BOARD OF DAVIS COUNTY COMMISSIONERS MINUTES

Board of Davis County Commissioners - Work Session Minutes
Tuesday, April 22, 2025

The Board of Davis County Commissioners met for their regularly scheduled meeting at 8:30 AM on April 22, 2025, in room 306 of the Davis County Administration Building, 61 South Main Street, Farmington, Utah. Required legal notice of this meeting was given.

All documents from this meeting are on file in the Davis County Clerk's Office. The agenda for this meeting is incorporated into the minutes as item headers.

ROLL CALL

Chair Lorene Kamalu
Vice Chair John Crofts
Commissioner Bob Stevenson
Chief Deputy Clerk Rebecca Abbott
Controller Curtis Koch
Deputy Civil Attorney Mike Kendall [arrived 8:39 AM]
Human Resources and Risk Director Chris Bone
Information Systems Jeff Hassett
Facilities Director Lane Rose
Deputy Clerk Becky Wright
Community and Economic Development (CED) Director Kent Andersen [arrived shortly after Roll Call]
CED Deputy Director, Tourism Jessica Merrill [arrived shortly after Roll Call]
County Attorney Troy Rawlings [present for Agenda Item 2]
Civil Attorney Bret James [present for Agenda Item 2]
Animal Care Director Ashleigh Young [present for Agenda Item 2]
South Davis Recreation District Executive Director Tif Miller

AGENDA ITEM

1 8:30 - 9:00 AM
#2025-438. A Work Session to discuss the South Davis Recreation District 2024 Update - *Presented by Tif Miller, Executive Director, South Davis Recreation District*

[Minute 00:50] Tif said there have been changes since his last presentation to Commissioners, including changes to the South Davis Recreation District's bylaws. He noted that the District's fiscal year ended Dec. 31, 2024. In the past, budgeting was basically done as a department overview. The new budgeting process, implemented last year, focuses on cost vs. revenues for each program individually and looks at what will grow or needs to be improved or eliminated. Final numbers are still coming, but 2024 was a great fiscal year with revenues of $500,000.00. Numbers have been progressively improving since the slowdown caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Tif used a slide show [Attachment A] to update Commissioners regarding the South Davis Recreation District (SDRD). Discussion topics were: Working with the County; SDRD Updates; Program Numbers; and District highlights.

[Minute 3:26] **Working with the County**
SDRD started with a vote in 2004, and opened its facility in 2007. It was formed through Davis County and, prior to last year, the County Commission chose SDRD's at-large board members. SDRD's bylaws were updated last year, allowing SDRD's Board to choose its at-large members. Additionally, the number of at-large members was reduced from three to two to decrease the possibility of tie votes.

SDRD collaborates on events with the County, working with Erin Miller from the Community and Economic Development (CED) Department. Examples of collaborations include hosting the Grizz Cup Hockey Tournament, for the last three years, and a jujitsu tournament scheduled this June. SDRD would like to work with Davis County's Western Sports Park (WSP) in the future, potentially bringing in new competitions or partnering to improve a large basketball competition hosted by SDRD.

SDRD's current bond goes off the books in January of next year. If there is a new opportunity for bonding, projects could include replacing the current locker rooms, expanding the lap pool, or adding restrooms for the second-level fitness area.

A new outdoor ice ribbon opened at the SDRD in 2020 and, with the help of County promotion, it has been a popular addition. It typically opens in December and closes in March when temperatures rise to 50-55°F.

[Minute 9:30] **SDRD Updates**
SDRD launched a new website that is very mobile device-friendly. The annual “Egg Dive” was held recently. Upcoming events include the Recreation District’s first triathlon of the year, to be held in May, and a half-marathon and other races usually held in conjunction with Bountiful Handcart Days. SDRD also hosts three movie nights during the summer.

The financial audit is still being finalized but shows 2024’s annual pass numbers were the highest they’ve been since before COVID. There was also growth in the flag football program and soccer, and more mental health wellness programs were introduced. SDRD is seeing more expenses due to rising costs of insurance, utilities and maintenance; however, those costs are being offset by revenues. Annual pass fees were increased by $10 this year, but first-quarter sales are already up $26,000.00 compared to 2024. Participation in soccer, football, Junior Jazz and other programs is up. There has been a decline in adult sports participation, which may be due to increased fees for programs. For example, the cost to participate in women’s volleyball went from $355.00 per team to $550.00, and only one team signed up. Staff will be reviewing the impact of fee increases as they try to balance offsetting costs while providing programs that don’t cost the District money.

