PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
JUNE 9, 2011

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting at the Marsac Municipal Building 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, June 9, 2011.

Closed Session
2:30 p.m. Property and litigation

Work Session
4:00 p.m. Council questions/comments
4:10 p.m. Water Fund Budget and outstanding budget issues
5:00 p.m. Senior Strategic Plan
5:25 p.m. City Fleet Fuel Strategy
5:50 p.m. Break

Regular Meeting
6:00 p.m.
I ROLL CALL

II COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

III PUBLIC INPUT *(Any matter of City business not scheduled on agenda)*

IV WORK SESSION NOTES AND MINUTES OF MEETING OF MAY 26, 2011

V RESIGNATIONS AND APPOINTMENTS

1. Consideration of the appointment of two Planning Commission members to fill unexpired terms to July 2013 and July 2012

2. Consideration of the appointment of Patricia Ball, Marlene Ligare and Suzette Lamb Robarge to the Library Board for terms expiring July 2014

VI CONSENT AGENDA *(Items that have previously been discussed or are perceived as routine and may be approved by one motion. Listed items do not imply a predisposition for approval and may be removed by motion and discussed and acted upon under "Additional Discussion – Agenda Items")*

1. Consideration of a Resolution supporting the Road Respect Campaign in Park City, Utah

2. Consideration of a Resolution authorizing the City Manager to waive building related fees for renewable energy projects in 2011

3. Consideration of the award of a banking services contract to Zions Bank, in a form approved by the City Attorney

VII NEW BUSINESS *(New items with presentations and/or anticipated detailed discussions)*

1. Consideration of a Resolution amending Section 1, Construction and Development related fees; Section 2, Water Fees, Section 8, Recreation Services and Facility Rental Fees; Section 9, Ice Arena and fields Rental Fee Schedule and replacing and repealing Resolution No. 13-10 in its entirety

    (a) Public hearing
    (b) Action

2. Consideration of a Resolution adopting a final revised budget for fiscal year 2011 and the budget for fiscal year 2012 for Park City Municipal Corporation and its related agencies

    (a) Public hearing
    (b) **Motion to continue to June 16, 2011**

VIII ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION – AGENDA ITEMS

IX ADJOURNMENT

A majority of members may meet socially after the meeting. If so, the location will be announced by the Mayor. City business will not be conducted. Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the City Recorder at 435-615-5007 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Wireless internet service available in the Marsac Building on Wednesdays and Thursdays – 4 p.m. to 9 p.m.

Posted: 06/05/11
See: www.parkcity.org

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING TENTATIVE
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
JUNE 16, 2011

PUBLIC NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the City Council of Park City, Utah will hold its regularly scheduled meeting at the Marsac Municipal Building 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah for the purposes and at the times as described below on Thursday, June 16, 2011.

Closed Session

Work Session
2:00 p.m. Council questions/comments
2:10 p.m. Monthly financial update
2:30 p.m. General Plan
3:10 p.m. High altitude training
3:30 p.m. Recreation Advisory Board interviews
5:50 p.m. Break

Regular Meeting
6:00 p.m.
I ROLL CALL

II COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

III PUBLIC INPUT ***(Any matter of City business not scheduled on agenda)***

IV CONSENT AGENDA ***(Items that have previously been discussed or are perceived as routine and may be approved by one motion. Listed items do not imply a predisposition for approval and may be removed by motion and discussed and acted upon under "Additional Discussion – Agenda Items")***

1. Consideration of a Resolution adopting an inter-local agreement with Summit County for police database integration

2. Consideration of a Resolution authorizing the Mayor to join the Partnership for a New American Economy

IV OLD BUSINESS

Consideration of an Ordinance establishing compensation for the Mayor, City Council and Statutory Officers for Fiscal Year 2011-2012 for Park City, Utah
(a) Public hearing
(b) Action

VII NEW BUSINESS ***(New items with presentations and/or anticipated detailed discussions)***

1. Resolution adopting the revised Personnel Policies and Procedures Manual, effective July 1, 2011, for Park City Municipal Corporation

2. Consideration of a Resolution adopting a final revised budget for fiscal year 2011 and the budget for fiscal year 2012 for Park City Municipal Corporation and its related agencies
(a) Public hearing
(b) Action

VII ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION – AGENDA ITEMS

VIII ADJOURNMENT

PARK CITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
JUNE 16, 2011

I ROLL CALL

II PUBLIC INPUT

III MINUTES OF MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2011

IV NEW BUSINESS

Consideration of a Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2011 Revised Budget and the Fiscal Year 2011 Budget for the Park City Redevelopment Agency
(a) Public hearing
(b) Action

V ADJOURNMENT

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL BUILDING AUTHORITY
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
JUNE 16, 2011

I ROLL CALL

II PUBLIC INPUT

III MINUTES OF MEETING OF JANUARY 6, 2011

IV NEW BUSINESS

Consideration of a Resolution adopting the Fiscal Year 2011 Revised Budget and the Fiscal Year 2011 Budget for the Park City Municipal Building Authority
(a) Public hearing
(b) Action

V ADJOURNMENT

A majority of members may meet socially after the meeting. If so, the location will be announced by the Mayor. City business will not be conducted. Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the City Recorder at 435-615-5007 at least 24 hours prior to the meeting. Wireless internet service available in the Marsac Building on Wednesdays and Thursdays – 4 p.m. to 9 p.m.

Posted: 06/13/11
See: www.parkcity.org

Note: This future meeting schedule is TENTATIVE and subject to change.
PARK CITY COUNCIL TENTATIVE MEETING SCHEDULE

June 2011

23 **Dick gone**
Special event overhaul (40 min) - TY
Delivery ordinance update
SLC-PC Inter-local Agreement – work
Quit claim of a portion of the City Owned Colman Parcel to Dennis Peterson (114 Hillside Avenue)
Ordinance – 929 Park Avenue plat amendment – KW
Triple Crown MOU and City services contract – MP
Public Art Board interviews

30 **No meeting**

July 2011

7 Joint work session with Planning Commission and City Council (2 hours)
SLC-PC Inter-local Agreement – action
Appeal of City Manager decision on convention business license fees – Heidi Hughes and Mike Sweeney

14

21 Monthly financial update

28 **No meeting**

August 2011

4

11

18 **No meeting**

25 Ordinance amending LMC – HPB - administrative reconstruction process - KS

September 2011

1

8 **No meeting** (Summer Tour 9/7 – 9/11)

15

22

29

Pending Items:

U S Postal Service gang boxes in Old Town
Bonanza Tunnel ribbon-cutting

City Council
Staff Report

Subject:	**City Manager's Recommended Budget**
Authors:	**Nate Rockwood, Bret Howser**
Department:	**Budget, Debt, & Grants**
Date:	**June 9, 2011**
Type of Item:	**Informational/Legislative**

Summary Recommendations:
Hold a public hearing on the Tentative Budget. Provide direction concerning outstanding budget issues for Final Budget. Adopt the City Fee Resolution.

Topic/Description:
FY 2011 Revised Budget, FY 2012 Proposed Budget, and FY 2013 Plan, City Fee Resolution, Outstanding Budget Issues.

Background:
The City usually begins the budget process in January with the City Council identifying objectives for the next year. This year, however, the budget process really began in July, 2010 and has included a thorough review of the Pay Plan, service levels and taxation polices.

During the FY 2011 budget process, discussion was held regarding the long-term sustainability of City services and service levels. Staff identified concerns related to the property tax revenue stream, increased volatility in sales tax (both collections and state legislative amendments) and the lack of an escalator in property tax to keep up with inflation. The Budget Department prepared a detailed report which outlined that without a change of course, the City would not be able to provide the existing levels of service in the long run due primarily to the gradual loss of purchasing power in the property tax revenue stream over time. This report promoted a strategy stabilizing long term General Fund revenues and aligning them with long term projected expenditures, while preserving the fiscally conservative strategy of continuing to rely primarily on annual/short term sales tax surplus revenues for one time/short term capital project funding.

The City balanced the FY 2011 budget with reductions to staff positions and performance bonuses, without a property tax increase and without incurring new debt for the Racquet Club. Staff committed to return in the fall with an expanded budget discussion, which would include a fairly rigorous prioritization process of all City services and capital initiatives as well as a discussion revisiting the City Council policy toward employee compensation.

Council spent several work sessions during December and January reviewing the service prioritization process, known as Budgeting for Outcomes (BFO). The process was to be more of a zero-based budgeting approach than the traditional incremental approach. It closely resembled a Request for Proposal (RFP) process, with a Results Team made up of City staff creating Requests for Results (RFRs) related to each Council goal and departments submitting “bids” for City services, programs, capital, etc. related to each RFR at varying levels of service. In this fashion, all funding in the budget was linked directly to a Council goal and the community vision. The Results Team performed preliminary prioritization and the process culminated in a Council prioritization exercise leading up to and during Council Visioning.

In addition to BFO, Council also had a robust discussion about the City’s compensation philosophy and practices during November and December. Council directed staff to take certain measures in order to control the growth of personnel costs in the City, including expanding the low end of pay grades, implementing a hiring maximum at 65% of the pay range, instituting a new working level for employees meeting but not exceeding expectations at 80% of the pay range, limiting annual pay increases for staff not at the top of pay ranges to no more than 5% per annum, and increasing the current calendar year at-risk lump merit pool from 4% to 7% rather than an across the board 2% increase to pay ranges as originally planned in FY 2012.

BFO was further discussed during Council Visioning in February. From those discussions department managers were able to take Council’s recommendations to look into increasing or decreasing certain BFO service levels for their own departments. Each department manager was responsible for preparing budget requests consistent with Council’s vision and BFO. Council objectives were addressed either in the current level budget or as additional options for enhanced, increased, or decreased service levels proposed by the departments.

On April 7, staff presented a capital budget preview to City Council which gave a preliminary view of the major capital issues in the next ten years as well as potential options for financing these projects. Staff took the comments and insights of Council which were voiced in that work session and developed the long-term strategy model presented in the analysis section of this staff report.

On May 2, staff delivered the City Manager’s Recommended Budget (Tentative or Proposed Budget) to City Council. On May 5, staff gave an overview of the tentative budget, discussed timelines, updated Council on long-range projections, and presented the Special Service Contract Subcommittee recommendation.

On May 12 staff presented the 5-Year CIP Committee Recommendation to Council, which included the CIP Alternative Matrix, OTIS Update, Downtown Enhancement Projects, and the Soils Repository. Included in this discussion was a presentation on a long-range strategy & financing options for these projects as well as the overall budget.

On May 26 staff presented the departmental operating budgets which included brief departmental presentations, Administrative Interfund Transfers, Transit Fund Analysis, CIP Follow-up, and Special Service Contracts.

On June 2 staff presented recommended Fee Changes, Budget Policies, Council Compensation, Outstanding Budget Issues, and the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan. Council adopted the Tentative Budget and the Comprehensive Emergency Management Plan.

Public hearings were held on May 5, 12, 26, and June 2 and further hearings are currently scheduled for June 9 and 16. Discussion/action is slated for these dates as follows, barring changes as needed:

June 9 – Water Fund Budget, Fee Resolution, Outstanding Budget Issues

June 16 – Personnel Policies and Procedures (P&P) Manual, Presentation & Adoption of Final Budget

Analysis:
On June 9, staff will focus on the following topics for discussion:

Outstanding Budget Issues

- City Service Fees
- Council and Statutory Officer Compensation
- Budget Policies

<u>City Service Fees</u>
As part of the Budget Process, City staff has reviewed the City's Fee Schedule and proposes adjustments for:

- Planning Fees
- Recreation Fees
- Ice Facility Fees
- Golf Fees
- Library Fees
- Water Fees

On May 26, Council was presented with proposed changes to the City's Fee Schedule. After discussion, Council directed staff to make further adjustments to the recreation fees.

Recreation Fees
Per Council direction, the proposed fees for Annual Tennis Passes were increased 10% to bring them into line with other pass increases. The fees are now $1,100 for single, $1,950 for couple and $2,160 for a family of 3. The fee for private tennis lessons was increased from $61 to $64 hr. and a new fee for a private lesson with the Head Tennis Pro was set at $70 hr. The fee for resident youth age 3 to 17 has been decreased from $4 to $3 per child.

Water Fees
On June 9, staff will present the Water Fund Model and budget. Included in the model are several scenarios which show potential capital projects and water rights options. Depending on the scenario selected, the model shows the corresponding bond amount and rate adjustment needed per year. At the time of this report it is not known which scenario is the most cost effective to accomplish the City's water needs. The budget assumes one likely scenario which has been included in the Tentative Budget. It is currently anticipated that changes in operating and capital cost will occur in future years and not drastically affect the FY2012 budget. The Water Department Budget will be adjusted as necessary once final direction on projects and costs are determined.

The Water Department operating budget and options were presented to Council on May 26. The Water Fund CIP Budget Table located in the appendix details the current Water Department capital budget for the FY 2011 Adjusted Budget, FY 2012 Budget, and FY2013 Plan.

The Water Fund Model has been set to include a 12 percent fee increase in FY2012. This level of increase is necessary to allow the Water Department to cover operating costs and additional Federal and State mandated capital costs currently budgeted in FY2012. It is recommended that Council adopt the fee resolution with a 12 percent water rate increase for FY2012. The following table details the history of water fee increases:

FY2005	20%
FY2006	20%
FY2007	4%
FY2008	4%
FY2009	24%
FY2010	12%
FY2011	8%
FY2012*	12%

*proposed rate

Attachment A to this report is the amended sections of the Park City Fee Schedule and Fee Resolution. Staff recommends the adoption of the resolution in order to make the appropriate fee changes.

(See Attachment A – Fee Resolution with Excepts of Fee Changes)

Budget Policies

Purchasing Policy
As noted verbally to Council on June 2, additional amendments were made to the Purchasing Policy, including changes to track more closely with state code regarding CMGCs, posting notice on the website, and allowing for electronic sealed bids. These amendments are attached.

Council & Statutory Officer Compensation

In the spring of 2009, City staff conducted a pay plan benchmark comparison in order to determine the appropriate market pay rates for City staff, appointed and elected officials. During the FY 2010 budget process, this data was presented along with recommended pay grade changes. However, at that time staff recommended that a 2% across the board increase be implemented rather than the market-based adjustments, essentially flipping the traditional on and off years of the pay plan. The recommendation specified inclusion of the market-based adjustments in FY 2011. Council accepted this recommendation and the 2% increases were applied in FY 2010 for all employees, including City Council. At that point, annual compensation for Council and the Mayor, the City Manager, and City Attorney was set at $11,633, $23,007, $135,980, and $132,131 respectively.

Last spring, staff proposed that the market increases which were calculated in 2009 be implemented for the FY 2011 budget for City staff, appointed and elected officials. After much debate, Council voted to implement these changes in the budget with restrictions on how quickly staff could receive the raises. The Mayor, Council, City Manager, and City Attorney also volunteered to forgo raises for their own positions at that time, with the amount that would have gone for raises to Council instead being put into their travel budget. At that point, annual compensation for Council and the Mayor, City Manager, and City Attorney was again set at $11,633, $23,007, $135,980, and $132,131 respectively by ordinance.

FY 2009

- 2% increase to employee Pay Plan
- 2% increase to statutory employees
- 2% increase to Council compensation delayed

FY 2010

- 2% increase to employee Pay Plan
- 2% increase to statutory employees
- 2% increase to Council compensation

FY 2011

- Employee Pay Plan implemented
- Council compensation delayed
- Statutory employees compensation delayed

FY 2012

- 3% employee at risk pay implemented 2011 Calendar year

The City Manager's Recommended Budget for FY 2012 does not include salary increases for staff, appointed, or elected officials. Following the City's historic pay plan pattern, this would be a year for implementing 2% across the board increases. However, Council direction in January regarding further changes to pay policy included direction to staff to prepare a budget with a 3% increase to lump merit bonus pool rather than 2% across the board pay increases. Accordingly, a Council Compensation ordinance was brought before Council on June 2 with no changes to compensation from the prior year.

The City Council on June 2 directed staff to return with further analysis regarding potential increases to Council and Mayor compensation. Council members subsequently asked staff to include information about the City Manager and City Attorney compensation as well. The instruction to staff was to update the 2009 benchmarking study using the average of the top seven comparison cities (throwing out the first and the seventh) rather than the top five. This is consistent with the new practice for staff pay benchmarking which Council directed staff to begin using in January 2011.

