitations. The addition of a second, smaller warm water therapeutic pool—potentially funded through partnerships with healthcare providers—could enhance service and help meet senior

needs. Adding a therapeutic pool could be considered before the design phase if it was found to be financially feasible.

- The community survey was an open online survey, distributed via QR codes, the project website, and email notifications. The survey was not sent to a defined sample; rather it was promoted broadly through social media, flyers, and community events. SFC believes this approach allows for greater community inclusion than traditional statistically valid surveys, which face declining response rates.
- The 10-minute drive time data for the three proposed sites encompassed all individuals within a 10-minute radius, regardless of municipal boundaries.
- The travel time analysis was conducted during the 2022-2023 study. The most recent analysis focused on land availability and cost.
- No developer partnerships beyond Rose Senior Living had been explored, in terms of seeking developers interested in adding senior housing to a new facility, in order to offset construction cost. However, in SFC's experience, 85% of successful projects involve some form of public-private partnership; this should be a priority moving forward.
- Currently the YMCA is considered a service provider that competes for activities and programs. However, there may be an opportunity in the future to form more of a programmatic relationship with the Y, including a lifeguard relationship.
- The cost estimate labeled as an "opinion of probable cost" was based on real-time, real-world data from 31 facilities currently under development nationwide. The figure incorporates local cost adjustments, contingencies, and inflation projections. The terminology is used because final estimates require completed design documents, which have not yet been developed.
- Regarding next steps, once a site is selected, environmental and geotechnical testing would be performed. Following that, the design process would begin, leading to formal cost estimates and development of a guaranteed maximum price. The phased process is designed to minimize uncertainty and incorporate market volatility.
- Regarding other funding sources such as anticipated congressional funding (\$4 million), potential naming rights, and revenue from the possible sale of the Costick Center property, were not yet factored into the formal analysis. However, the three different models for the three different locations all landed within \$50,000 of each other because of the variables specific to each site.

Council comments

- Councilmember Bridges stressed the importance of integrating affordability considerations from the community engagement survey into financing strategies, to ensure seniors can continue to afford to live in and access programs in Farmington Hills.
- Councilmember Knol requested a list of subsidized programs along with their subsidy amounts. She also raised concerns about balancing community needs with revenue opportunities for the pool. She emphasized that seniors value the warmer water temperature of the existing Costick Center pool, and expressed skepticism about a pool being used for both competition and senior swim use.
- Councilmember Knol asked about the potential partnership with Oakland Community College, noting that OCC Farmington Hills was transitioning into a medical-focused campus that may include a therapy pool. City Manager Mekjian confirmed that preliminary conversations with OCC leadership had taken place, wherein OCC expressed strong interest in partnering with the City, noting that the goals of the new Activities Center align well with their medical technology

and physical therapy training programs. Other potential features of an OCC location included outdoor walking paths and an art park.

- Councilmember Boleware was concerned that the methodology of the community survey was not inclusive of everyone in the senior community. She also revisited the issue of available funds through the Oakland County Parks millage and its potential application toward the activity center project. This information should be included in financial planning and millage deliberations. She asked if the City could explore using some of its own funding including in the fund balance, reducing the need to double the parks millage.
- Councilmember Aldred asked about the maturity of discussions with OCC regarding integrated educational programming. He also asked that travel times be analyzed from a Farmington Hills resident-centric point of view, as opposed to a purely population-centric analysis that included residents from other municipalities.
- Mayor Pro Tem Dwyer asked about the projected timetable following City Council approval of one of the three potential sites, and how a millage request would be calculated.
- Mayor Rich reiterated that there is no intent to close the Costick Center before a new facility is in place. Rumors about imminent closure are unfounded. She asked for a breakdown of how many residents within the 10-minute drive radii for each proposed site are Farmington Hills taxpayers, noting that local tax dollars should primarily benefit local residents. Mayor Rich also requested more robust engagement with the YMCA, particularly since its therapy pool is widely used and could address senior needs.
- Mayor Rich further raised the need for ADA and privacy accommodations in the new facility, particularly for the pool and restrooms. While ADA compliance and features were included in the cost assumptions, accommodating the needs of the senior community needed to go beyond mere ADA compliance.