Future projects include resurfacing the parking lot in 2027, and potentially bonding for lockers and other needs previously mentioned. SDRD is incorporating more formalized, narrow sponsorships.

[Minute 15:03] **Program Numbers 2025**
Tif reported that SDRD memberships are up in the first quarter with 7,635 memberships and 18,904 members in the facility. Prior to 2023, family passes were a flat rate for seven people; it was changed to a base of three people with an option to pay $25 more per additional child. Sales of “insurance passes,” which are admissions reimbursed by insurance companies, are also up. Examples of insurance passes include Silver Sneakers and Silver & Fit for seniors.

Revenue and participation for 2024 and 2025 were compared for winter Junior Jazz Basketball; spring Youth Soccer, Flag Football, Youth Volleyball; and Youth Spring/Summer Baseball. Increases range from 6.3 percent for soccer and 20 percent for baseball [attachment pages A8-A12]. SDRD utilizes school courts and fields in community parks to accommodate more participation. There were 4,061 swim lessons given in 2024, including for adults, and Tif said they are important to the community because they help prevent drownings. Most swim lessons are taught by staff lifeguards, with a few additional hires to meet specialized needs such as lessons for infants and toddlers.

It was noted that the ice rink will close for about three weeks in May to melt the ice for scheduled repairs and maintenance. It will reopen before or just after Memorial Day.

[Minute 26:18] **District Highlights**
The highlights presented included:

- SDRD is offering Mentally Fit classes with Dr. Nedley.
- There were 28,000 more visitors in 2024.
- More than 8,000 people have visited so far in 2025.
- A new Zamboni will be delivered in May, to replace the oldest ice resurfacing machine, at a cost of approximately $160,000.00.
- The ice arena is getting a turnstile to prevent people from sneaking in.
- Hockey is growing in Utah bringing more demand for SDRD’s ice sheet.
- It’s anticipated the 2034 Winter Olympics in Utah will bring increased interest in figure skating.

Jessica Merrill asked about the status of previously considered expansions and remodels of the SDRD facility. Tif said they are still a possibility but would require going out for bonds; there will be more discussion. There was a subsidy increase in 2024, and smaller increments could be done in the future. Jessica asked about the potential to partner with Davis School District to expand the pool area; Tif said that conversation is happening, but the School District is looking at building its own. When asked about the cost of expansions considered for the master plan, Tif said the overall cost had been estimated at $46 million. Now, looking specifically at an additional 6-lane outdoor pool, it would cost about $13 million. A second facility at Hatch Park is not likely as

North Salt Lake City is moving forward with their own project. Adding a second ice sheet would require new space as it would take the current facility's parking lot.

Commissioner Crofts asked about public support of SDRD. Tif said there are people who feel some services, such as fitness, should be provided by the private sector. Recreation programs are generally not competitive, and rising participation shows the community appreciates having these services. Having pool, ice, and fitness facilities all in one location is unique in south Davis County. Ice arenas and pools are not cheap to run and SDCD provides a service to the community.

Tif concluded by inviting all present to visit the South Davis Recreation District.

Discussion of the first agenda item ended at 9:05 AM.

---

2 9:00 - 9:45 AM
#2025-424. A Work Session to discuss Animal Care of Davis County Project Decision Options -
Presented by Ashleigh Young, Director, Animal Care

Davis County Attorney Troy Rawlings apologized in advance for needing to leave before the end of the discussion for Agenda Item 2 because of a scheduling conflict.

[Minute 34:55] Commissioner Kamalu said the County knows its current Animal Care facility is not sufficient for the current population of people, animals, and staff. A feasibility study was conducted, and a lot of hard work was done to get the modeling right for a new facility. Recently, Director Young, Director Rose, and Deputy Civil Attorney Kendall met with individual Commissioners over a period of months to discuss the concept and plan and bring the costs down. Many cuts were made and now, with a $2 million funding gap for the proposed shelter, there is concern that any more cuts will make the building inappropriate for the build-out of Davis County and all the legal requirements for animal care.

[Minute 37:03] Director Young said meetings were again held with each Commissioner on April 10, to discuss three possible options for moving forward:

1. Continue as planned, and identify a solution to the $2 million deficit
2. Put the project on pause
3. Build within the current budget, recognizing it will not be sufficient for the build-out of Davis County

Director Young said the purpose of the Work Session was to receive direction from Commissioners on how to proceed. [Attachment B, an overview of the options and considerations, was provided with the Work Session agenda prior to the meeting. It was not presented in the meeting, but is attached to these minutes to provide background information for this discussion and a follow-up meeting.]