The following table shows potential raises for elected and appointed officials based on criteria specified by Council. For elected officials, the raises have been calculated based on the average of the top 7 comparison cities, throwing out #1 and #7 (in other words, the top 2-6). The latest information was gathered from the Wasatch Compensation Group for this comparison, and Summit and Wasatch Counties were added to the list. It should be noted that some cities are not diligent in updating compensation data for elected positions in the Wasatch Comp Group database, and staff did not have time to call each entity to verify data. Council and Mayor compensation would be set at a zero percent variance from the market. For the City Manager and City Attorney, the existing 2009 data was used and compensation was calculated at 5% below the average of the top 5.

Potential Market Adjustments for Elected & Appointed Officials

	Current Salary	Proposed Salary*	% Increase	Market Variance
Mayor	$23,007	$23,069	0.3%	0%
City Council	$11,633	$14,974	28.7%	0%
City Manager	$135,980	$141,415	4.0%	-5%
City Attorney	$132,131	$136,225	3.1%	-5%

* Consistent with prior Council direction, the market for elected officials set at average of top 2-6 based on 2011 data. Market for appointed officials set at 5% below average oftop 5 based on 2009 data.

There are a few ways to look at potential raises. First, Council could use the average of the top five comparison cities, which is the standard that was used when market pay increases were last implemented for staff. Council could also use the average of the top seven less numbers one and seven (or in other words, the average of the top 2 through 6), which is Council's current direction for staff. Additionally, Council could set pay at market (or a 0% difference from either the average of the top 5 or top 2-6) or they could choose to set pay at 5% below market, which is the threshold for reclassification used when benchmarking for staff. They may also choose to use the 2009 benchmarking data or the updated 2011 data. Potential raises based on each of these varying criteria are attached to this report.

In addition to any potential market increase that Council may elect to implement, staff will add $240 to Council and Mayor compensation to cover tax liability related to the taxable value of the iPad that each elected official received in May 2011. This amount was calculated by figuring out the gross pay that would be necessary to achieve net pay of $760 (which is the approximate value of the iPad). However, as state and federal income tax differs from Council member to Council member, staff used the highest tax liability which is about $240.

An ordinance establishing compensation for the Mayor, City Council, and statutory officers must be adopted according to state statute each year. Following direction from Council on June 9, staff will prepare an ordinance for adoption on June 16.

Department Review:
This report has been reviewed by the Budget, Legal, and City Manager departments.

Alternatives:

A. Approve:

1. **Staff recommends that Council hold a public hearing regarding the Proposed Budget and provide direction on outstanding budget issues;**
2. **Adopt the Fee Resolution;**
3. **Give direction to staff regarding desired changes to the budget to be made before Final Adoption.**

B. Deny:
State statute requires at least one public hearing before the adoption of a Final Budget. The City has traditionally held a public hearing accompanying each discussion of the budget. If Council decides to forgo a public hearing at this time, another must be held before adoption of the Final Budget.

C. Modify:

D. Continue the Item:
This has the same effect as Alternative B.

E. Do Nothing:
This also has the same effect as Alternative B.

Significant Impacts:

This public hearing would satisfy the requirements of state statute to hold a public hearing before the adoption of a final budget.

Consequences of not taking the recommended action:
If Council decides to forgo a public hearing at this time, another must be held before adoption of the Final Budget.

Recommendation:
Hold a public hearing on the City Manager Recommended Budget. Provide direction concerning outstanding budget issues.

Attachments:

A – Fee Resolution with excerpts showing changes to Fees Schedule
B – Purchasing Policy
C – Council & Appointed Officers Compensation Benchmarks
D – Water Fund CIP Budget Table

Resolution No.

A RESOLUTION AMENDING SECTION 1, CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT RELATED FEES; SECTION 2, WATER FEES; SECTION 8, RECREATION SERVICES AND FACILITY RENTAL FEES; SECTION 9, ICE ARENA AND FIELDS RENTAL FEE SCHEDULE AND REPLACING AND REPEALING RESOLUTION NO. 13-10 IN ITS ENTIRETY

WHEREAS it is necessary to update the fee resolution to reflect the changing costs of performing services; and

WHEREAS, a public hearing was held on June 9, 2011, to receive public comments on the user fee increases,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Park City, Utah, as follows:

SECTION 1. FEE SCHEDULE AMENDMENTS. The Park City Fee Schedule is hereby re-adopted with changes as outlined in Exhibit A

SECTION 2. EFFECTIVE DATE. This resolution shall take effect upon adoption.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 9th day of June, 2011.

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

____
Mayor Dana Williams

Attest:

____
Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

Approve as to form:

____
Mark D. Harrington, City Attorney

PARK CITY FEE SCHEDULE (REVISED JUNE 9, 2011)
SECTION 1. CONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT RELATED FEES

1.1 PLANNING FEES

1.1.1 Plat/Subdivision *

Plat Amendment	$750	~~$600~~ per application
Subdivision	$250	~~$220~~ per lot/parcel
Administrative lot line adjustment		$300 per application
Extension of Approval	$300	~~$280~~ per application

Condominium

Condominium or timeshare conversion		$450 per unit
Record of Survey		$450 per unit
Amendment to Record of Survey		$100 per unit affected
Extension of Approval	$300	~~$280~~ per application

1.1.2 Master Planned Development (MPD) Process *

Pre-Master Planned Development $1,000 ~~$810~~

Application includes one formal staff review and Planning Commission review of compliance with General Plan that includes a public hearing. If applicant files for formal Master Planned Development the $1,000 ~~$810~~ will apply toward the application fee.

Master Planned Development	$500	~~$450~~ per unit equivalent
Modification to an MPD	$300	~~$280~~ per unit equivalent

1.1.3 Conditional Use Permit (CUP) *

Planning Commission Review	$1,000	~~$860~~ per application
Steep Slope Review	$1,000	~~$680~~ per application
Administrative Staff Review	$250	~~$180~~ per application
Extension or Modification	$300	~~$280~~ per application

1.1.4 Zone Changes * $1,500 ~~$1,380~~

1.1.5 Board of Adjustment *

Special Exception	$750	~~$560~~ per application
Variance	$750	~~$560~~ per application

1.1.6 Architectural and Design Review

Historic District/Site

New residential construction <1000 sf	$200	~~$190~~ per application
New residential construction >=1000 sf	$750	~~$480~~ per application
Commercial review		$200 per unit equivalent for the first 10 units $15/ue after

Non-Historic District/Site

New Residential - SF/Duplex	$200 per application
Multi-Family/Commercial	$100 per unit equivalent up to 10 units then $15/ue after
Residential Additions	$100 per application
Commercial Additions	$100 per unit equivalent up to 10 units then $15/ue after

1.1.7 Historic Review *

Historic Design Review < ~~>~~1000 sf $200 ~~$190~~

Historic Design Review >= ~~=<~~ 1000 sf $750 ~~$480~~
Determination of Significance $300 ~~$250~~
Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition $300

1.1.8 Land Management Code Review * $2,000 per application

1.1.9 General Plan Amendment * $2,000 per application

1.1.10 Sign Review
Master Sign Plan Review $250 ~~$180~~
Amendment to Master Sign Plan $100 ~~$80~~
Individual sign permit $100 ($99.00 ~~$80 ($79.21~~ plus 1% state tax)
Sign permit under master sign plan $100 ($99.00 ~~$70 ($69.30~~ plus 1% state
Temporary Sign Permit $50 ($49.50 ~~$30 ($29.70~~ plus 1% state tax)

1.1.11 Annexation * $5,000 ~~$4,150~~
Annexation Fiscal Impact Analysis $1,550
plus actual cost of City approved consultant fee
Modification to Annexation Agreement $4,150

1.1.12 Appeals Fees *
Appeals to Board of Adjustment $500 ~~$450~~
Appeals to City Council $500 ~~$450~~
Appeals to Historic Preservation Board $500 ~~$300~~
Appeals to Planning Commission $500 ~~$300~~

1.1.13 TDR – Development Credit Determination $100

1.1.14 ~~3~~ Refund of Withdrawn Planning Applications
In the case of a withdrawal of an application, the associated fees shall be refunded, less the actual cost for professional services rendered by City staff.

1.1.15 ~~4~~ Reactivation Fee
For projects that have been inactive by the applicant for more than six months a Reactivation Fee of 50% of orig. application fee will be assessed

1.1.16 ~~5~~ Attorney or Other Professional Services
Reimbursement for actual expense incurred

* Projects under these classifications will be assessed the additional cost of the property posting and courtesy mailing as required by Land Management Code regulations at the time of submittal.

1.2 BUILDING FEES

1.2.1 Impact Fee Schedule Impact fees are now located in the Park City Municipal Code, Title 11, Chapter 13.

1.2.2 Building Permit

Total Valuation Free

$1 and up	3/4 of 1% (.75%) of the total valuation of construction as herein above described with a minimum fee of $15. Any additional fees will be as otherwise outlined in Section 304 and Table 3A of the Uniform Building Code.

1.2.3 Plan Check Fees

a. Deposit. On buildings requiring plan checks at the time of building permit application, the applicant shall pay a deposit of $500.00 for buildings up to three units or 3,000 square feet of commercial area; $1,000.00 for buildings up to six units or 6000 square feet of commercial area; and $2,000.00 for buildings exceeding six units or 6,000 square feet of commercial area. The deposit shall be credited against the plan check fee when the permit is issued. This deposit is non-refundable in the event permits are not issued.

b. Fee. Except as otherwise provided herein, the plan check fee shall be equal to sixty-five percent (65.0%) of the building permit fee for that building. The plan check fee for identical plans shall be charged at a rate of $54.26 per hour of total Community Development staff time. As used herein, Aidentical plans@ means building plans submitted to Park City that: (1) are substantially identical to building plans that were previously submitted to and reviewed and approved by Park City; and (2) describe a building that is: (A) located on land zoned the same as the land on which the building described in the previously approved plans is located; and (B) subject to the same geological and meteorological conditions and the same law as the building described in the previously approved plans.

1.2.4 Mechanical Permit Issuance Fee	$20.00
In Addition:	
Furnace	$15.00
Suspended Heater & Vent	$15.00
Wall Heater & Vent	$15.00
Floor-Mounted Heater & Vent	$15.00
Air Conditioner	$15.00
Boiler or Compressor 0-100,000BTU	$15.00
101,000 BTU to 500,000 BTU	$20.00
501-000 BTU to 1,000,000 BTU	$25.00
1,001,000 BTU to 1,750,000 BTU	$40.00
Over 1,750,000 BTU	$60.00
Air Handling Unit	$15.00
Humidifier	$15.00
Vent Fan	$5.00
Vent System	$10.00
Hood Exhaust	$25.00
Fireplace inserts	$15.00
Radiant heat tube	$20.00
Gas pipe systems	$15.00
Others not listed	$15.00
Plus 1% State Surcharge	

1.2.5 Electrical Permit issuance fee	$20.00
In Addition:	
Residential new and addition	$.04 per
square ft	

Residential and Commercial

Remodel or Service Change	$30.00
Temporary Power: on pole or underground	$30.00
Hot tubs	$20.00
Heat tape	$30.00

Commercial

Total Service	$30.00 for first 100 Amps $10.00 for each adl. 100 Amps
Sub or Branch Circuits	
0-30	$2.00
31-60 Amps	$3.00
61-100 Amps	$4.00
Plus 1% State Surcharge	

1.2.6 Plumbing Permit Issuance Fee	$20.00
In Addition:	
For each plumbing fixture or trap on set of fixtures on one trap (including water, drainage piping and backflow protection therefore)	$7.00
For each water heater and/or vent	$10.00
For installation, alternation, or repair of water piping and/or water treating equipment	$10.00
For repair or alteration of drainage or vent piping	$10.00
For each lawn sprinkler system on any one meter, including backflow protection devices therefore	$15.00
For vacuum breakers or backflow protective devices vats, etc. or for installation on unprotected plumbing fixtures	$7.00
For each gas piping system	$15.00
Others not listed	$15.00
Plus 1% State Surcharge	

1.2.7 Uniform Fire Code Fee Issuance Fee	$20.00
In Addition:	
Aircraft Refueling Vehicles	$30.00
Bonfires or Rubbish Fires	$10.00
Burning in Public Places	$10.00
Candles and Open Flames in Assembly Area	$15.00
Excavations Near Flammable or Combustible Liquid Pipelines	$15.00
Explosives or Blasting Agents	$150.00
Fireworks	$120.00
Flammable Liquids	$15.00
Flammable or Combustible Liquid Tanks	$15.00
Garages	$15.00
Liquefied Petroleum Gases	$15.00
Places of Assembly	$15.00
Others not listed	$15.00

Tents, air-supported structures and trailers $.20 per square foot
Temporary structures built to permanent standards will be subject to fees set forth in Section 1.2.2.

For plans already on file and approved, the fee will be reduced to $.13 per square foot

1.2.8 Grading Plan Review and Permit Fees

See attached appendix of fees as adopted by the Uniform Building Code Table No. 70-A and 70-B, adopted by Park City and incorporated herein by this reference.

1.2.9 Soil Sample Fee $100

1.2.10 Other Inspections and Fees

Inspections outside normal business hours*	$75 per hour (minimum charge 2 hours)
Re-inspection fee	$75 per hour (minimum charge 1 hour)
Additional inspection services*	$75 per hour (minimum charge 1 hour)
For use of outside consultants for plan reviews, inspections or both	Actual cost**

* Or the total hourly cost to the City, whichever is greatest. This cost shall include supervision, overhead, equipment, hourly wages and fringe benefits of the employee involved. These services will be offered based on inspector availability.

** Actual Cost includes administrative and overhead costs.

1.3 ENGINEERING FEES

1.3.1 Construction Inspection Fees. Prior to receiving a building permit, a notice to proceed or plat approval, developers shall pay a fee equal to six percent (6%) of the estimated construction cost as determined by the City Engineer. In projects with private street systems that limit city inspection requirements to water, drainage, and other improvements, but not to streets, the inspection fee shall be four percent (4%) of the estimated construction cost of the improvements to be inspected as determined by the City Engineer. The city, upon notice to the developer, may charge the developer a fee of $75 per man-hour to recoup costs to the city above the fee charged. The city may also charge $75 per man-hour for re-inspections of work previously rejected.

1.3.2 Permit to Work in Public Right-of-Way

$200 fee plus $2,000 letter of credit or cashier's check plus proof of insurance

1.4 ADMINISTRATIVE CODE ENFORCEMENT (ACE) FEES

1.4.1 Civil Fee Schedule

Daily Violation Fee	$25
Minimum Fee for Noncompliance	$50
Maximum Fee for Daily Violations	$2,000
Re-inspection Fee	$75
Reoccurrence Fee	$250
Hearing Request Fee	$100
Late Payment Fee	$100

SECTION 2. WATER FEES

2.1 WATER IMPACT FEES. Water Impact Fees are located in the Park City Municipal Code, Title 11, Section 13.

2.2 MONTHLY WATER METERED SERVICES FEE SCHEDULE:

2.2.1 Base Rates (For all water billed on or after July 1, 201~~0~~1).

Individually Metered Residential (single-family, condo, townhouse)

Meter size	Monthly Base/ Demand Charge	Meter Price
5/8 x 3/4"	$28.26 ~~$25.23~~	$372 ~~$332~~
1"	$38.15 ~~$34.06~~	$451 ~~$403~~
1-1/2"	$45.24 ~~$40.39~~	$708 ~~$632~~

Other than Individually metered Residential (Multi-Family, Commercial, Irrigation)

Meter Size	Monthly Base/ Demand Charge	Meter Price
3/4"	$36.74 ~~$32.80~~	$529 ~~$472~~
1"	$62.16 ~~$55.50~~	$608 ~~$543~~
1 2"	$132.79 ~~$118.56~~	$865 ~~$772~~
2"	$276.91 ~~$247.24~~	$1,530 ~~$1,366~~
3"	$720.59 ~~$643.38~~	$1,810 ~~$1,616~~
4"	$1,308.32 ~~$1,168.14~~	$3,154 ~~$2,816~~
6"	$2,466.87 ~~$2,202.56~~	$4,907 ~~$4,381~~
8"	$4,247.11 ~~$3,792.06~~	$7,370 ~~$6,580~~
Construction Meter	$164.23 ~~$146.63~~	
Indigent Rate*	$2.24 ~~$2~~	

*Indigent Rate includes 10,000 gallons. Water consumption greater than 10,000 gallons is charged per the normal block structure presented in paragraph 2.2.3.