City Manager Mekjian addressed earlier questions about use of the City's fund balance. He noted that while using a portion of the fund balance to offset capital costs is on the table, Council should remain focused on the full financial picture, including operational, staffing, and programming costs. He also reminded Council that the City's five-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) includes \$219 million in projects—ranging from public safety equipment to infrastructure—that must be factored into long-term financial planning.

Finance Director Skrobola provided a detailed overview of the City's projected general fund balance, confirming an expected balance of 61% by the end of fiscal year 2026. Assuming continued drawdowns between \$4–4.5 million annually, the balance is projected to fall to approximately 38–39% by 2028. This remains within the acceptable range for maintaining the City's AAA bond rating. While the Parks and Recreation millage will expire after the 2028 tax year, a renewed millage will ideally appear on the ballot in 2027 to allow time for a fallback option if needed.

Funding assumptions incorporated into the 2025–2026 budget included \$900,000 in anticipated annual support from the Oakland County Parks millage beginning in FY 2025–2026. If not for the \$900,000 contribution, the projected general fund deficit would be closer to \$5 million. The one-time \$4 million allocation from the County had not previously been included in the budget due to uncertainty over its designated use, but was now confirmed to be flexible and available for capital needs such as the activity center.

City Manager Mekjian reiterated that the City is exploring a combination of funding sources including cash from the fund balance, bonding, land sales, federal earmarks, and public-private partnerships. He also confirmed ongoing discussions with both OCC and Rose Senior Living about site co-location and emphasized that if the Costick Center property was sold, land value would depend on the density allowed by City Council and the Planning Commission.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Pat Hansen, Farmington Hills resident, objected to characterizing the new facility as a general “activity center” rather than a dedicated 50+ center and urged the City to prioritize senior use. She asked whether non-resident memberships were factored into financial planning. She was concerned that the importance of transportation may be underestimated, noting SMART buses drop off seniors at the Costick Center daily. She was skeptical about cost savings through shared staffing, stressing that serving the senior population requires a distinct and dedicated approach. Noting there had been years of study and community sessions, she urged the City to move forward with a decision.

Dan Fantore, Chair of the Farmington Area Commission on Aging, thanked Council for the presentation and supported moving forward swiftly due to the deterioration of the existing facility, especially relative to the pool and pickleball courts. He referenced listening sessions held by the Commission on Aging over the past two years, the results of which had been presented to City Council.

Glen Rader, Farmington Hills resident, advised Council to base financial decisions on reliable, hard numbers rather than speculative or aspirational funding sources. He cautioned against repeating past financial missteps such as those associated with the Hawk.

Latika, Farmington Hills resident, questioned the representativeness of the community survey, noting that many seniors are not online and may have been excluded from participation. She cautioned against relying on private partnerships like Rose Senior Living, citing affordability issues at that facility for seniors on fixed incomes. She acknowledged that the Costick center serves users beyond Farmington Hills, and viewed this as an opportunity to model regional excellence. She supported intergenerational programming but emphasized the importance of maintaining affordable, inclusive programs for senior users.

Anita Stromberg, Farmington Hills resident, emphasized the importance of the pool. She expressed appreciation that the Costick Center would not close until a replacement is ready. She urged Council to move the project forward.

Cynthia Gottlieb, Farmington Hills resident, advocated for retaining a dedicated senior center. She opposed co-location with the Hawk, citing accessibility and atmosphere concerns. Ms. Gottlieb stated that seniors deserve a space of their own that reflects their needs and physical abilities. She pointed to the broader community functions the Costick Center fulfills, including as a voting and cooling center. She cautioned against forcing seniors to carry the burden of past fiscal decisions.