[Minute 38:24] Commissioner Kamalu introduced the possibility of using money from the Opioid Settlement Agreement to close the funding gap. One of Davis County's expenses in dealing with the opioid crisis was building a medical wing at the jail to handle withdrawal and other issues, and it cost millions of dollars. Commissioner Kamalu invited County Attorney Troy Rawlings to the Work Session to discuss the idea of replenishing the County's capital fund by using settlement money to recoup some of the funds spent on the jail medical wing.

[Minute 40:24] County Attorney Rawlings said Davis County has $6 million in settlement money that hasn't been used, but advised there are two main concerns with pursuing opioid settlement money to get back capital spent on the jail medical wing – the timing of the building project and whether that use would be considered opioid-use remediation. County Attorney Rawlings said there are eight broad categories outlined in Schedule A of the Opioid Settlement Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), called Core Strategies, for opioid use remediation. The strategies include things such as drug court, jail first responders, Naloxone, and opioid treatment programs for women who are pregnant. The list does not include capital expenditures on buildings, so using opioid settlement money to pay for capital projects presents a risk. If Commissioners use $2 million of settlement money to recoup expenses for the medical wing, they will need strong documentation that the wing is used to treat Opioid Use Disorder (OUD) to such a degree that it's a justified use of settlement money. The County will be required to fill out a report about settlement money spent. If settlement plan administrators contest that use of money, they can file an injunction in the Third District Court to prevent/stop the use of the money as outlined in the report. They can also request the money be paid back and future payments stopped until it is deemed that spending is in harmony with the settlement agreement.

[Minute 59:02] After a lengthy discussion of the pros and cons of pursuing opioid settlement money, Animal Care Director Young suggested that the conversation should focus on other options for the shelter. Discussion turned to whether it would be wiser to move forward now with the current plan for a new shelter and find another way to fund it, or to pause the project until the financial situation is better. It was pointed out that the County has already spent five years, a lot of time in meetings with various cities, and hundreds of thousands of dollars planning for the new shelter. Contracts are in place for contractors and the architect. It is not easy to pause a project and get it started again, and doing so could waste the investments already made and add more costs. Additionally, construction costs usually increase over time. There may also be issues with contractors not wanting to continue working on the project.

County Controller Koch shared worksheets showing five years of financial projections, which are trending down. He told Commissioners the good days of sales tax are over and he does not believe the County is in a good financial position. There was discussion about the potential for an economic recession, and that sometimes building costs go down at such times, but that isn't something that can be planned on. The conversation also touched on the idea that more value engineering could add hundreds of thousands in costs to what has already been spent, and making cuts to the shelter project takes it farther away from the feasibility study.

[Minute 1:15:24] Major cuts, bonding, and raising taxes were also discussed. The Controller invited the Commissioners to meet with him because, even without the Animal Care shelter, the County is in financial trouble.

No decisions were made by the end of the Work Session, so the request was made to schedule a follow-up Work Session.

MEETING ADJOURNED

The meeting adjourned at 10:01 AM.

ATTACHMENTS

All publicly distributed materials associated with this meeting are noted as the following attachments:

A1-A15. South Davis Recreation District Presentation
B1-B4. Board of Commissioners Shelter Project Decision Options

Minutes Prepared by:
Becky R. Wright
Deputy Clerk

Brian McKenzie (May 14, 2025 12:24 MDT)

Brian McKenzie
Davis County Clerk

Minutes Approved on:
05/13/2025

Lorene Kamalu (May 13, 2025 19:14 MDT)

Lorene Miner Kamalu
Commission Chair

STATE OF UTAH
DAVIS COUNTY

SOUTH DAVIS
Recreation District

DISTRICT UPDATE 4/21/25

SOUTHDAVISRECREATION.COM

SOUTH DAVIS RECREATION

2024 was a great year for the South Davis Recreation District. We saw a number of important steps take place throughout the year, including our new budgeting process, incorporating new mental wellness programs for our residents, our annual memberships continue to grow, changes to our District Board, and more! Though we are waiting on final numbers, the FY 2024 was an exciting and successful year for the District, and so far 2025 is looking like the momentum is continuing to move forward with program numbers continuing to increase and changes bringing new opportunities to our residents. We are looking forward to continued success and continued growth into the future.