2.2.2 Water Consumption Rates. All water delivered through each meter, excepting commercial meters, between November 1 and May 31 of each year shall be charged at the rate of $4.95 ~~$4.42~~ per thousand gallons. All water delivered through commercial meters shall be charged per Paragraph 2.2.3 year-round.

2.2.3 Water Conservation Rates (For all water billed on or after July 1st, 201~~0~~1). All water delivered through each meter serving single family residential, multi-family residential, commercial and landscape irrigation customers per month between June 1 and September 30 of each year shall be billed at the following rates:

Type	**Block 1 $3.52 ~~$3.14~~ per 1,000 gals**	**Block 2 $5.64 ~~$5.04~~ per 1,000 gals**	**Block 3 $917 ~~$8.19~~ per 1,000 gals**	**Block 4 $14.12 ~~$12.61~~ per 1,000 gals**
Single Family	0-5,000	5,001 - 30,000	30,001 - 80,000	Over 80,000
Multi-Family				
3/4"	0-10,000	10,001-36,000	36,001-80,000	Over 80,000

1"	0-17,000	17,001-57,000	57,001-120,000	Over 120,000
1.5"	0-30,000	30,001-100,000	100,001-200,000	Over 200,000
2"	0-48,000	48,001-160,000	160,001-320,000	Over 320,000
3"	0-96,000	96,001-320,000	320,001-640,000	Over 640,000
4"	0-150,000	150,001-500,000	500,001-1,000,000	Over 1,000,000
6"	0-180,000	180,001-600,000	600,001-1,200,000	Over 1,200,000
Irrigation				
3/4"		0-56,000	Over 56,000	
1"		0-90,000	Over 90,000	
1.5"		0-185,000	Over 185,000	
2"		0-300,000	Over 300,000	
3"		0-600,000	Over 600,000	
4"		0-935,000	Over 935,000	
6"		0-1,865,000	Over 1,865,000	
Commercial Year round		**$4.95 ~~$4.42~~ per 1,000 gals**	**$7.66 ~~$6.84~~ per 1,000 gals**	
3/4"		0-150,000	Over 150,000	
1"		0-300,000	Over 300,000	
1.5"		0-500,000	Over 500,000	
2"		0-750,000	Over 750,000	
3"		0-1,200,000	Over 1,200,000	
4"		0-1,700,000	Over 1,700,000	
6"		0-1,700,000	Over 1,700,000	
All users except construction between November & May	$4.95 ~~$4.42~~ per thousand gals			
Construction Water	$164.23 ~~$146.63~~ Monthly Base Chg.	$6.51 ~~$5.81~~ per thousand gals.		

2.3 WATER VIOLATION PENALTIES

$150.00	first violation
200.00	second violation
400.00	third violation
500.00	fourth violation
750.00	for the fifth violation and for each subsequent violation within that calendar year.

2.4 WATER SERVICE REINSTATEMENT FEE

$100 fee for meter shut off because of non-payment of account.

2.5	**WATER METER TESTING FEE**	$100 per test
2.6	**WATER LABOR RATE**	50 per Hour
2.7	**WATER PARTS & SUPPLIES RATE**	Cost + 15% stocking fee
2.8	**FIRE HYDRANT METER DEPOSIT FEE**	$1,050
	Fire hydrant wrench deposit fee	$50

SECTION 8. RECREATION SERVICES AND FACILITY RENTAL FEES

8.1 PURPOSE AND PHILOSOPHY. Recreation Services, the Parks Department, Miners Hospital Community Center and the Library are supported primarily by tax dollars through the City's General Fund. The Golf Course has been established as an enterprise fund and should be primarily supported by revenues other than taxes. This policy applies to Recreation Services and the Golf Course Enterprise fund.

The purpose of this section is to establish a level of operations and maintenance cost recovery for programs, activities and facilities, and direction for establishing fees and charges for the use of and/or participation in the programs, activities and facilities offered by the Recreation Services, Golf Course, Library, and Miners Hospital Community Center.

It is the intent of the City to offer its Recreation Services programs, activities and facilities to the entire community. To help offset the cost of providing these services, and since the primary beneficiaries of these services are users, it is appropriate to charge fees that are adequate to fund operation of the facility in line with other like programs.

8.2 COST RECOVERY. It is the intent of the City to recover roughly 70% ~~80%~~ of the operations and maintenance expenses incurred by the Recreation Department and the Recreation Center ~~Racquet Club~~ and 100% of the operations and maintenance expenses incurred by the Golf Course through sources of revenue other than taxes. The City's cost recovery plan is described in detail in the City's budget document. User fees should not be considered the only source for accomplishing this objective. Revenues may also include:

Increases in program participation.

- Fees charged for non-recreational use of facilities (conventions/special events)
- Rental income
- New programs or activities
- Private sponsorship of programs or activities
- Public agency grants or contributions.

8.3. ESTABLISHING USER FEES. Fees shall be set at a level which ensures program quality and meets the objectives of the City Council.

8.3.1 Area Resident Discount Those people whose primary residence is within the Park City School District limits; are currently paying property tax within Park City School District limits; or are holding a valid Park City business license and leasing or renting office space within Park City are entitled to receive a discount on user fees for the

Recreation Center and Golf Course. ~~obtain a recreation or county card. This allows the holder to receive a discount on user fees for the Racquet Club and Golf Course.~~

8.3.2 Recreation Program Fees The Recreation Department, the Recreation Center ~~Racquet Club~~ and the Golf Course offer a variety of organized programs and activities. Due to the fluctuations in the number of participants and frequent changes in circumstances, program fees are established on a program-by-program basis by dividing the number of projected participants by the estimated program costs. Fees are then published in the Recreation Services annual brochure (PLAY Magazine). In most cases, fees will be kept commensurate with fees charged by others providing like service.

8.3.3 Fees for Non-Recreational Activities at the Recreation Center ~~Racquet Club~~ The fees charged for non-recreational or special event use will be competitive with the marketplace providing the fees cover a minimum of: a) the costs involved in the production of the event; and b) recovery of lost revenue.

The Recreation Center ~~Racquet Club~~ facility is principally for recreation. Non-recreation activities usually will be charged up to fifty percent (50%) more than the minimum. No fee waivers for non-recreational or special event use will be permitted. However, the City Council may authorize the City to pay all or a portion of the fee in accordance with the master festival ordinance provisions.

8.3.4 Fee Increases Recommendations for fee increases may be made on an annual basis. The City will pursue frequent small increases as opposed to infrequent large ones. Staff will be required to provide an annual review and analysis of the financial posture of the Golf Course Fund along with justification for any recommended increase. When establishing fees, the City will consider rates charged by other public and private providers as well as the ability of the users to pay.
To establish and maintain the Council's objective of 70% ~~80%~~ cost recovery, the City Manager will have the authority to annually increase fees up to $.50 or 10%, whichever is greater. Any requested increase over that amount will require Council action.

Fee increases will take place only if they are necessary to achieve the City Council's objective and maintain program quality, and only with the authorization of the City Manager or the City Council.

8.3.5 Discounting Fees The Recreation Services Manager may, at their ~~his~~ discretion, discount fees when:

- Offering special promotions designed to increase use.
- Trying to fill non-prime time.
- Introducing new programs or activities.
- Playing conditions are below standard due to weather or facility disrepair.

8.3.6 Fee Waivers The City intends that no resident under 18 years old or over age 65 be denied the use of any program, activity or facility for reasons of financial hardship. The Recreation Services Manager may, at his discretion, waive all or a portion of a fee, or may arrange offsetting volunteer work for anyone demonstrating an inability to pay for services.

8.4. RECREATION CENTER ~~RACQUET CLUB~~ FEES:

~~8.4.1 Annual City Resident Recreation Card~~

~~$ 7.00 Per First card per family~~
~~7.00 Each card thereafter~~
~~7.00 Per card renewal fee~~

~~8.4.2 Annual County Resident Recreation Card~~

~~$ 7.00 First card per family~~
~~$ 7.00 Each card thereafter~~
~~$ 7.00 per card renewal fee~~

8.4. 1 ~~3~~ Recreation Center Fees ~~Racquet Club Fees~~

Punch Card Admission. For ease of administration and convenience to users, a punch card system has been established for Recreation Center ~~Racquet Club~~ programs and activities. ~~Tennis court time and drop-in use may be purchased in advance and used when needed.~~ The purchase of a punch card may result in a savings off the regular rate.

Punch Passes	**Resident**	**Visitor**
Youth (3 to 17) 10 Punch	$28	$40
Adult 10 Punch	$70	$90
Senior & Military 10 Punch	$60	$70
Tennis Lesson 10 Punch (5hrs)	$275	
Child Care 10 Punch (10 hrs)	$35	

Tennis Court Charges	Hourly Court Fees	
	Indoor	Outdoor
Resident ~~discount~~ rate	$24 ~~$22.00~~	$8 $ ~~7.00~~
Visitor ~~Regular~~ rate	$32 ~~28.00~~	$10~~.00~~

~~Drop-in Fees: Drop-in activities fall into two categories - those with instructors, and those without.~~

~~Instructed classes~~
~~Resident discount rate $8.00~~

~~Regular rate $10.00~~

Other Tennis Fees ~~lessons~~

Private Lesson 1 Hr	$70.00 ~~$61.00~~
Private Lesson 1/2 Hr	$32.00
Semi Private Lesson 1 Hr	$64.00
Group of 3	$66.00
Group of 4	$70.00
Hitting Lesson	$50.00
Clinic Drop-in Fee	$20.00
Ball Machine	$9.00
Tennis Courts Non Athletic (Daily)	$3,000

~~Facility use~~
~~Resident discount rate $6.00~~
~~Regular rate $8.00~~
~~Resident 15 and under $2.50~~
~~Regular 15 and under $4.50~~

Daily Drop In	**Resident**	**Visitor**
Toddlers 2 & Under	Free	Free
Youth (3 to 17)	$3	$5
Adult	$7	$10
Senior 70+ & Military	$6	$7
Fitness Classes	$9	$12
Senior/Military Fitness Classes	$8	$9

~~Monthly and multiple month~~ Facility Passes: ~~Passes may include use of any or all facility classes and amenities, except tennis.~~ There are two types of facility passes one which includes all amenities except tennis and the other which includes all amenities except group fitness and tennis. Program fees are additional and are not included in pass fees.

~~Resident and county passes~~	~~Single~~	~~Couple~~
~~1 month~~	~~$54~~	~~$97~~
~~3 month pass~~	~~$145~~	~~$259~~
~~6 month pass~~	~~$259~~	~~$468~~
~~12 month pass~~	~~$455~~	~~$810~~

Individual Rate

Term	**Facility Rate**	**Class Add On**	**Total**
1 Month	$40	$20	$60
3 Month	$110	$50	$160
6 Month	$192	$80	$272
12 Month	$345	$144	$489

Senior 70+ & Military Individual Rate

Term	**Facility Rate**	**Class Add On**	**Total**
1 Month	$36	$20	$56
3 Month	$99	$50	$149
6 Month	$173	$80	$253
12 Month	$310	$144	$454

Couple Rate

Term	**Facility Rate**	**Class Add On**	**Total**
1 Month	$72	$35	$107
3 Month	$216	$90	$306
6 Month	$328	$144	$472
12 Month	$590	$260	$850

Senior 70+ & Military Couple Rate

Term	**Facility Rate**	**Class Add On**	**Total**
1 Month	$65	$35	$100
3 Month	$194	$90	$284
6 Month	$295	$144	$439
12 Month	$531	$260	$791

Tennis Passes

Single Annual $1,100

Couple Annual	$1,950
Family Annual (3 members)	$2,160
Each Additional member	$205

Gymnasium	**Hourly Resident**	**Hourly Visitor**	**Daily**
Full Gym	$65	$125	
Half Gym	$35	$75	
Non Athletic			$1,400

Other Fees ~~passes and punch cards~~

~~Children Under 3~~		~~$0~~
~~Resident 10 Punch Card~~		~~$60.00~~
Visitor 10 Punch Card	$90	~~$80.00~~
I Month Visitor Pass	$90	~~$80.00~~
Family Swim Pass		$247.50
Child Care Per Hr	$4	~~$3.50~~
Personal Training 1 Hour		$50
Personal Training Punch Card (12 visits)	$500	$480.00
Couple Personal Training Punch Card (12 visits)		$699
Birthday Party		$150
Party Room per hour		$50
~~Lesson Punch Card~~		~~$275.00~~
~~Court Time Punch Card~~		~~$223.00~~
~~Single Annual Tennis Pass~~		~~$985.00~~
~~Couple Annual Tennis Pass~~		~~$1,760.00~~
~~Family Annual Tennis Pass~~		~~$1,964.00~~
~~Single Winter Tennis Pass~~		~~$693.00~~
~~Couple Winter Tennis Pass~~		~~$1,249.00~~
~~Family Winter Tennis Pass~~		~~$1,386.00~~
~~Single Summer Tennis Pass~~		~~$347.00~~
~~Couple Summer Tennis Pass~~		~~$621.50~~
~~Family Summer Tennis Pass~~		~~$726.00~~

8.5 GOLF FEES. The Park City Municipal Golf Course is an 18 hole course and 6,743 yards in length. The fees listed below are established fees, however they may be altered for certain types of tournament play. To receive a resident discount, the recreation card (which must have a City resident designation) must be presented to the golf starter. Season passes are available only to those who possess a locals card. Playing conditions on the course may vary due to weather constraints, particularly early and late in the season. The Golf Manager may, at his discretion, discount the established fees in order to encourage use of the course when playing conditions are less than optimum.

Regular Season- Memorial Day through September
Off-Season- Pre-Memorial Day, October and November

Resident Season Pass	$990
Junior Pass	$425
Jr./Sr. Punch Pass	$275
Corporate Pass	$2,850

Resident 18 Hole	$32
Resident 18 Hole with Cart	$46
Non-Resident 18 Hole	$43

Non-Resident 18 Hole with Cart	$57
Resident 9 Hole	$16.00
Resident 9 Hole with Cart	$23.00
Non-Resident 9 Hole	$21.50
Non-Resident 9 Hole with Cart	$28.50
Resident Off-Season 18 Hole	$25
Non-Resident Off-Season 18 Hole	$28
Small Range Bucket	$3.50 ~~$3~~
Large Range Bucket	$7.00 ~~$6~~

8.6. LIBRARY FEES. The Park City Library Board routinely reviews non-resident fee options and recommends changes. Library services, which are funded by the General Fund, are provided without charge to property owners, residents, and renters within the City's boundaries. Non-resident card fees are charged to those who request borrowing privileges but live outside the City's taxing area. On September 8th, 2002, the Library Board voted to change the fee charged to some non-resident library users.

Non-Resident Card Fees

Family membership		$40.00 per year
Temporary membership (90 days)		$20.00 plus ~~$10.00 refundable deposit~~
Students residing in Summit County (ages 5-18)		Free
Organization card - non-profit	$45 per year	~~$50.00 per year~~
Organization card - for-profit	$55 per year	~~$100.00 per year~~

8.7. CEMETERY FEES. Anyone owning property, currently residing, or having resided in Park City for a period of more than ten years consecutively, is eligible to purchase cemetery property or may be buried in the Park City Cemetery. All cemetery plots will be sold on a first-come, first-served basis.

Resident	Resident Fees	Eligible Non-Resident Fees
Single adult grave	$300	$600
Single infant grave	150	300
Opening and closing adult grave	480	480
Opening and closing infant grave	360	360
Removal of adult from one grave to another within cemetery	960	960
Removal of infant from one grave to another within cemetery	720	720
Removal of adult for interment outside cemetery	480	480
Removal of infant for interment outside cemetery	360	360
Schil for flower beds/grave	N/A	N/A
Additional charge for after hour burials including		

Saturdays, holidays, weekends	200	300
Interment of cremated remains	70	140
Monument grave marker maintenance	100	100

8.7.1.<u>Cemetery Fee Waivers.</u> Any or all of the fees associated with the operation of the Park City Cemetery may be waived by the Cemetery Sexton. Grave sites, located in the "veterans section" for Park City veterans, firemen and police officers will be provided free of charge, as well as fees for cemetery services. Family members wishing to be buried in this section of the cemetery will be charged for lots and services.