Ellen Silverberg, Farmington Hills resident, expressed concern about the limited capacity and frequent shutdowns of the Costick pool, leading her to also join the Y and use that pool when the Costick pool is closed. She had tried using the pool at The Hawk, but it was cold and crowded. She opposed small replacement pools and advocated for a larger, more versatile aquatic center. She emphasized the importance of women-only swim sessions for various religious communities and endorsed the OCC site

due to proximity and better access during road construction periods. She noted that over time many area pools had closed, making the Costick Center pool even more important.

Joshua Taylor, Farmington Hills resident, and representing Changing Spaces, advocated for expanded accessibility features in the new facility, including powered height-adjustable adult changing tables, patient lifts, and larger restrooms with space for companion care. He stressed the importance of adaptive recreation programming and noted that improving accessibility could lead to better grant opportunities and higher facility utilization. He recommended that both pool and non-pool areas be equipped with enhanced accessibility options.

Pamela Santo, Farmington Hills resident, highlighted the social and health benefits provided by the Costick Center, especially water aerobics. She described the strong sense of community among water aerobics participants, with post-swim luncheons at local restaurants drawing 35–55 people. She emphasized the broad regional use of the facility and encouraged Councilmembers to visit the center and experience the community firsthand.

Homayoon Missaghi, Farmington Hills resident, was concerned about the reliability of the survey data, noting that only 500 individuals responded out of a much larger senior population in Farmington Hills. He stated that many seniors do not have internet access and therefore could not participate in an online survey. He emphasized the importance of keeping the Costick Center open and affordable for senior residents.

Jerry Ellis, Farmington Hills resident and former mayor, believed that any senior center should always be called the Costick Center, in honor of former city manager and mayor William Costick, and the center should be a dedicated senior facility. He emphasized four key features that must be retained: the pool, gym, indoor walking track, and the Meals on Wheels program. Mr. Ellis suggested selling land in front of the Costick Center to build senior condos and using that revenue, in addition to grants, to fund improvements. He warned against overbuilding and urged the city to follow past successful models of grant and self-funded projects, and not raise taxes.

Bob LaCosse, Farmington Hills resident, emphasized the importance of designing any new facility with senior-specific needs in mind. He noted that parking accommodations and building access for those with limited mobility were missing from the current presentation. He urged the Council to ensure sufficient accessible parking spaces near entrances and to avoid standard office-style layouts for a facility intended primarily for seniors.

Marilyn Leatham, Farmington Hills resident, was concerned about the accessibility of restroom facilities at The Hawk, citing the location of handicapped restrooms at the rear of the building and the difficulty of using low-seated toilets, especially for individuals recovering from surgery. She also questioned whether the median income data presented in the assessment was specific to the senior population or the general population.

Anita Wagoner, Farmington Hills resident, criticized the limited reference to previous citywide Parks and Recreation surveys regarding the Costick Center. She did not believe the current assessment represented the larger population. She argued that the Costick Center building still had usable value and could be updated affordably. Ms. Wagoner proposed an alternative renovation plan that would preserve current services while selectively replacing infrastructure, such as building a new pool and upgrading the

kitchen. She also supported seeking partnerships with local institutions like OCC, Habitat for Humanity, and Lawrence Tech in order to realize cost savings.

Darcy Scott, Farmington Hills resident, requested clarification regarding the proposed multifunction room, questioning whether activities such as pickleball and banquets would occur in the same room. She was also concerned about the lack of a deep end in the proposed six-lane lap pool, which would impact existing deep water aerobics classes. Ms. Scott asked how the city would maintain services during construction if the Costick Center site were selected for redevelopment.

Lori Daro, Farmington Hills resident, shared how the Costick Center transformed her retirement experience by providing community, daily engagement, and access to social activities. She spoke against the idea of using the new center for general recreational purposes, emphasizing the importance of preserving the Center as a dedicated senior facility. Ms. Daro also expressed concern about the Costick Center's deteriorating conditions. She stressed the need for an easily navigable, one-story building. She criticized the online survey for failing to reach most seniors. She suggested charging more for non-resident use and praised the volunteer network that supports operations.

Paul Huyck, Farmington Hills resident, appreciated the detailed presentation. He emphasized the importance of clearly understanding the statistics and financial projections when evaluating the project.