DISCUSSION TOPICS

- WORKING WITH THE COUNTY
- SDRD UPDATES
- PROGRAM NUMBERS
- DISTRICT HIGHLIGHTS

COMMISSION AND SDRD

1. History 2004 - Present
2. Updated District Bylaws 2024
3. Collaborating on Events
4. Future District Growth
5. Working Together in the Future

SDRD UPDATES

1. New Website/Upcoming Events
2. 2024 Financial Update
3. 2025 1Q Glance
4. Future Projects
5. Sponsorship Package

Program Numbers 2025

1. Upcoming and Current Programs
2. Membership Information
3. YTD Program Comparisons
4. Program Updates

Membership Updates

Membership	Resident	Non-	Annual	Monthly	Punch Pass	Total
25 Visit-Bountiful Jr High	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	1 / 1	1 / 1
Adult Couple	263 / 531	23 / 46	286 / 577	0 / 0	0 / 0	286 / 577
Family Membership	1,107 / 5,030	115 / 514	1,222 / 5,544	0 / 0	0 / 0	1,222 / 5,544
Senior Couple 60 +	307 / 615	13 / 26	320 / 641	0 / 0	0 / 0	320 / 641
Adult Single	178 / 190	33 / 33	211 / 223	0 / 0	0 / 0	211 / 223
Senior Single 60 +	224 / 232	14 / 14	238 / 246	0 / 0	0 / 0	238 / 246
Youth 3YRS-17YRS	47 / 51	3 / 3	50 / 54	0 / 0	0 / 0	50 / 54
25 Visit-Adult Ice Skate	5 / 17	6 / 8	0 / 0	0 / 0	11 / 25	11 / 25
25 Visit-Adult Swim/Fitness	754 / 1,546	171 / 257	0 / 0	0 / 0	924 / 1,802	925 / 1,803
Charter Adult Couple	3 / 8	0 / 0	3 / 8	0 / 0	0 / 0	3 / 8
Disability Individual Plus	106 / 394	28 / 120	134 / 514	0 / 0	0 / 0	134 / 514
Disability Individual	30 / 32	3 / 5	33 / 37	0 / 0	0 / 0	33 / 37
Eft Adult Couple	169 / 343	12 / 25	0 / 0	181 / 368	0 / 0	181 / 368
Eft Adult Single	113 / 114	13 / 13	0 / 0	126 / 127	0 / 0	126 / 127
Eft Family Membership	787 / 3,900	57 / 284	0 / 0	844 / 4,184	0 / 0	844 / 4,184
Eft Disability Individual	8 / 10	0 / 0	0 / 0	8 / 10	0 / 0	8 / 10
Eft Disability Individual Plus	27 / 103	8 / 37	0 / 0	35 / 140	0 / 0	35 / 140
Eft Flex Pass	4 / 8	0 / 0	0 / 0	4 / 8	0 / 0	4 / 8
Eft Senior Couple	63 / 124	5 / 10	0 / 0	68 / 134	0 / 0	68 / 134
Eft Senior Single	34 / 35	5 / 5	0 / 0	39 / 40	0 / 0	39 / 40
Eft Youth	17 / 17	1 / 1	0 / 0	18 / 18	0 / 0	18 / 18
Charter Family-Up To 7 People	16 / 103	0 / 0	16 / 103	0 / 0	0 / 0	16 / 103
Flex Pass	18 / 36	1 / 2	19 / 38	0 / 0	0 / 0	19 / 38
Freestyle Skating 25	5 / 5	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0	6 / 6	6 / 6
Freestyle Skating 50	1 / 2	0 / 0	0 / 0	0 / 0	1 / 2	1 / 2
25 Visit-Racquetball	7 / 16	3 / 4	0 / 0	0 / 0	10 / 20	10 / 20
Renew Active Admission	650 / 732	87 / 92	737 / 824	0 / 0	0 / 0	737 / 824
25 Skate Rentals	12 / 40	3 / 16	0 / 0	0 / 0	15 / 56	15 / 56
Charter Senior COUPLE-60YRS +	21 / 42	1 / 2	22 / 44	0 / 0	0 / 0	22 / 44
Silver Sneakers Admission	280 / 301	53 / 59	333 / 360	0 / 0	0 / 0	333 / 360
Charter Adult Single	0 / 0	1 / 1	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0	1 / 1
25 Visit-Senior IceSkate	2 / 2	1 / 2	0 / 0	0 / 0	3 / 4	3 / 4
Silver/Active & Fit Admission	144 / 158	32 / 33	176 / 191	0 / 0	0 / 0	176 / 191
Charter Senior SINGLE-60 Yrs +	14 / 14	1 / 1	15 / 15	0 / 0	0 / 0	15 / 15
25 Visit-Stud/Youth Ice Skate	10 / 31	8 / 18	0 / 0	0 / 0	18 / 49	18 / 49
25 Visit-Stud/Youth Swim/Fitness	350 / 944	66 / 138	0 / 0	0 / 0	415 / 1,081	416 / 1,082
25 Visit-Senior Swim	264 / 489	61 / 101	0 / 0	0 / 0	325 / 590	325 / 590
Swim Team	0 / 0	1 / 1	1 / 1	0 / 0	0 / 0	1 / 1
Senior Walking Pass	348 / 385	20 / 21	368 / 406	0 / 0	0 / 0	368 / 406
Total Unique Members By Membership	6,707 / 16,933	928 / 1,971	4,581 / 10,237	1,323 / 5,029	1,729 / 3,636	7,635 / 18,904