8.8. PARK PAVILLION RENTAL FEES. It is not mandatory that a fee be paid for the use of a park pavilion. However, those persons having reserved a pavilion and paid the reservation fee shall have the exclusive use to use that pavilion over others. Reservation fees for park pavilion use are as follows:

<u>Rotary and South-End of City Park Pavilions</u>	<u>Half Day</u>	<u>Full Day</u>
Residents within Park City School District	$ 50	$ 85
Non-residents/commercial +$100 refundable cleaning deposit	125+	200+

8.9. MINERS HOSPITAL COMMUNITY CENTER FEES. This facility is located at 1354 Park Avenue. Reservation fees for use of the Miners Hospital Community Center are as follows:

<u>Function/Use</u>	Park City/Snyderville Basin Resident or <u>Non-Profit Commercial</u>	Non-Resident or <u>Non-</u> <u>Profit/Commercial</u>
Single level:		
Hourly:		
First/additional up to 3 hours	$15/$10	$25/$15
Half day (4 hours.)**	$40	$60
Whole day (8 hours)***	$75	$110
Entire building:		
Two hours minimum	$60	$110
Half day**	$100	$175
Whole Day (8 a.m. to 5 p.m.)**	$25	$200
Special events (weddings, receptions, etc.)***	$400	$550

Park City/Snyderville non-profit groups will receive 12 free rentals per year, after which time the standard rate applies.

<u>Cancellation Policies for entire building reservations:</u>

For two hour reservations, a $25 handling fee will be charged for cancellations received less than one week prior to rental.

For half-day reservations, a $50 handling fee will be charged for cancellations received less than two weeks prior to rental.

For whole day reservations, a $75 handling fee will be charged for cancellations received less than two weeks prior to rental.

Notes:

*Snyderville Basin and Park City residents and groups were formerly charged two separate rates. Those groups have now been combined.

**a $50 damage/cleaning deposit is required on all whole day rentals, refundable if the facility is left in satisfactory condition; full payment of all fees is due two weeks prior to the facility rental.

***a $300 damage/cleaning deposit is required on all special events rentals, $275 is refundable if the facility is left in satisfactory condition; full payment of all fees for special events is due 30 days prior to the date of the event.

Snyderville Basin Resident is defined as a resident or business that is located within the boundaries of the Park City School District and Park City Fire Service District.

Commercial is defined as any use of the facility wherein participants are charged fees for profit.

8.10. PARK CITY LIBRARY & EDUCATION CENTER AUDITORIUM RENTAL RATES

This facility is located at 1255 Park Avenue. The rates for this facility are as follows:

Number of Patrons	5 Hours (or less)	Per Day	Refundable Deposit
Fewer than 50	$ 50	$100	$100
50 -100	75	150	150
100 - 150	150	300	300
150 - 250	250	500	500
More than 250	500	1,000	1,000

Notes:

1. Advance reservations and standard lease agreement required, tenants included.
2. Events without admission or fee or non-profit groups are eligible for 50% rate reduction.

3. Tenants of the Park City Library and Education Center are eligible or a 50% rate reduction.
4. Multi-day events (more than three days) are eligible for a 25% rate reduction.
5. Special parking arrangements may be required for events for more than 250 participants and guests.

6. All rates are subject to change without notice.
7. All fees are to be paid in advance.
8. Only one rate reduction may apply to any group or user (the largest allowable reduction will apply).
9. City reserves the right to change fees, especially in the case of commercial enterprises.
10. These rates apply to Auditorium rental only; rental rates for film equipment are calculated separately.

SECTION 9. ICE ARENA AND FIELDS RENTAL FEE SCHEDULE.

9.1. Establishing User Fees. Fees shall be set at a level which ensures program quality and meets the objectives of the City Council. Area rates apply to residents of Park City, Summit County and Wasatch County. Outside rates apply to requests outside Summit and Wasatch Counties.

Admission Fees	Local Area Rates		Outside Area Rates	
Youth = 6 -17 year olds; Adult = 18 and over				
Public Skate – 5 & under		Free		Free
Public skate – youth/senior	$6.00	~~$ 5.50~~	$9.50	~~$ 9.25~~
Public skate – adult	6.50	~~6.00~~		10.00
Cheap Skate (includes skate rental)	6.00	~~7.00~~		9.00
Group Rates (20+) includes admissions & skates	6.00	~~5.50~~	10.50	~~9.50~~
Skate rental	3.50	~~3.00~~	3.50	~~3.00~~
Drop-in hockey - youth	7.50	~~7.00~~	10.50	~~10.00~~
Drop-in hockey - adult	10.00	~~9.50~~	13.00	~~12.50~~
Stick & Puck - youth	7.50	~~7.00~~	10.50	~~10.00~~
Stick & Puck - adult	10.00	~~9.50~~	13.00	~~12.50~~
Skills & Drills - youth		10.00		13.00
Skills & Drills- adult		12.50		15.50
Coached Drop-in Hockey – adult		12.50		16.00
Drop-in Speed Skating – youth	8.50	~~7.00~~	10.50	~~10.00~~
Drop-in Speed Skating – adult		9.50	13.00	12.50
Freestyle – all	7.50	~~7.00~~	11.50	~~10.00~~
Drop-in curling	11.50	~~11.00~~	14.50	~~14.00~~

10 Session Punch Cards will be sold to locals only - $1.50 ~~$1~~ off each session or $15 ~~$10~~ off in total.

Admission Passes (10 admissions)	Local Area Rates	Outside Area Rates
Public Skate – youth/senior	$45	N/A
Public Skate – adult	50	N/A
Drop-in Hockey - youth	60	N/A
Drop-in Hockey – adult	85	N/A
Stick and Puck – youth	60	N/A
Stick and Puck – adult	85	N/A
Skills and Drills – youth	90	N/A
Skills and Drills – adult	115	N/A
Freestyle	60	N/A
Drop-in Speedskating – youth	60	N/A
Drop-in Speedskating – adult	85	N/A
Off-ice conditioning – 5 punch	55	N/A

Off-ice conditioning – 10 punch		100	N/A

Hourly Ice

User Groups*/Employees	$180	~~$175~~
Locals / Businesses	200	~~195~~
For-profit	260	~~255~~

*User Groups are defined as local, organized programs who rent weekly ice from the arena (minimum 25 hours per season).

Season Passes (11 month season)

Family (4)*	$500
Additional Family Member	$50 per person
Adult	$250
Youth (6-17 year olds/Senior +55 years)	$180

Equipment (per hour)

Broomball	$25.00
Curling (2 hour minimum)	$50.00

Skate Services

Hockey Skate Sharpening	
24 Hours	$5.00
Immediate	$8.00
Goalie Skate Sharpening	
24 Hours	$6.00
Immediate	$9.00
Figure Skate Sharpening	
24 Hours	$7.00
Immediate	$10.00
Custom Radius	$20.00
Figure Skate Sealing	$30.00
Rivets Replacements	$2.00 (ea.)
Blade Holder Replacements	varies with skate and blade type
Figure Skate Blade Mounting	$10.00

Room Rental

Multi-purpose Rooms	$40/hr (ea.)

User Groups can use the Upper Level Meeting Room for monthly board meetings at no cost, but rooms must be booked in advance.

Gate Fees

The Park city Ice Arena will take 25% of any gate fees collected for an event.

Vendor Fees

The Park City Ice Arena will take 10% of gross sales for any food, beverage, or merchandise sold.

Advertising Fees and Sponsorship Fees

Dasher Board Ads	West Wall	$1,500 (136.36/mo.)
	East Wall	$725 (65.91/mo.)
In Ice Ads $25/sq. foot		$2,000 (182.82/mo.)

Speed Skating Pad Pockets	$150 (13.64/mo.)
North Wall Banners	$1,100 (100/mo.)
Score Clock Banner	$2,500 (227.27/mo.)
Glass Decals	$400 (36.36/mo.)
Program Sponsorship	$1,000
Information Screen	$150 (per month)
Scoreboard Screen	$150 (per month)

Note: All user groups will receive a free dasher board ad on the east side to promote their activity. They can sell the ad, acknowledge their sponsors or promote their program.

9.2. <u>Recreation Program Fees</u> The Park City Ice Arena offers a variety of organized programs and activities. Due to the fluctuations in the number of participants and frequent changes in circumstances, program fees are established on a program-by-program basis by dividing the number of projected participants by the estimated program costs. Fees are then published in the Recreation Services annual brochure. In most cases, fees will be kept commensurate with fees charged by others providing like service.

9.3. <u>Fees for Non-Recreational Activities at the Ice Arena Facility</u> The fees charged for non-recreational or special event use will be competitive with the marketplace providing the fees cover a minimum of: a) the costs involved in the production of the event; and b) recovery of lost revenue.

The Park City Ice Arena is principally for recreation. Non-recreation activities usually will be charged up to fifty percent (50%) more than the minimum. No fee waivers for non-recreational or special event use will be permitted. However, the City Council may authorize the City to pay all or a portion of the fee in accordance with the master festival ordinance provisions.

9.4. <u>Fee Increases</u> Recommendations for fee increases may be made on an annual basis. The City will pursue frequent small increases as opposed to infrequent large ones. Staff will be required to provide an annual review and analysis of the financial posture of the Ice Arena Fund along with justification for any recommended increase. When establishing fees, the City will consider rates charged by other public and private providers as well as the ability of the users to pay.

The City Manager will have the authority to annually increase fees up to $.50 or 10%, whichever is greater. Any requested increase over that amount will require Council action. Fee increases will take place only if they are necessary to achieve the City Council's objective and maintain program quality, and only with the authorization of the City Manager or the City Council.

9.5. <u>Discounting Fees</u> The Ice Arena Manager may discount fees when:

1. Offering special promotions designed to increase use.
2. Trying to fill non-prime time.
3. Introducing new programs or activities.
4. Playing conditions are below standard due to weather or facility disrepair.

9.6. <u>Fee Waivers</u>. The City intends that no resident under 18 years old or over age 65 be denied the use of any program, activity or facility for reasons of financial hardship. The Ice Arena Manager may, at his discretion, waive all or a portion of a fee, or may arrange offsetting volunteer work for anyone demonstrating an inability to pay for services.

9.7 **Establishing User Fees:** Fees shall be set at a level which ensures field quality and meets the objectives of the City Council. Resident rates apply to residents of Park City School District. Visitor rates apply to requests outside of the Park City School District Boundaries. In order to receive the resident rate a minimum of 75% of the participants must be residents of the Park City School District.

					FULL COMPLEX RATES	
	FULL DAY VISITOR	**FULL DAY RESIDENT**	**HR/FIELD VISITOR**	**HR/FIELD RESIDENT**	**VISITOR TOTAL**	**RESIDENT TOTAL**
PCSC Stadium SB	$500 ~~$400~~	– $200 ~~$300~~	$100 ~~$75~~	$50	-	-
PCSC Stadium SOC	$500 ~~$400~~	$200 ~~$300~~	$100 ~~$75~~	$50	-	-
PCSC multipurpose	$375 ~~$350~~	$100 ~~$250~~	- $75 ~~$60~~	$40	**$1,600**	**$1,000**
PCSC Sportexe	$1,000	$500	$200	$100	-	-
	-	-	-	-	-	-
PCHS BB	$375 ~~$350~~	$100 ~~$250~~	- $75~~$60~~	$40		
PCHS SB	$375 ~~$350~~	$100 ~~$250~~	$75 ~~$60~~	$40		
PCHS LL	$375 ~~$350~~	$100 ~~$250~~	$75 ~~$60~~	$40	**$800**	**$575**
North 40 North	$375 ~~$350~~	$250	$75~~$60~~	$40	-	-
North 40 South	$375 ~~$300~~	$250 ~~$200~~	$75 ~~$45~~	$40 ~~$35~~	-	-
	-	-	-	-	**$500**	**$350**
	-	-	-	-	-	-
City Park	$375 ~~$350~~	$250	$75 ~~$60~~	$40	**$350**	**$250**
	-	-	-	-	-	-
PCHS Dozier	$1,000	$500	~~$200~~	~~$100~~	~~**$1,000**~~	~~**$500**~~
~~Dozier w/gate~~	~~add'l $200~~	~~add'l $200~~	~~add'l $$25/hr~~	~~add'l $25/hr~~	~~add'l $200~~	~~add'l $200~~
TMIS	$375	$100	$75	$40	-	-
~~TMIS Pony~~	~~$300~~	~~$200~~	~~$45~~	~~$35~~	-	-
~~TMIS LL1~~	~~$300~~	~~$200~~	~~$45~~	~~$35~~	**$675**	**$450**
~~TMIS LL2~~ Stakeholder Fee	~~$300~~	~~$200~~	~~$45~~	~~$35~~	-	$200 per team per season

Additional Restroom Cleaning	$30 per clean
Additional Field Prep (Softball/Baseball)	$75 per field
Special Field Prep (Low grass Cut)	$1,000 per field
Field Set Up (Lacrosse, Soccer, Football)	$200 per field
Lights - PCSC & City Park	$20 per hr

SECTION 10. MISCELLANEOUS FEES

10.1	Fee for in lieu of providing public parking	$14,000 per stall
10.2	Returned Check Charge:	$25.00
10.3	News Rack Application and Permit	$50 per application $75 per three-year permit

PART II - CONTRACTING AND PURCHASING POLICY

A. Purpose

These rules are intended to provide a systematic and uniform method of purchasing goods and services for the City. The purpose of these rules is to ensure that purchases made and services contracted are in the best interest of the public and acquired in a cost-effective manner.

Authority of Manager: The City Manager or designate shall be responsible for the following:

1. Ensure all purchases for services comply with these rules;
2. Review and approve all purchases of the City;
3. Establish and amend procedures for the efficient and economical management of the contracting and purchasing functions authorized by these rules. Such procedures shall be in writing and on file in the office of the manager as a public record;
4. Maintain accurate and sufficient records concerning all City purchases and contracts for services;
5. Maintain a list of contractors for public improvements and personal services who have made themselves known to the City and are interested in soliciting City business;
6. Make recommendations to the City Council concerning amendments to these rules.

B. *Definitions*

Building Improvement: The construction or repair of a public building or structure (Utah Code 11-39-101).

City: Park City Municipal Corporation and all other reporting entities controlled by or dependent upon the City's governing body, the City Council.

Contract: An agreement for the continuous delivery of goods and/or services over a period of time greater than 15 days.

CPI: The Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States Department of Labor.

Local Business: a business having:

a. A commercial office, store, distribution center or other place of business located within the boundaries of Summit County, with an intent to remain on a permanent basis;
b. A current County or City business license; and
c. At least one employee physically present at the local business outlet.

Local Bidder: A Local Business submitting a bid on a Park City Public Works Project or Building Improvement

Manager: City Manager or designee.

Public Works Project: The construction of a park, recreational facility, pipeline, culvert, dam, canal, or other system for water, sewage, storm water, or flood control (Utah Code 11-39-101). "Public Works Project" does not include the replacement or repair of existing infrastructure on private property (Utah Code 11-39-101), or emergency work, minor alteration, ordinary repair, or maintenance necessary to preserve a public improvement (such as lowering or repairing water mains; making connections with water mains; grading, repairing, or maintaining streets, sidewalks, bridges, culverts or conduits).

Purchase: The acquisition of goods (supplies, equipment, etc.) in a single transaction such that payment is made prior to receiving or upon receipt of the goods.