Angie Smith, Farmington Hills resident and school board member, echoed concerns about affordability and the impact of rising taxes and fees on seniors. She supported preserving a separate senior center, stressing the need for seniors to have their own space away from the bustle of younger families. Ms. Smith warned against overburdening seniors financially and emphasized that they have earned the right to access respectful, affordable services tailored to their needs.

Maureen Clinesmith, Farmington Hills resident and Costick Center volunteer, was concerned that the proposed new activity center may not provide sufficient space to maintain the breadth of senior programming currently offered. She requested a comparison of current versus proposed square footage. She advocated for renovation rather than full replacement. She thought the inclusion of shared-use scheduling conflicted with the desire for expanded senior programming on evenings and weekends.

Final Councilmember Comments

Councilmember Aldred thanked residents for their input. He emphasized that Council had heard resident concerns, and he reaffirmed that the Costick Center would not close before a new facility is ready. He supported moving forward with a clear plan, based on "why", "what", and "how":

- Why: There is a continued need to serve residents 50 and better.
- What: While the Hawk is likely not suitable, remaining options such as the current site and OCC warrant further consideration.
- How: While Councilmember Aldred had reservations about selling the green space on the Costick Center property, he acknowledged that the goal was to fund the project without raising taxes, using a millage only if necessary.

Councilmember Boleware supported expediting the decision; two years of discussion needed to be brought to conclusion. While she appreciated The Hawk as an award winning facility that did many things well, she was strongly opposed to locating the senior center at The Hawk, citing logistical and accessibility issues. She emphasized financial responsibility, and was concerned about the impact of tax

increases on fixed-income seniors. She advocated for pursuing creative partnerships and funding alternatives. She supported reviewing the OCC option further.

Councilmember Knol expressed appreciation for the variety of public comments received tonight. She pointed out that Council received feedback through multiple channels beyond the survey. She emphasized the importance of a dedicated senior space in a single-story facility with adequate parking and accessibility, and affirmed the primary purpose of the new center would be to serve seniors, although limited rentals or community use – as with the current Costick Center – would continue. She supported maintaining a lap pool and continuing existing programming. She believed that the City should find ways to meet the needs of seniors within existing funding, and not through a millage increase. She supported exploring cost-saving measures including grants and partnerships, and restructuring current funds. She opposed placing the center at the Hawk. She shared a sense of urgency in reaching a decision regarding moving forward.

Councilmember Bridges acknowledged anxiety among the senior population regarding this issue and emphasized the need to come to a timely decision. He supported building a new facility nearer to 11 Mile Road on the current Costick site. He was confident in the City's financial strength and its ability to pursue financing strategies that do not raise taxes. He reiterated support for preserving senior services and delivering a facility that residents can be proud of.

Councilmember Bruce supported construction of a new center at OCC or the existing Costick site, but not at The Hawk. Final location should be determined by cost analysis. He recommended selecting a site and design promptly so as to begin cost estimation and identifying funding sources. He did not support raising taxes and did support creative solutions including partnerships, grants, and strategic fund use.

Mayor Pro Tem Dwyer thanked the residents who spoke this evening and emphasized Council support for building a new senior center. He thanked former Mayor Ellis for his comments, and he also supported the OCC or Costick site options, but not The Hawk.

Mayor Rich thanked the residents who spoke. She acknowledged the strong community passion and advocacy relative to this issue. She pointed to Council consensus on the need for a senior-focused facility, including core amenities such as a pool, indoor track, kitchen, gym, pickleball courts, and support services. She affirmed The Hawk site was no longer under consideration due to lack of Council support. She expressed interest in the OCC site based on accessibility and cost. She agreed that it was important to make a decision in order to enable progress on design and funding. She stressed the importance of fiscal responsibility, leveraging creative funding solutions and partnerships, including ongoing advocacy for federal funding.

Mayor Rich directed staff to prioritize next steps for decision and development of a new senior center.

ADJOURNMENT

The Study Session meeting was adjourned at 7:23pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Carly Lindahl, City Clerk