1. Price Changes 2025
2. Total Memberships Up
3. Insurance Passes
4. Annual Pass Sales Growth

JR. JAZZ BASKETBALL

Jr. Jazz Revenue Winter 2024
$79,578

Jr. Jazz Revenue Winter 2025
$104,554

Jr. Jazz Total Participation Winter
2024: 1039   2025: 1223

15.8% Increase in Participation from 2024

Youth Soccer 2024

Youth Soccer Revenue Spring 2024
$46,375

Youth Soccer Revenue Spring 2025
$56,018

Youth Soccer Registrants Spring
2024: 872   2025: 931

6.3% Increase in Participation from 2024

Youth Flag Football 2024

Flag Football Revenue Spring 2024
$42,588

Flag Football Revenue Spring 2025
$57,497

Flag Football Registrants Spring
2024: 468   2025: 634

26.2% Increase in Participation from 2024

Youth Volleyball 2024

Youth Volleyball Revenue Spring 2024
$17,252

Youth Volleyball Revenue Spring 2025
$20,436

Youth Volleyball Registrants Spring
2024: 255   2025: 295

18.5% Increase in Participation from 2024

YOUTH SPRING/SUMMER BASEBALL

Youth Baseball Revenue Spring 2024
$21,115

Youth Baseball Revenue Spring 2025
$25,449

Youth Baseball Registrants Spring
2024: 284   2025: 355

20% Increase in Participation from 2024

SWIM LESSONS

4061

SWIM LESSONS in 2024

DISTRICT HIGHLIGHTS

1. MENTALLY FIT - DR. NEDLEY
2. COME ON IN! - 28,000+ MORE VISITORS IN 2024; 8,000 SO FAR 2025
3. I WANT TO RIDE THE ZAMBONI! NEW RIDE IN 2025
4. NEW LOOK! - UPCOMING CHANGES TO ICE ENTRANCE
5. CROSS CHECKING-GROUPS CHECKING FOR MORE HOCKEY

SOUTH DAVIS
Recreation District

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME!

SOUTHDAVISRECREATION.COM

Purpose

The purpose of today's meeting is to go over three different options for the Animal Care of Davis County shelter project. Each option comes with its own set of challenges and benefits, so it's important that we take the time to carefully consider all the factors before making a decision. Below, you'll find a breakdown of each option along with some key things to keep in mind as we move forward.

Option 1: Continue on the Current Path Despite the Shelter Budget Overrun

The current shelter project is set to exceed the approved budget, and in our recent budget meeting, it was confirmed that no additional resources will be available from the County. Continuing with the project as is, without significant adjustments, could lead to several complications:

- **Contract Issues:** Moving forward with the current plan could lead to significant contract complications. If we decide to revert to the original budget later, additional redesign work by the architect could cost between $100,000 and $500,000. This expense would be added to the existing budget overrun, increasing financial strain and potentially resulting in further disputes with contractors and suppliers.

- **Unrealistic Fundraising Goals:** The current goal of raising two million dollars in just a few months is not feasible, especially with the county's restrictive donation policy, which would require time to adjust. Discussions with other animal shelters show that raising such a sum within this timeframe is unlikely, with larger shelters typically securing only a few hundred thousand dollars annually. Grants are a possible option, but most of the cycles do not line up with the current project timeline.
    - SLC (2024) $93,524, 3 full-time staff on development team
    - HSUS (2023) $3.56 million, 5 full-time staff on development team

- **Need for Dedicated Staff:** To continue on this path, we would need to hire a temporary, full-time marketing and development staff member to focus on fundraising and public relations. However, even with this resource, the ambitious fundraising goals may still fall short of covering the budget overrun.