C. General Policy

1. All City purchases for goods and services and contracts for goods and services shall be subject to these rules.
2. No contract or purchase shall be so arranged, fragmented, or divided with the purpose or intent to circumvent these rules. All thresholds specified in this policy are to be applied to the total cost of a contract over the entire term of the contract, as opposed to annualized amounts.
3. City departments shall not engage in any manner of barter or trade when procuring goods and services from entities both public and private.
4. No purchase shall be contracted for, or made, unless sufficient funds have been budgeted in the year in which funds have been appropriated.
5. Subject to federal, state, and local procurement laws when applicable, reasonable attempts should be made to support Park City businesses by purchasing goods and services through local vendors and service providers.
6. All reasonable attempts shall be made to publicize anticipated purchases or contracts in excess of ~~$10,000~~ $15,000 to known vendors, contractors, and suppliers.
7. All reasonable attempts shall be made to obtain at least three written quotations on all purchases of capital assets and services in excess of ~~$10,000~~ $15,000.
8. When it is advantageous to the City, annual contracts for services and supplies regularly purchased should be initiated.
9. All purchases and contracts must be approved by the manager or their designee unless otherwise specified in these rules.
10. All contracts for services shall be approved as to form by the city attorney.
11. The following items require City Council approval unless otherwise exempted in these following rules:
    a. All contracts (as defined) over ~~$20,000~~ $25,000
    b. All contracts and purchases awarded through the formal bidding process.

c. Any item over ~~$10,000~~ $15,000 that is not anticipated in the current budget.

d. Accumulated "Change Orders" which would overall increase a previously approved contract by:

i. the lesser of 20% or ~~$20,000~~ $25,000 for contracts of ~~$200,000~~ $250,000 or less

ii. more than 10% for contracts over ~~$200,000~~ $250,000.

12. Acquisition of the following Items must be awarded through the formal bidding process:

a. All contracts for building improvements over the amount specified by state code, specifically:

i. for the year 2003, $40,000

ii. for each year after 2003, the amount of the bid limit for the previous year, plus an amount calculated by multiplying the amount of the bid limit for the previous year by the lesser of 3% or the actual percent change in the CPI during the previous calendar year. (see Park City's Best Practices in Procurement for updated thresholds)

b. All contracts for public works projects over the amount specified by state code, specifically:

i. for the year 2003, $125,000

ii. for each year after 2003, the amount of the bid limit for the previous year, plus an amount calculated by multiplying the amount of the bid limit for the previous year by the lesser of 3% or the actual percent change in the CPI during the previous calendar year. (see Park City's Best Practices in Procurement for updated thresholds)

c. Contracts for grading, clearing, demolition or construction in excess of $2,500 undertaken by the Community Redevelopment Agency.

13. The following items require a cost benefit analysis where there is a quantifiable return on investment as defined by the Budget, Debt, and Grants Department before approved:

a. All contracts, projects and purchases over ~~$20,000~~ $25,000

b. All contracts and purchases awarded through the formal bidding process.

c. Any item over ~~$10,000~~ $15,000 that is not anticipated in the current budget process.

14. City Employees or anyone acting on behalf of the City may not receive or accept any gift or loan if the gift or loan could influence a reasonable person in the discharge of the person's official duties including but not limited to the granting of City contracts. This prohibition does not apply to any occasional non-pecuniary (non-cash equivalent) gifts with a value less than $50.0. Employees must abide by PCMC 3-1-4.

D. Exceptions

Certain contracts for goods and services shall be exempt from bidding provisions. The manager shall determine whether or not a particular contract or purchase is exempt as set forth herein.

1. Emergency contracts which require prompt execution of the contract because of an imminent threat to the safety or welfare of the public, of public property, or of private property; circumstances which place the City or its officers and agents in a position of serious legal liability; or circumstances which are likely to cause the City to suffer financial harm or loss, the gravity of which clearly outweighs the benefits of competitive bidding in the usual manner. The City Council shall be notified of any emergency contract which would have normally required their approval as soon as reasonably possible. Consult the Emergency Manager regarding purchases for disaster events.
2. Projects that are acquired, expanded, or improved under the "Municipal Building Authority Act" are not subject to competitive bidding requirements.
3. Purchases made from grant funds must comply with all provisions of the grant.
4. Purchases from companies approved to participate in Utah State Division of Purchasing and General Services agreements and contracts and under $100,000 are not subject to competitive bidding requirements.
5. Purchases made via public auction.
6. Purchases from local government purchasing pools in which the City is a participant as approved by a resolution of the City Council.

E. *General Rules*

1. **Purchases of Materials, Supplies and Services** are those items regularly purchased and consumed by the City. These items include, but are not limited to, office supplies, janitorial supplies, and maintenance contracts for repairs to equipment, asphalt, printing services, postage, fertilizers, pipes, fittings, and uniforms. These items are normally budgeted within the operating budgets. Purchases of this type do not require "formal" competitive quotations or bids. However, for purchases in excess of $15,000 all reasonable attempts shall be made to obtain at least three written quotations and to notify via the City website any local businesses that, in the normal course of business, provide the materials, supplies or services required by the City. A written record of the source and the amount of the quotations must be kept.
2. **Purchases of Capital Assets** are "equipment type" items which would be included in a fixed asset accounting system having a material life of three years or more and costing in excess of $5,000. These items are normally budgeted within the normal operating budgets. Purchases of this type do not require "formal" bids. All reasonable attempts shall be made to obtain at least three written quotations on all purchases of this type in excess of $15,000. A written record of the source and the amount of the quotations must be kept. A reasonable attempt will be made to notify via the City website any ~~business with a Park City business license~~ local businesses that, in the normal course of business, sells the equipment required by the City.

3. **Contracts for Professional Services** are usually contracts for services performed by an independent contractor, in a professional capacity, who produces a service predominately of an intangible nature. These include, but are not limited to, the services of an attorney, physician, engineer, accountant, architectural consultant, dentist, artist, appraiser or photographer. Professional service contracts are exempt from competitive bidding. All reasonable attempts shall be made to obtain at least three written quotations on all contracts exceeding $15,000 and to notify via the City website any local businesses that, in the normal course of business, provide the service required by the City. A written record of the source and the amount of the quotations must be kept.

   The selection of professional service contracts in an amount exceeding $25,000 shall be based on ~~an~~ a formal documented evaluation process such as Request for Proposals (RFP), Statement of Qualifications (SOQ), Qualification Based Selection (QBS), etc. (see Park City's Best Practices in Procurement for details). The evaluation process should include an objective assessment, preferably by multiple reviewers, of the services needed, the abilities of the contractors, the uniqueness of the service, the cost of the service, and the general performance of the contractor. Special consideration may also be given to local businesses during the evaluation in instances where knowledge of local issues, geography, statutes, etc., may enhance the quality of service rendered. The lowest quote need not necessarily be the successful contractor. Usually, emphasis will be placed on quality, with cost being the deciding factor when everything else is equal. The manager shall determine which contracts are professional service contracts. Major professional service contracts (~~$20,000~~ $25,000 and over) must be approved by the City Council.

4. **Contracts for Public Improvements** are usually those contracts for the construction or major repair of roads, highways, parks, water lines and systems (i.e., Public Works Projects); and buildings and building additions (i.e. Building Improvements). Where a question arises as to whether or not a contract is for public improvement, the manager shall make the determination.

   Minor public improvements (less than the amount specified by state code.): The department shall make a reasonable attempt to obtain at least three written competitive quotations for contracts in excess of $15,000. A written record of the source and the amount of the quotations must be kept. Procurement for all minor public improvements in excess $25,000 shall be based on a formal documented evaluation process (see Park City's Best Practices in Procurement for details). The evaluation process should include, at minimum, an objective assessment of the services needed, the abilities of the contractors to perform the service and the cost of the service. A reasonable attempt will be made to notify via the City website any local businesses that, in the normal course of business, provide the public improvements required by the City. The manager may require formal bidding if it is deemed to be in the best interest of the City.

   Major public improvements (greater than or equal to the amount specified by state code): Unless otherwise exempted, all contracts of this type require competitive bidding.

5. **Contracts for Professional Services, where the Service Provider is responsible for ~~Public~~ Building Improvements/Public Works Project (Construction Manager / General Contractor "CMGC" Method)** are contracts where the City ~~owner~~ contracts with a ~~Construction Manager for services to construct public improvements~~ "Construction Manager/General Contractor" which is a contractor who enters into a contract for the management of a construction project when that contract allows the contractor to subcontract for additional labor and materials that were not included in the contractor's cost proposal submitted at the time of the procurement of the Construction Manager/General Contractor's services. It excludes a contractor whose only subcontract work not included in the contractor's cost proposal submitted as part of the procurement of construction is to meet subcontracted portions of change orders approved within the scope of the project. The CMGC contract is exempt from competitive bidding. The selection of CMGC contracts shall be based on ~~an~~ a documented evaluation process such as a Request for Proposals (RFP), Statement of Qualifications (SOQ), Qualification Based Selection (QBS), etc. (see Park City's Best Practices in Procurement for details). The evaluation process should include an objective assessment, preferably by multiple reviewers, of the services needed, the abilities of the contractors, the uniqueness of the service, the cost of the service, and the general performance of the contractor. Special consideration may also be given to local businesses during the evaluation in instances where knowledge of local issues, geography, statutes, etc., may enhance the quality of service rendered. The lowest quote need not necessarily be the successful contractor. Usually, emphasis will be placed on quality, with cost being the deciding factor when everything else is equal. The manager shall determine which contracts are CMGC contracts. Major CMGC contracts (over ~~$20,000~~ $25,000) must be approved by the City Council. The selected CMGC will then implement all bid packages and subcontractors under a competitive bid requirement as required herein. The Project Manager will attend the award of all subcontracts which meet the threshold requirements of General Policy 12 a or b above.

F. Formal or Competitive Bidding Provisions

1. **Bid Specifications:** Specifications for public contracts shall not expressly or implicitly require any product by any brand name or make, nor the product of any particular manufacturer or seller, unless the product is exempt by these regulations or the City Council.
2. **Advertising Requirements:** An advertisement for bids is to be published at least twice in a newspaper of general circulation, printed and published in the city and in as many additional issues and publications as the manager may determine, at least five days prior to the opening of bids. The advertisement shall also be posted on the Park City website and the Utah public legal notice website established by the combined efforts of Utah's newspapers. Advertising for bids relating to Class B and C road improvement projects shall be published in a newspaper of general circulation in the county at least once a week for three consecutive weeks as well as be posted on the Park City website and the Utah

public legal notice website established by the combined efforts of Utah's newspapers.

All advertisements for bids shall state the following:

a. The date and time after which bids will not be accepted;

b. The date that pre-qualification applications must be filed, and the class or classes of work for which bidders must be pre-qualified if pre-qualification is a requirement;

c. The character of the work to be done or the materials or things to be purchased;

d. The office where the specifications for the work, material or things may be seen;

e. The name and title of the person designated for receipt of bids;

f. The type and amount of bid security if required;

g. The date, time, and place that the bids will be publicly opened.

3. **Requirements for Bids:** All bids made to the city shall comply with the following requirements:

a. In writing or electronically sealed;

b. Filed with the manager;

c. Opened publicly by the manager at the time designated in the advertisement and filed for public inspection;

d. Have the appropriate bid security attached, if required.

4. **Award of Contract:** After bids are opened, and a determination made that a contract be awarded, the award shall be made to the lowest responsible bidder. "Lowest responsible bidder" shall mean the lowest bidder who has substantially complied with all prescribed requirements and who has not been disqualified as set forth herein. The successful bidder shall promptly execute a formal contract and, if required, deliver a bond, cashier's check, or certified check to the manager in a sum equal to the contract price, together with proof of appropriate insurance. Upon execution of the contract, bond, and insurance, the bid security shall be returned. Failure to execute the contract, bond, or insurance shall result in forfeit of the bid security.

a. **Local Bidder Preference**: If the bid of a nonlocal bidder is lowest and there was a local bidder who also submitted a bid which was within five percent (5%) of the low bid, then the contract shall be awarded to the local bidder if the bidder agrees in writing within forty-eight (48) hours after being notified of the low bid, that the bidder will meet the bid price while the bidder meets all the prescribed requirements set forth in the bid documents. If there are more than two local bidders who are within 5% then the contract shall be awarded to the local bidder which had the lowest original bid according to the procedure above.

5. **Rejection of Bids:** The manager or the City Council may reject any bid not in compliance with all prescribed requirements and reject all bids if it is determined to be in the best interest of the City.

6. **Disqualification of Bidders:** The manager, upon investigation, may disqualify a bidder if he or she does not comply with any of the following:
   - **a.** The bidder does not have sufficient financial ability to perform the contract;
   - **b.** The bidder does not have equipment available to perform the contract;
   - **c.** The bidder does not have key personnel available, of sufficient experience, to perform the contract;
   - **d.** The person has repeatedly breached contractual obligations with public and private agencies;
   - **e.** The bidder fails to comply with the requests of an investigation by the manager.
7. **Pre-qualification of Bidders:** The City may require pre-qualification of bidders. Upon establishment of the applicant's qualifications, the manager shall issue a qualification statement. The statement shall inform the applicant of the project for which the qualification is valid, as well as any other conditions that may be imposed on the qualification. It shall advise the applicant to notify the manager promptly if there has been any substantial change of conditions or circumstances which would make any statement contained in the pre-qualification application no longer applicable or untrue. If the manager does not qualify an applicant, written notice to the applicant is required, stating the reasons the pre-qualification was denied, and informing the applicant of his right to appeal the decision within five business days after receipt of the notice. Appeals shall be made to the City Council. The manager may, upon discovering that a pre-qualified person is no longer qualified, revoke pre-qualification by sending notification to the person. The notice shall state the reason for revocation and inform the person that revocation will be effective immediately.
8. **Appeals Procedure:** Any supplier, vendor, or contractor who determines that a decision has been made adversely to him, by the City, in violation of these regulations, may appeal that decision to the City Council. The complainant contractor shall promptly file a written appeal letter with the manager, within five working days from the time the alleged incident occurred. The letter of appeal shall state all relevant facts of the matter and the remedy sought. Upon receipt of the notice of appeal, the manager shall forward the appeal notice, his investigation of the matter, and any other relevant information to the City Council. The City Council shall conduct a hearing on the matter and provide the complainant an opportunity to be heard. A written decision shall be sent to the complainant.

CITY COUNCILOR (Using March 2009 Data)

Entity	Population Estimate	Annual Salary	Ret	Health*	Dental*	Life*	401	457	Total Ben $	Total Ben %	Total Comp. Value
WEST VALLEY	126,000	$18,820.00	20.00%	$708.80	$80.58	$6.65	X	X	$ 9,552.36	20.00%	$32,136.36
STEAMBOAT SPRINGS, CO	11,100	$17,592.00	0.00%	$1,172.00	0	0		x	$ 14,064.00	0.00%	$31,656.00
OREM	92,000	$13,200.00	23.90%	$899.31	$108.52	$8.80	X	X	$ 12,199.56	23.90%	$28,554.36
ASPEN, CO	5,914	$20,400.00		$471.00	0				$ 5,652.00	0.00%	$26,052.00
BRECKENRIDGE, CO	3,500	$9,600.00		$1,326.00	$0				$ 15,912.00	0.00%	$25,512.00
ST. GEORGE**	75,000	$12,000.00	0.00%	$671.66	0	0		X	$ 8,059.92	0.00%	$20,059.92
CLEARFIELD	29,902	$8,880.00	13.00%	$669.74	$87.55	$16.50	X		$ 9,285.48	13.00%	$19,319.88
MOAB		$6,000.00		$1,100.00	0	$5.70			$ 13,268.40	0.00%	$19,268.40
BOUNTIFUL	42,534	$7,800.00		$805.60	0	$22.00			$ 9,931.20	0.00%	$17,731.20
SOUTH JORDAN	53,971	$10,600.00	13.61%	$391.98	44.65		X	X	$ 5,239.56	13.61%	$17,282.22
ROY	35000	$8,118.78	18.57%	$554.74	0	$10.00	X	X	$ 6,776.88	18.57%	$16,403.32
TELLURIDE, CO	2,352	$9,600.00		$406.00					$ 4,872.00	0.00%	$14,472.00
LAYTON	64,000	$13,130.00							$ -	0.00%	$13,130.00
DRAPER	38,000	$10,700.00	11.62%			9.4	X		$ 112.80	11.62%	$12,056.14
SPANISH FORK	30,500	$9,180.00	17.90%		$75.00			X	$ 900.00	17.90%	$11,723.22
DURANGO, CO	15,213	$5,999.76		$333.33	0	0		X	$ 3,999.96	0.00%	$9,999.72
KAYSVILLE	26,000	$6,000.00	18.00%						$ -	18.00%	$7,080.00
HEBER CITY		$6,000.00							$ -	0.00%	$6,000.00
GUNNISON, CO		$6,000.00						X	$ -	0.00%	$6,000.00
GLENWOOD SPRINGS, CO	8,887	$6,000.00							$ -	0.00%	$6,000.00
FRISCO, CO	2,621	$6,000.00							$ -	0.00%	$6,000.00
HURRICANE		$5,400.00							$ -	0.00%	$5,400.00
WASHINGTON TERRACE	8,600	$4,800.00							$ -	0.00%	$4,800.00

Comparison to Market

Average of top 5		$15,922.40	14.63%	$915.42	$37.82	$5.15			$ 11,475.98	8.78%	$28,782.14
Park City		$11,405.00	0.00%	$978.00	$85.00	$0.00			$ 12,756.00	0.00%	$24,161.00
Difference		-$4,517.40	-14.63%	$62.58	$47.18	-$5.15			$ 1,280.02	-8.78%	-$4,621.14
		-39.61%	0.00%	6.40%	55.51%	0.00%			$ 0.10	0.00%	**-16.06%**

Comparison to Market

Average of top 2-6		$14,558.40	7.97%	$907.99	$21.70	$2.93			$ 11,177.50	4.78%	$26,366.86
Park City		$11,405.00	0.00%	$978.00	$85.00	$0.00			$ 12,756.00	0.00%	$24,161.00
Difference		-$3,153.40	-7.97%	$70.01	$63.30	-$2.93			$ 1,578.50	-4.78%	-$2,205.86
		-27.65%	0.00%	7.16%	74.47%	0.00%			$ 0.12	0.00%	**-8.37%**

Potential Market Adjustments	Difference from Market from Market										
Using Avg of top 5	-5%	$14,588	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 27,344
Using Avg of top 5	0%	$16,026	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 28,782
Using Avg of top 2-6	-5%	$12,293	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 25,049
Using Avg of top 2-6	0%	$13,611	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 26,367

CITY COUNCILOR (Using June 2011 Data)

Entity	Population Estimate	Annual Salary	Ret	Health*	Dental*	Life*	401	457	Total Ben $	Total Ben %	Total Comp. Value
WEST VALLEY	126,000	$18,820.00	20.00%	$1,003.61	$100.72	$6.65	X	X	$ 13,331.76	20.00%	$35,915.76
SUMMIT COUNTY		$29,000.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$29,000.00
DRAPER	38,000	$10,700.00	13.37%	$1,211.57	105.73	16.9	X		$ 16,010.40	13.37%	$28,140.99
STEAMBOAT SPRINGS, CO	11,100	$15,840.00	0.00%	$972.00	0	5.92		x	$ 11,735.04	0.00%	$27,575.04
OREM	92,000	$13,200.00	17.90%	$861.70	$99.14	$8.80	X	X	$ 11,635.68	17.90%	$27,198.48
ASPEN, CO	5,914	$22,100.00	0.00%	$386.25	0	0			$ 4,635.00	0.00%	$26,735.00
BRECKENRIDGE, CO	3,500	$9,600.00	0.00%	$1,335.94	$0	0			$ 16,031.28	0.00%	$25,631.28
BOUNTIFUL	42,534	$7,800.00	0.00%	$1,044.68	0	$22.00			$ 12,800.16	0.00%	$20,600.16
CLEARFIELD	29,902	$8,880.00	13.00%	$752.61	$79.28	$22.64	X		$ 10,254.36	13.00%	$20,288.76
MOAB		$6,000.00	0.00%	$1,092.00	0	$5.70			$ 13,172.40	0.00%	$19,172.40
SOUTH JORDAN	53,971	$10,896.30	14.36%	$391.98	80.14	21.36	X	X	$ 5,921.76	14.36%	$18,382.77
ST. GEORGE**	75,000	$12,000.00	0.00%	$371.66	0	0		X	$ 4,459.92	0.00%	$16,459.92
ROY	35000	$8,118.78	15.54%	$554.74	0	$13.36	X	X	$ 6,817.20	15.54%	$16,197.64
TELLURIDE, CO	2,352	$9,600.00	0.00%	$406.00	0	0			$ 4,872.00	0.00%	$14,472.00
LAYTON	64,000	$13,130.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$13,130.00
WASATCH COUNTY		$11,646.13	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$11,646.13
DURANGO, CO	15,213	$5,999.76	0.00%	$333.33	27.45	3.37		X	$ 4,369.80	0.00%	$10,369.56
SPANISH FORK	30,500	$9,180.00	0.00%	$0.00	$92.00	0		X	$ 1,104.00	0.00%	$10,284.00
KAYSVILLE	26,000	$6,000.00	18.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	18.00%	$7,080.00
HURRICANE		$6,600.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$6,600.00
HEBER CITY		$6,000.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$6,000.00
GUNNISON, CO	5,531	$6,000.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0		X	$ -	0.00%	$6,000.00
GLENWOOD SPRINGS, CO	8,887	$6,000.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$6,000.00
FRISCO, CO	2,621	$6,000.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$6,000.00
WASHINGTON TERRACE	8,600	$4,800.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$4,800.00

Comparison to Market

Average of top 5		$17,512.00	10.25%	$809.78	$61.12	$7.65			$ 10,542.58	10.25%	$29,566.05
Park City		$11,405.00	0.00%	$978.00	$85.00	$0.00			$ 12,756.00	0.00%	$24,161.00
Difference		-$6,107.00	-10.25%	$168.22	$23.88	-$7.65			$ 2,213.42	-10.25%	-$5,405.05
		-53.55%	0.00%	17.20%	28.10%	0.00%			$ 0.17	0.00%	-18.28%

Comparison to Market

Average of top 2-6		$18,168.00	6.25%	$686.30	$40.97	$6.32			$ 8,803.22	6.25%	$27,729.90
Park City		$11,405.00	0.00%	$978.00	$85.00	$0.00			$ 12,756.00	0.00%	$24,161.00
Difference		-$6,763.00	-6.25%	$291.70	$44.03	-$6.32			$ 3,952.78	-6.25%	-$3,568.90
		-59.30%	0.00%	29.83%	51.80%	0.00%			$ 0.31	0.00%	-12.87%

Potential Market Adjustments	Difference from Market from Market										
Using Avg of top 5	-5%	$15,332	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 28,088
Using Avg of top 5	0%	$16,810	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 29,566

MAYOR (Using March 2009 Data)

Entity	Population Estimate	Annual Salary	Ret	Health*	Dental*	Life*	401	457	Total Ben $	Total Ben %	Total Comp. Value
OREM	92,000	$26,400.00	23.90%	$899.31	$108.52	$8.80	X	X	$ 12,199.56	23.90%	$44,909.16
WEST VALLEY	126,000	$23,909.00	20.00%	$708.80	$80.58	$6.65	X	X	$ 9,552.36	20.00%	$38,243.16
STEAMBOAT, CO**	11,100	$23,436.00		$1,172.00	0	0			$ 14,064.00	0.00%	$37,500.00
ST. GEORGE	75,000	$30,000.00		$371.66	0	0		X	$ 4,459.92	0.00%	$34,459.92
ASPEN, CO	5,914	$27,900.00		$471.00	0				$ 5,652.00	0.00%	$33,552.00
BRECKENRIDGE, CO	3,500	$14,400.00		$1,326.00	$0				$ 15,912.00	0.00%	$30,312.00
BOUNTIFUL	42,534	$15,600.00	11.59%	$821.28	0	$77.81			$ 10,789.08	11.59%	$28,197.12
MOAB		$12,000.00	17.05%	$1,100.00	0	$5.70			$ 13,268.40	17.05%	$27,314.40
SOUTH JORDAN	53,971	$15,898.47	13.61%	$391.98	44.65		X	X	$ 5,239.56	13.61%	$23,301.81
TELLURIDE, CO	2,352	$18,000.00		$406.00					$ 4,872.00	0.00%	$22,872.00
CLEARFIELD	29,902	$11,640.00	13.00%	$669.74	$87.55	$16.50	X		$ 9,285.48	13.00%	$22,438.68
LAYTON	64,000	$21,800.00							$ -	0.00%	$21,800.00
DRAPER	38,000	$19,394.00	11.62%	$0.00	0	$9.40			$ 112.80	11.62%	$21,760.38
ROY	35,000	$10,053.58	18.57%	$554.74	0	$10.00	X	X	$ 6,776.88	18.57%	$18,697.41
SPANISH FORK	30,500	$14,100.00	17.90%		$75.00			X	$ 900.00	17.90%	$17,523.90
KAYSVILLE	26,000	$12,300.00	18.00%						$ -	18.00%	$14,514.00
HEBER CITY		$10,200.00	12.00%	$150.00					$ 1,800.00	12.00%	$13,224.00
DURANGO, CO	15,213	$8,999.00		$333.33	0	0			$ 3,999.96	0.00%	$12,998.96
FRISCO, CO	2,621	$11,400.00							$ -	0.00%	$11,400.00
WASHINGTON TERRACE	8,600	$9,600.00							$ -	0.00%	$9,600.00
GLENWOOD SPRINGS, CO	8,887	$8,400.00							$ -	0.00%	$8,400.00
HURRICANE		$7,200.00							$ -	0.00%	$7,200.00
GUNNISON, CO		$7,200.00						X	$ -	0.00%	$7,200.00

Comparison to Market

Average of top 5		$26,329.00	21.95%	$724.55	$37.82	$3.86			$ 9,185.57	8.78%	$37,732.85
Park City		$22,556.00	0.00%	$978.00	$85.00	$0.00			$ 12,756.00	0.00%	$35,312.00
Difference		-$3,773.00	-21.95%	$253.45	$47.18	-$3.86			$ 3,570.43	-8.78%	-$2,420.85
		-16.73%	0.00%	25.91%	55.51%	0.00%			$ 0.28	0.00%	**-6.42%**

Comparison to Market

Average of top 2-6		$23,929.00	20.00%	$809.89	$16.12	$2.22			$ 9,928.06	4.00%	$34,813.42
Park City		$22,556.00	0.00%	$978.00	$85.00	$0.00			$ 12,756.00	0.00%	$35,312.00
Difference		-$1,373.00	-20.00%	$168.11	$68.88	-$2.22			$ 2,827.94	-4.00%	$498.58
		-6.09%	0.00%	17.19%	81.04%	0.00%			$ 0.22	0.00%	**1.43%**

Potential Market Adjustments	Difference from Market from Market										
Using Avg of top 5	-5%	$23,090	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 35,846
Using Avg of top 5	0%	$24,977	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 37,733
Using Avg of top 2-6	1%	$22,556	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 35,312
Using Avg of top 2-6	1%	$22,556	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 35,312

MAYOR (Using June 2011 Data)

Entity	Population Estimate	Annual Salary	Ret	Health*	Dental*	Life*	401	457	Total Ben $	Total Ben %	Total Comp. Value
OREM	92,000	$26,400.00	17.90%	$861.70	$99.14		X	X	$ 11,530.08	17.90%	$42,655.68
WEST VALLEY	126,000	$23,909.00	20.00%	$1,003.61	$100.72	$6.65	X	X	$ 13,331.76	20.00%	$42,022.56
ASPEN, CO	5,914	$30,222.40	0.00%	$386.25	0	0			$ 4,635.00	0.00%	$34,857.40
SUMMIT COUNTY		$34,800.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$34,800.00
ST. GEORGE	75,000	$30,000.00	0.00%	$371.66	0	10.86		X	$ 4,590.24	0.00%	$34,590.24
STEAMBOAT, CO**	11,100	$21,096.00	0.00%	$972.00	0	7.76			$ 11,757.12	0.00%	$32,853.12
DRAPER	38,000	$14,593.00	13.37%	$1,211.57	105.73	$16.90			$ 16,010.40	13.37%	$32,554.48
BOUNTIFUL	42,534	$15,600.00	14.70%	$1,044.68	0	$22.00			$ 12,800.16	14.70%	$30,693.36
BRECKENRIDGE, CO	3,500	$14,400.00	0.00%	$1,335.94	$0	0			$ 16,031.28	0.00%	$30,431.28
MOAB		$12,000.00	11.59%	$1,092.00	0	$5.70			$ 13,172.40	11.59%	$26,563.20
SOUTH JORDAN	53,971	$16,343.63	14.36%	$391.98	80.14	$21.36	X	X	$ 5,921.76	14.36%	$24,612.34
CLEARFIELD	29,902	$11,686.00	13.00%	$752.61	$79.28	$22.64	X		$ 10,254.36	13.00%	$23,459.54
TELLURIDE, CO	2,352	$18,000.00	0.00%	$406.00	0	0			$ 4,872.00	0.00%	$22,872.00
LAYTON	64,000	$21,800.00	0	$0.00	0	$0.00			$ -	0.00%	$21,800.00
ROY	35,000	$9,496.00	0.00%	$825.72	0	$13.36	X	X	$ 10,068.96	0.00%	$19,564.96
HURRICANE		$18,000.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$18,000.00
SPANISH FORK	30,500	$14,100.00	0.00%	$0.00	$92.00	0		X	$ 1,104.00	0.00%	$15,204.00
KAYSVILLE	26,000	$12,300.00	18.00%	$0.00	0	$0.00			$ -	18.00%	$14,514.00
DURANGO, CO	15,213	$8,999.90	0.00%	$333.33	27.45	3.37			$ 4,369.80	0.00%	$13,369.70
WASATCH COUNTY		$13,086.11	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$13,086.11
HEBER CITY		$10,200.00	12.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	12.00%	$11,424.00
FRISCO, CO	2,621	$11,400.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$11,400.00
WASHINGTON TERRACE	8,600	$9,600.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$9,600.00
GLENWOOD SPRINGS, CO	8,887	$8,400.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0			$ -	0.00%	$8,400.00
GUNNISON, CO	5,531	$7,200.00	0.00%	$0.00	0	0		X	$ -	0.00%	$7,200.00
Comparison to Market											
Average of top 5		$29,066.28	7.58%	$524.64	$39.97	$4.38			$ 6,817.42	7.58%	$37,785.18
Park City		$22,556.00	0.00%	$978.00	$85.00	$0.00			$ 12,756.00	0.00%	$35,312.00
Difference		-$6,510.28	-7.58%	$453.36	$45.03	-$4.38			$ 5,938.58	-7.58%	-$2,473.18
		-28.86%	0.00%	46.36%	52.97%	0.00%			$ 0.47	0.00%	**-6.55%**
Comparison to Market											
Average of top 2-6		$28,005.48	4.00%	$546.70	$20.14	$5.05			$ 6,862.82	4.00%	$35,824.66
Park City		$22,556.00	0.00%	$978.00	$85.00	$0.00			$ 12,756.00	0.00%	$35,312.00
Difference		-$5,449.48	-4.00%	$431.30	$64.86	-$5.05			$ 5,893.18	-4.00%	-$512.66
		-24.16%	0.00%	44.10%	76.30%	0.00%			$ 0.46	0.00%	**-1.43%**
Potential Market Adjustments	Difference from Market from Market										
Using Avg of top 5	-5%	$23,140	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 35,896
Using Avg of top 5	0%	$25,029	$0	$978	$85	$0			$ 12,756	$ -	$ 37,785

Job # 125 - CITY/COUNTY MANAGER (Using March 2009 Data)