Key Considerations:

1422 East 600 North – Fruit Heights, Utah 84037
Telephone: (801) 444-2200 – TDD: (801) 451-3228 – Fax: (801) 444-2212

- High financial risk due to continued budget overruns and added redesign costs.
- Potential for contract disputes and damaged trust with contractors and stakeholders.
- Fundraising goals are unrealistic within the current timeframe.
- Need for additional staffing to manage fundraising efforts.
- **A clear timeframe and strategy for securing funds are essential to move forward with this option.**

Option 2: Pause the Project Until Sufficient Funds Are Raised

This option suggests pausing the project until enough funds are raised to proceed without risking further budget overruns. This approach would involve:

- **Finding Additional Revenue:** Pausing the project would provide time to establish a more sustainable fundraising strategy, which may include smaller, more manageable donations, animal grants, or even exploring bond options or tax increases. This would reduce the pressure to raise an unrealistic amount of money in a short time frame.
- **Project Delay:** Delaying the project could significantly extend the timeline, but this could allow the organization to adjust its strategy and secure the necessary funds without rushing, potentially avoiding future budget overruns.
- **Increased Project Cost:** Delaying the project may lead to higher overall costs due to inflation in labor and material prices over time.
- **Minimal Costs to Contracts:** Pausing the project now would not incur significant additional costs to existing contracts, as work can be halted without triggering major penalties, minimizing the financial exposure at this stage.

Key Considerations:

- Potentially lengthy delay while funds are raised.

- The overall project cost may increase once work resumes.
- Reduced financial risk compared to Option 1, as funds will be secured before proceeding.
- Opportunity to adjust the fundraising strategy and involve more stakeholders.
- Minimal contract costs for halting the project now.

Option 3: Redesign the Shelter to Fit Within the $14 Million Budget

This option involves adjusting the shelter's design to fit within the existing $14 million budget. While this approach offers certain advantages, it also comes with several considerations:

- **Potential Compromises in Shelter Quality:** A redesign could result in a shelter that meets current needs but might not be sufficient for future growth. The facility may lack certain features or capacity, leading to possible renovations or expansions in the future.
- **Immediate Feasibility:** This is the most likely option to allow the project to move forward quickly. By scaling back the design, the shelter could proceed with minimal delays, which is crucial given the current substandard working conditions at the existing shelter.
- **Highest Priority Needs:** The need for a new facility to better serve the public, ensure that staff have appropriate working conditions, and provide proper care for the animals is of the highest priority. While the shelter may be scaled down in size or features, meeting these fundamental needs should remain central to the redesign. The current shelter is not meeting best practices for staff and animal care, and this option would allow us to address those critical issues more immediately.
- **Long-Term Considerations:** While the shelter may be built within the $14 million budget, it may not fully meet the community's long-term needs. Future renovations or expansions could be necessary to accommodate growth.

Key Considerations:

- The shelter may be smaller or less functional, potentially limiting future expansion.

1422 East 600 North – Fruit Heights, Utah 84037
Telephone: (801) 444-2200 – TDD: (801) 451-3228 – Fax: (801) 444-2212

- The project could proceed more quickly than in other options.
- Long-term planning should account for potential future upgrades or redesigns.
- The highest priority remains ensuring proper conditions for both staff and animals, while meeting the immediate needs of the public.

Recommendation and Conclusion:

The Board of Commissioners faces a difficult decision, with each option presenting unique challenges and benefits:

- **Option 1** continues on the current path, which risks additional budget overruns, unrealistic fundraising expectations, and the possibility for significant contract redesign costs ($100,000 - $500,000).
- **Option 2** offers a pause in the project, allowing time to secure adequate funds but resulting in a significant delay. It also incurs minimal additional contract costs.
- **Option 3** proposes a redesign to fit within the existing $14 million budget, allowing the shelter to proceed more quickly but with potential limitations on its long-term capacity.

It is critical that the Board weighs the community's future needs, the feasibility of securing necessary funds, and the project's timeline. A thoughtful decision will ensure that the shelter project remains sustainable and serves its intended purpose for years to come.