Entity	Preferred Title	Range			Actual			Ben $	Ben %	TCVMP
		Min	Mid	Max	Low	High	MP			
VAIL	TOWN MANAGER	160,325	160,325	160,325	160,325	160,325	160,325	15,042	18%	203,585
WEST VALLEY	CITY MANAGER	153,004	153,004	153,004	153,004	153,004	153,004	9,552	22%	196,447
SOUTH JORDAN	CITY MANAGER	101,858	129,969	158,080	149,947	149,947	149,947	12,118	22%	195,593
SANDY	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER	94,099	121,152	148,205	151,195	151,195	151,195	9,696	20%	191,448
ASPEN	CITY MANAGER	156,016	159,016	159,016	159,016	159,016	159,016	4,905	15%	187,217
BOUNTIFUL	CITY MANAGER/ADMINISTRATOR	94,422	119,631	144,840	144,840	144,840	144,840	9,931	22%	187,157
LAYTON	CITY MANAGER	86,632	117,316	148,000	147,624	147,624	147,624	9,514	20%	186,471
BRECKENRIDGE	Town Manager	139,254	139,254	139,254	139,254	139,254	139,254	14,115	15%	173,769
OREM	CITY MANAGER	100,492	125,615	150,738	134,560	134,560	134,560	10,534	20%	172,477
LEHI	CITY ADMINISTRATOR	95,647	117,177	138,707	130,678	130,678	130,678	12,422	21%	170,764
SALT LAKE CITY	CAO/MANAGEMENT SERVICES DIRE	106,620	138,465	170,310	130,979	130,979	130,979	11,680	19%	167,898
DRAPER	City Manager	97,127	116,553	135,978	125,000	125,000	125,000	17,597	19%	166,759
MIDVALE	CITY ADMINISTRATOR	84,760	111,696	138,632	125,611	125,611	125,611	7,632	24%	163,138
OGDEN	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER	124,272	124,272	124,272	124,272	124,272	124,272	10,980	20%	160,206
PROVO	CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER	71,001	98,620	126,239	118,341	118,341	118,341	11,992	25%	159,823
STEAMBOAT SPRINGS	City Manager	127,213	127,213	127,213	127,213	127,213	127,213	11,888	15%	157,649
SPANISH FORK	CITY MGER/ADMINISTRATOR	93,261	116,576	139,891	116,576	116,576	116,576	9,168	26%	156,450
TAYLORSVILLE	CITY ADMINISTRATOR	85,610	109,902	134,193	114,750	114,750	114,750	8,763	19%	145,659
CLEARFIELD	CITY MANAGER	94,786	115,076	135,366	106,413	106,413	106,413	15,279	21%	143,677
EAGLE MOUNTAIN	CITY ADMINISTRATOR	62,899	73,549	84,198	80,000	80,000	80,000	20,780	32%	126,228
BRIGHAM CITY	CITY ADMINISTRATOR	79,743	99,679	119,614	90,248	90,248	90,248	11,265	19%	118,904
CACHE COUNTY	COUNTY EXECUTIVE	67,409	84,261	101,113	84,261	84,261	84,261	11,618	25%	116,666

Comparison to Market

		Min	Mid	Max	Low	High	MP	Ben $	Ben %	TCVMP
Average of top 5		133,060	144,693	155,726	154,697	154,697	154,697	10,263	19%	194,858
Park City		110,000		133,314	133,314	133,314	133,314	13,961	21%	175,311
Difference		-23,060		-22,412	-21,383	-21,383	-21,383	3,698	2%	-19,547
Potential Market Adjustment	(Move to 5% below Avg of Top 5)	110,000		141,415	141,415	141,415	141,415	13,961	21%	185,115

Job # 1025 - CITY ATTORNEY (DEPARTMENT HEAD) (Using March 2009 Data)

Entity	Preferred Title	Range Min	Range Mid	Range Max	Actual Low	Actual High	Actual MP	Ben $	Ben %	TCVMP
OREM	CITY ATTORNEY	85,642	107,053	128,464	126,322	126,322	126,322	10,534	52%	203,124
DAVIS COUNTY	COUNTY ATTORNEY	151,416	151,416	151,416	151,416	151,416	151,416	12,520	25%	201,548
SANDY	CITY ATTORNEY	86,341	111,165	135,988	144,123	144,123	144,123	9,696	20%	182,947
ASPEN	City Attorney	150,987	150,987	150,987	150,987	150,987	150,987	4,905	15%	178,012
MURRAY	CITY ATTORNEY - GRADE 35	93,454	116,813	140,171	133,432	133,432	133,432	10,851	23%	175,599
UTAH COUNTY	COUNTY ATTORNEY (1002)	122,226	122,226	122,226	122,226	122,226	122,226	11,354	34%	174,635
SALT LAKE CITY	CITY ATTORNEY	106,620	138,460	170,300	136,554	136,554	136,554	11,680	19%	174,548
VAIL	TOWN ATTORNEY	132,000	132,000	132,000	132,000	132,000	132,000	15,042	18%	170,274
BOUNTIFUL	CITY ATTORNEY (DEPART. HEAD)	83,550	105,864	128,178	128,178	128,178	128,178	9,931	22%	166,769
WEST VALLEY	CITY ATTORNEY (DEPART. HEAD)	99,025	122,271	145,517	128,616	128,616	128,616	9,552	22%	166,657
LAYTON	CITY ATTORNEY (DEPART. HEAD)	83,254	104,068	124,881	124,881	124,881	124,881	9,514	20%	159,209
LOGAN	CITY ATTORNEY (DH)	89,956	112,445	134,934	119,205	119,205	119,205	11,204	23%	157,671
SOUTH JORDAN	Assistant City Manager/City Attorney	92,394	117,895	143,395	117,083	117,083	117,083	12,118	22%	155,381
SUMMIT COUNTY	County Attorney	114,061	114,061	114,061	116,276	116,276	116,276	10,500	21%	151,485
PROVO	CITY ATTORNEY	71,001	98,620	126,239	110,693	110,693	110,693	11,992	25%	150,269
ST. GEORGE	CITY ATTORNEY	89,582	100,780	111,978	111,573	111,573	111,573	7,560	24%	145,576
DRAPER	City Attorney	97,127	116,553	135,978	109,886	109,886	109,886	12,797	19%	143,924
WEBER COUNTY	COUNTY ATTORNEY	109,392	109,392	109,392	109,392	109,392	109,392	9,973	22%	143,278
SPANISH FORK	CITY ATTORNEY	80,743	100,929	121,115	100,929	100,929	100,929	9,168	26%	136,682
OGDEN	CITY ATTORNEY (DEPT HEAD)	69,624	88,584	107,544	102,510	102,510	102,510	10,980	20%	134,074
CACHE COUNTY	COUNTY ATTORNEY	77,709	97,136	116,563	97,136	97,136	97,136	11,618	25%	132,717
CLEARFIELD	CITY ATTORNEY	87,152	105,799	124,446	88,795	88,795	88,795	12,656	21%	119,796

Comparison to Market

		Min	Mid	Max	Low	High	MP	Ben $	Ben %	TCVMP
Average of top 5		113,568	127,487	141,405	141,256	141,256	141,256	9,701	27%	188,246
Park City		105,070		129,540	129,540	129,540	129,540	13,961	21%	170,743
Difference		-8,498		-11,865	-11,716	-11,716	-11,716	4,260	-6%	-17,503
Potential Market Adjustment	(Move to 5% below Avg of Top 5)	105,070		136,225	136,225	136,225	136,225	13,961	21%	178,834

Fund 51 CIP Budget (as entered 5/6/2011)

CIP #	CIP Name	Description	Funding Source	FY 2011	FY 2012	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016
cp0007	**Tunnel Improvements**	Tunnel Improvements	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 464,157	$ 226,600	$ 233,398	$ 240,400	$ 247,612	$ 255,040
cp0010	**Water Department service equipment**	Water Equipment	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 369,056	$ 77,250	$ 79,568	$ 81,955	$ 84,413	$ 86,946
cp0026	**Motor Change-out and Rebuild Program**	Motor Change Out	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 28,297	$ 25,750	$ 26,523	$ 27,318	$ 28,138	$ 28,982
cp0040	**Water Department Deficiency Correction Projects**	Infrastructure Improvement	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 354,446	$ 494,400	$ 1,570,132	$ 524,509	$ 540,244	$ 556,452
cp0069	**Judge Water Treatment**	Judge Tunnel Improvements							
		Pretreatment - Zinc and Cadmium (Judge Only)	WATER SERVICE FEES (Bonds)	$ -	$ -	$ 2,050,000	$ 4,100,000	$ 2,050,000	$ -
		Dewatering Facility	WATER SERVICE FEES (Bonds)	$ -	$ -	$ 625,000	$ 1,250,000	$ 625,000	$ -
		Pipeline from Portal to QJWTP	WATER SERVICE FEES (Bonds)	$ -	$ 702,000	$ 923,000	$ 3,250,000	$ 1,625,000	$ -
		Judge Tunnel Water Treatment UPDES) - STAG Grant	FEDERAL GRANTS	$ -	$ 1,375,000	$ 598,200	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0070	**Meter Radio Read**	Meter Reading Upgrade							
			WATER IMPACT FEES	$ 43,325	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
			WATER SERVICE FEES (Bonds)	$ 575,600	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0081	**OTIS Water Pipeline Replacement Projects**	Old Town Water Projects	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ -	$ 926,588	$ 954,386	$ 257,754	$ 265,487	$ 273,452
cp0140	**Water System Emergency Power Master Planning**	Emergency Power Master Planning	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 126,483	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0141	**Boothill Transmission Line**	Boothill Transmission Line							
			WATER IMPACT FEES (Bonds)	$ 419,408	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
			WATER SERVICE FEES (Bonds)	$ 197,369	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
		Boothill Trans. Line - Developer Contrib. (Deer Valley Corp)	OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS	$ 214,813		$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0178	**Rockport Water, Pipeline, and Storage**	Rockport (capital facilities and water)							
			WATER IMPACT FEES	$ 544,285	$ 544,285	$ 544,285	$ 544,285	$ 544,285	$ 544,285
			WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 228,577	$ 228,577	$ 228,577	$ 228,577	$ 228,577	$ 228,577
cp0180	**Corrosion Study of Water System**	Corrosion Study	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 50,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0181	**Spiro Building Maintenance**	Spiro Building Maintenance	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 68,722	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0184	**Judge/Talisker/NPDES**	Judge/Talisker NPDES	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 1,464	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0227	**Park City Water Infrastructure Project**	PCWIP							
			WATER IMPACT FEES (Bonds)	$ 845,095	$ 50,776	$ 186,784	$ -	$ -	$ -
			WATER SERVICE FEES (Bonds)	$ 354,905	$ 21,324	$ 78,441	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0238	**Quinn's Junction Transmission Lines**	Quinns Junction Transmission Lines							
			WATER IMPACT FEES (Bonds)	$ 507,057	$ 49,297	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
			WATER SERVICE FEES (Bonds)	$ 212,943	$ 20,703	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0239	**PC Heights Capacity Upgrade**	PC Heights Tank Capacity Upgrade	WATER IMPACT FEES	$ -	$ -	$ 297,052	$ 305,964	$ -	$ -
		PC Heights Tank Capacity Upgrade - Devp. Contrib. (IHC)	OTHER MISCELLANEOUS	$ 647,013	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
cp0240	**Quinn's Water Treatment Plant**	Quinn's Water Treatment Plant	WATER IMPACT FEES (Bonds)	$ 12,522,674	$ 3,042,148	$ -	$ 327,818	$ 2,836,282	
cp0241	**Promontory Pipeline**	Promontory Pipeline	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 126,000					
NEW 30	**Prospector Drain - Regulatory Project**	Prospector Drain UPDES	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 250,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
		Prospector Drain UPDES	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ -	$ -	$ 501,627	$ 1,033,351	$ 532,176	$ -
New 31	**Soils Repository**	Soils Repository	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 62,500	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
NEW 38	**Water Rights - Perpetual Lease**	Water Rights - Perpetual Lease							
			WATER IMPACT FEES		$ 113,454	$ 113,454	$ 113,454	$ 113,454	$ 113,454
			WATER SERVICE FEES		$ 47,646	$ 47,646	$ 47,646	$ 47,646	$ 47,646
NEW 40	**Landscape Water Checks**	Landscape Water Checks	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ -	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ 5,000	$ -
NEW 41	**PC Heights Development Infrastructure (cap expansion cor**	PC Heights Development Infrastructure (cap expansion component)							
			WATER IMPACT FEES (Bonds)	$ -	$ -	$ 159,887	$ 164,683	$ -	$ -
			WATER SERVICE FEES (Bonds)	$ -	$ -	$ 67,146	$ 69,160	$ -	$ -
NEW 42	**Smart Irrigation Controllers**	Smart Irrigation Controllers	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ -	$ 6,000	$ 6,000	$ 6,000	$ 6,000	$ -
NEW 43	**Water Quality Study**	Water Quality Study	WATER SERVICE FEES	$ 100,000	$ 200,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -
		Water Quality Study - 2011 CIB Loan	BOND PROCEEDS (CIB)	$ 100,000	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -	$ -

City Council
Staff Report

Subject:	**Senior Strategic Plan**
Author:	**Rhoda Stauffer and ReNae Rezac**
Department:	**Sustainability**
Date:	**June 9, 2011**
Type of Item:	**Informational**

Summary Recommendation: This report is for informational purposes only, no action is requested. Staff recommends that the Council discuss and provide input on the main goals developed for a Senior Strategic Plan.

Background:

In January of 2010, Council directed staff to work with County staff to convene a working group on Senior Issues. The primary role of the group was to use the results of the 2009 Senior Survey to develop recommendations for both the City and the County to meet the most pressing needs expressed by persons aged 65 and older.

The results of the survey conducted in the fall of 2009 indicated that there were three key areas and the working group would utilize the survey findings along with other available market studies as a basis to develop an integrated workplan to address these three key areas as follows:

1. review current information distribution systems to determine gaps in information services and work together to fill those gaps;
2. review development plans and proposals for smaller housing units to ensure that there will be units appropriate for "downsizing" seniors; and
3. review plans and proposals for the development of assisted living facilities for appropriate scale and service levels for the projected needs of Park City and Summit County's senior population as well as to guide the design and development process where applicable.

Current population data:

	1990	2000	2010	
Park City 65+				
65 to 74 years	105	226		*
75 to 84 years	36	47		*
85 years and over	7	29		*
	148	**302**	**653**	
As a % of County 65+	**17%**	**21%**	**24%**	
Summit County				
65 to 74 years	526	993		*
75 to 84 years	315	350		*
85 years and over	51	110		*
	892	**1,453**	**2,768**	

*2010 age sub categories not yet available from Census

Analysis:

The Senior Issues Working Group is made up of representatives from: Park City staff, Summit County staff, Summit County Health Department, each of the three Senior Centers in Park City and the County, Mountainland Association of Governments Aging Services program, and a local medical clinic that provides services to a high number of seniors.

The group has been meeting monthly since October of 2010 and after reviewing the outcomes of the Senior Issues Survey, group members began reviewing current programs and services in order to develop a profile of gaps in service. Using the experience and expertise of the working group members, meetings were devoted to compiling a complete list of existing programs and services and then assessed the most critical gaps in services, programs and resources. The group also conducted a site visit to the Heber City to see their recently built Senior Center, review the scope of programs and services provided there, and interview Center staff about participation and what they have learned in the process.

The listing of services and programs currently in place compiled by the working group is as follows:

1. <u>Mountainland Association of Governments Aging and Family Services Department</u>
    - Chronic Disease Service Management Plan (CDSP), a 6-week workshop with hands-on training for people with chronic diseases. It is funded through a grant
    - Fund two caregiver support groups: Coalville (at Denise's) and Elk Meadows (Oakley).
    - Health Fair held once/year
    - Appreciation dinner for caregivers once/year
    - Five in-home health programs: 111B; HCBA $; Aging Waiver; New Choice Waiver; NCSP (Respite Program); Waiting list services; Local intake/info packets; Meals On Wheels
    - Chore Service (snow removal, etc.) through the Inmate Program
    - SHIIP (Insurance program that helps with Medicare)
    - Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) & appreciation dinner
    - Information Referrals
    - Provide Ensure
    - Community Resource Booklet
    - Free legal assistance
    - Durable medical equipment
    - Home visits by the Alzheimer's Association to train caregivers
    - Adult Protective Service Worker
    - Weatherization services through a Federal Housing Program

2. <u>Other Existing Services</u>
    - Wentworth Assisted Living Center in Oakley provides daycare, respite and assisted living services
    - Community Action Program Services based in Provo provides locations for food pick up from their food bank and also provides financial assistance with heating bills.
    - Fee for service programs to assist people to stay in their homes such as Applegate Homecare & Hospice.
    - Hi Mountain Drugstore in Kamas provides home delivery for seniors and the Mercantile in Coalville provides home delivery of groceries for seniors.

3. <u>Senior Centers</u>
   There are three Senior Centers located in Summit County and they are in Park City, Coalville and Kamas. Each one provides programming, some services and meals on select days of the week. The total number of seniors that participate in Senior Center activities is just under 300 or ten percent of the senior population in Summit County. The activities and services are summarized in the following chart.

	Coalville	**Kamas**	**Park City**
Hours	9:30am-3:30pm	11am-3pm	11am-3pm
Meals Offered	Twice a week, Wed & Fri	Twice a week, Mon & Thurs	Twice a week, Mon & Thurs
Number of Meals	Wed-50 meals, Fri-33 meals	35 to 40 2 times/week	Summer-45, Winter- 30
Games Available	Cards, Pool, Puzzles	Cards, Pool	Cards, Pool, Puzzles
Health Check (blood sugar/pressure, bone density)	Once/month	2 times/month	One time per month
Happy Feet (Podiatrist Visit)	Every 60 days	NA	NA
Monthly Activity	Yes	Yes	Yes
Exercise Classes	NA	NA	Yes
Bingo	Yes	Last Thursday of the month	NA
Quilting	Yes	NA	NA
Band & Singing	Yes	NA	NA
Board Officers (President, Vice President and Secretary)	Paid – 2 year terms and monthly meetings	Paid – 2 year terms and monthly meetings	Paid – 2 year terms and monthly meetings
Membership	60 paid plus 40 less active	61 paid plus 22 less active	75 paid plus 25 less active
Transportation Assistance	Once a month for shopping, prescriptions, groceries	Meals at Sr. Center, shopping, prescriptions, groceries	Through PC Transit, Mobility Bus
Buildings	Summit County owns building and maintains everything – need a maintenance agreement	Kamas owns building, County pays for cleaning etc. Need maintenance agreement	Park City owns building, County pays for cleaning, both County and City pay for upgrades/repairs, etc. Need maintenance agreement
Complimentary Use of South Summit Recreation Center	Yes-60+	Yes-60+	Yes-60+
Companion Services	NA	NA	Yes

Key Goals and Strategies to Meet Identified Gaps

Goal I. Information Dissemination: Establish an effective communication program.

A. Objective: Information on senior services, programs and resources needs to be more available, in a number of formats as well as from multiple sources.
B. Objective: Ensure that a much higher percentage of seniors in Summit County and Park City are well-informed of all available services and programs.

Strategies:

1. Create a cumulative service and program directory for Summit County and Park City;
2. Place articles in local newsletters on a regular basis,
3. Utilize social media for updates, program and services news as well as listings of resources;
4. Create regularly mailed emailed updates;
5. Place information brochures and directories doctors' offices and pharmacies;
6. Provide notes and reminders in utility bills;
7. Utilize churches to circulate information to their senior members; and
8. Focus special efforts on reaching "younger" seniors.
9. Bring on a county-wide program coordinator to oversee the information dissemination.

Goal II. Program Participation: Expand program and service options and number to encourage wider participation.

A. Objective: Enhance programming at Centers in order to provide a diversity of options and attract a higher number of seniors – especially younger seniors.
B. Objective: Enhance off-site programming to provide a greater number of activity options throughout the region.
C. Objective: Ensure a more welcoming atmosphere in all Senior Centers for new members and younger seniors.
D. Objective: Ensure that current facilities are in optimum condition.

Strategies:

1. Develop partnerships with community entities to gain access to additional programming and resources – such as Silver Mountain Sports Club, Basin Recreation Center.
2. Work with Summit County Health Department to conduct a medical education series.
3. Inspect all Senior Center facilities for current condition of structure, appliances, electrical, plumbing, etc. and draw up a wish-list to repair and renovate facilities to meet current ADA codes and make the buildings more user-friendly.
4. See County-wide program coordinator mentioned in Goal I. This person would also facilitate enhanced programming and oversee additional services to seniors.

Goal III. 'Age-in-Place' Programs: Explore "Aging-in-Place" programs to find a feasible fit for Summit County and Park City seniors.

A. Objective: Help Seniors stay in their homes as long as possible.

Strategies:

1. Explore the feasibility of launching a "Companion" or "Village" program.
2. Work with high school students to gain access to more 'community service' volunteers.
3. Organize a Senior Volunteer program to assist seniors in helping seniors.
4. Expand existing home repair and maintenance program provided through County prison- perhaps utilizing juvenile service agencies & Home Depot employees.
5. Expand the existing RSVP program through Mountainland Association of Government's Aging Services Office.
6. Assess the Feasibility of establishing an Adult Day Care program.
7. See County-wide program coordinator mentioned in Goal I. This person would also oversee the work to establish additional 'aging-in-place' services, programs and resources.

Goal IV. Housing: Facilitate the development of more housing options for seniors.

A. Objective: Ensure that there are an adequate number of well-managed assisted living/long-term care units available to aging seniors as they need them.
B. Objective: Ensure that over the next five to ten years, up to 20 smaller units are developed in a variety of styles (detached, condos, townhomes, etc.) for senior households wanting to downsize from larger houses.
C. Objective: Ensure that one to three of the units built in each of the future affordable housing developments are targeted for seniors.

Strategy:

1. Work with City and County planning staff to ensure that in five to ten years a "continuum of care campus style" development of modest proportions is planned to meet growing assisted living/long-term care needs (20-25 units total).
2. Work with City and County planners to ensure that future residential developments include units that are suitable for senior households wanting to downsize (both affordable and market options). Three to five units are needed per year.
3. Assist planners in integrating regulatory language into the General Plan addressing the "senior downsizing unit" concept.
4. See County-wide program coordinator mentioned in Goal I. This person would also coordinate the partnership work with City and County planning departments.

Goal V. Transportation: Improve the number of transportation assistance options.

A. Objective: Ensure that seniors have access to transportation when and where they need it.

Strategy:

1. Work with current volunteers and paid Senior Center providers to develop a plan for expanded transportation using both volunteers and paid contract employees where possible.
2. Work with Park City Transportation Department to develop an expanded service component for seniors.
3. See County-wide program coordinator mentioned in Goal I. This person would also manage an expanded transportation assistance network.

Summary Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Council discuss and provide input on the main goals developed for a Senior Strategic Plan.

City Council
Staff Report

Subject:	**Fuel Strategy**
Author:	**Diane Foster, Kent Cashel, Tyler Poulson**
Department:	**Sustainability and Transportation**
Date:	**June 9, 2011**
Type of Item:	**Informational**

Summary Recommendations:
Staff recommends that Council provide feedback on Council's current policy and the staff recommendation on fuel strategy for the City's fleet and City/County bus system.

Topic/Description:
Staff would like to discuss three topics with City Council related to fuel strategy:
1. Public electric vehicle charging stations in Park City;
2. Electric trolley project with Utah State University; and
3. Fuel strategy for public transit system.

Background & Analysis by Topic:

1. <u>Public Electric Vehicle Charging Stations in Park City</u>

Background
On May 1, 2011 the Mayor forwarded to Sustainability staff an email from a Prospector Square resident requesting the installation of electrical vehicle (EV) charging station. The resident offered to pay for the charging station, pay the electric bill for the first year (for other EV users as well) and pay for associated signage. The resident thought the lots where he parks were municipally-owned, but they are not (Prospector lots E and F).

On May 2, Staff advised the resident that we would discuss this item with Council in the mid-June timeframe. Since then, staff has held two meetings with representatives of the Transportation & Parking, Public Works, Planning, Building and Sustainability teams to understand the breadth and depth of the challenge of providing EV infrastructure.

Generally, there are three types of charging stations, two of which exists currently:
Level 1 = 8 to 20 hours: plug into a normal US household 120 volt AC socket
Level 2 = 3 to 8 hours: 240 volt AC plug (requires special equipment)
Level 3 = faster, possibly < 30 minutes (there are only a handful of public Level 3 charging stations in the US today)
More info: http://www.afdc.energy.gov/afdc/vehicles/electric_charging_equipment.html
Staff's recommendation is based on research and input from all of the aforementioned departments.

Analysis
EV infrastructure is in its infancy. As of May 25, 2011 there were a total of 948 EV charging stations in the US. 53% are in California; 7% in New York; with a total of 6 stations in Utah (http://www.afdc.energy.gov/afdc/fuels/stations_counts.html).

Most public EV infrastructure installation is being supported by a $114.8 million dollar grant from the US Department of Energy. This grant will result in the installation of approximately 14,000 chargers in 18 major cities and metropolitan areas in California, Oregon, Washington, Arizona, Texas, Tennessee, and Washington, D.C.

Municipal infrastructure in Utah is currently limited to five level 1 and one level 2 charging stations in SLC (http://www.slcgov.com/transportation/Parking/Electric.htm). Currently these stations are free to the public. Additionally, the new Whole Foods in Salt Lake City has a couple of 120v outlets in its parking garage over which it has place "EV Charging Station" signs.

No public or private official charging stations currently exist within Park City. There are electric vehicles in Park City, however, owners of those vehicles usually charge their vehicles at home or, according to one Park City EV owner, "[I] carry around a 75 foot extension cord and plug in at a friend's house or at my office."

Current activity by City staff on EV infrastructure has been limited to:

1. The aforementioned limited research and two cross-departmental meetings;
2. Sustainability staff has agreed to participate, in conjunction with Utah Clean Cities and Salt Lake City's Sustainability Department, in applying for a grant from the US Department of Energy titled "Clean Cities Community Readiness and Planning for Plug-In Electric Vehicles and Charging Infrastructure." (http://utahcleancities.org/grants) If awarded, this grant would provide up to $500,000 to develop an Electric Vehicle Deployment and Infrastructure Plan here in Utah. While Park City would be a participant, the grants funding would be managed by Utah Clean Cities. Included in the Infrastructure Plan would be recommended policy changes that would encourage or require EV infrastructure with new development.

Options

1. Continue with the aforementioned grant application and, if awarded, work with Utah Clean Cities and other Utah communities to develop an EV infrastructure plan for Utah, including Park City.
2. Develop and bring back to Council a plan to install one or two free Level 1 municipal charging stations in China Bridge. Included in this plan would be identification of possible funding sources to pay for the infrastructure installation and electric bills.
3. Develop and bring back to Council a plan to install one or two free Level 2 municipal charging stations in China Bridge. Included in this plan would be identification of possible funding sources to pay for the infrastructure installation and electric bills.

4. A combination of option 1 and option 2 or option 1 and option 3.
5. None of the above.

Staff Recommendation
Staff recommends Option 1, continuing on the path to apply for the DOE grant and work with Utah Clean Cities and Salt Lake City to develop an EV infrastructure plan for the State, including Park City. While this recommendation would require staff time, because of grant funding and the involvement of Utah Clean Cities, staff time would be less than if staff were to develop this plan without grant funding.

Option 1 does not prevent local individuals from purchasing EVs: With the current ranges of the more popular plug-in electric-only EVs, such as the Nissan Leaf at 100 miles or the 300 mile range of the Tesla, at home charging is possible. The major limitations come with housing types – as residents without garages or access to outdoor outlets do not necessarily have the same potential for in-home charging.

If Council chooses Option 1, staff will contact the homeowner in Prospector and let him know that the City will be embarking on a plan to eventually install public parking stations.

2. Electric trolley project with Utah State University's Energy Dynamics Lab

Background
In August 2010 the City entered into a Letter of Intent with Utah State University's Energy Dynamics Lab(EDL) (Exhibit B) to use the City's Main Street trolley as a demonstration project for inductive power transfer technology (wireless transfer of electricity from the road to trolley).

While the City has pledged $140,000 to this project, no funds have been expended – and no funds will be spent without additional Council approval.

Throughout the fall and early winter, staff worked with the EDL team to address operational issues. The project has hit a few proverbial "bumps in the road" that have resulted in a recommended change in direction. Specifically, the operational requirements of the technology as it currently stands would require the trolley to have a 15 minute dwell time at the Transit station (this would result in a 25% reduction in Trolley Frequency) or necessitate two Trolleys running concurrently (significantly increased operating costs with no increase in frequency) . Additionally, due to economic conditions, EDL was unable to secure the entire funding required for this project in the expected timeframe.

Staff believes it is still in the City's interest to remain committed to our good relationship with USU and EDL and, importantly, to the goals set forth by Council for this project. Council goals for this project included

- continuing to show leadership on environmental sustainability issues,
- the national media exposure potential of the project,
- the long-term carbon reduction that could be realized through this technology (in the future when we no longer rely on carbon-producing fuel sources),
- contributing to the greater good by supporting research that has the potential to benefit all;
- possible future economic development; and
- the benefits of our municipality partnering with a university.

In early March staff provided an update to Council of the trolley project status. Since that time, staff has been having monthly conference calls with EDL staff to evaluate the potential for a modification of the project that would still meet Council's goals and still positively contribute to EDL's technology development.

Analysis: Revised project proposal
EDL would still like to partner with Park City Municipal on an IPTT (Inductive Power Transfer Technology) project. The parameters of the revised project proposal are as follows:

1. **Vehicle:** The selected vehicle for the project would be a market-ready EV automobile or possibly a light truck. The vehicle would be used as a fleet vehicle for the City and would, most likely, be a fleet vehicle to be used for City-only business by the Marsac staff as well as the Council and Mayor. Staff recommends that the selected vehicle would have a vehicle "wrap" that would include the City's logo, USU's EDL logo and IPTT branding. It would be quite obvious that this was a demonstration IPTT vehicle.
2. **Charging Method:** While IPTT would still be utilized, the charging would be wireless stationary charging. For charging, the vehicle would park over a flat charging pad that would be placed in the Marsac North lot. It may be possible that the charging pad would be movable, so that the vehicle could be parked and charging at different event locations or at different municipal facilities.
3. **Educational Signage:** Along with the charging mat, a weather-resistant display would be placed in front of the charging station that explained IPTT and EVs.
4. **Financial Support:** Park City committed $140,000 of transit funding to this project, none of which has yet been spent. Staff recommends that Council consider putting half of those funds back in the Transit fund and keep the other half committed to this project revision – but require staff to come back with more specific parameters of the project (total project cost, project timeline, make & model of car, etc.) before any money is spent.
5. **Timing:** While EDL and PCMC staff discussed presenting project specifics to Council now, the vehicles that would be most appropriate for this project are not necessarily ones that staff from EDL and PCMC believe are right for this project (distance range too short or top speed too slow). Currently EDL is in serious

discussions with a major automobile manufacturer about a partnership. There is the possibility that the partnership could involve a Park City demonstration project similar to the revised project described herein. Should Council approve continuation of this project, that would include continued very limited staff time, PCMC staff and EDL would then likely meet with this major automobile manufacturer in Park City in the July/August 2011 timeframe.

Options

1. Direct staff to end the partnership with USU's Energy Dynamics Lab, extinguish the LOI and return the $140,000 to the Transit Fund.
2. Direct staff to continue the partnership with USU's Energy Dynamics Lab, return half of the $140,000 to the Transit Fund, return to Council at a later date to present specific details related to the revised project and a recommended modification to the LOI.
3. Direct staff to continue the partnership with USU's Energy Dynamics Lab, maintain the entire $140,000 in the project fund, return to Council at a later date to present specific details related to the revised project and a recommended modification to the LOI.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends Option 2: Direct staff to continue the partnership with USU's Energy Dynamics Lab, return half of the $140,000 to the Transit Fund, return to Council at a later date to present specific details related to the revised project and a recommended modification to the LOI.

Maintaining funding supports EDL by allowing them to say to prospective funders, including major automotive companies, "Park City is our partner and they have committed funds to this project." However, Option 2 includes returning half of the funds to the Transit Fund.

3. Fuel strategy for public transit system.

Background

The City's bus system has been running on bio-diesel mixture that includes soy for the past 5 years. In the warmer summer months, 20% of the fuel is a soy-based biodiesel while in the coldest winter months that percentage is reduced to 5% to avoid gelling.

During the 2009 Visioning Session staff from the Transportation and Sustainability teams presented a paper on fleet and fuel strategy (Exhibit A). Council's general direction was for staff to continue to monitor developments in new technology, but, because of the City's relatively small bus, truck and car fleet size, to avoid deploying "bleeding edge" technologies for the whole fleet.

Analysis

Recently there have been questions raised about the impacts of biodiesel on the food supply and the possibility of moving the bus system to Compressed Natural Gas (CNG). While staff has been monitoring developments in alternative fuels, as directed by Council during 2009 Visioning, staff does not believe that changing the bus system fuel to CNG is a good decision at this time, as discussed below.

In an effort to stay current with changes in fueling strategy, in addition to staying current though municipal transit industry publications, conferences and relationships with other municipal transit system operators, as well as State and Federal transit officials, city staff has:

- added a single CNG automobile to the fleet to understand the maintenance of current technology of CNG cars; and
- added a single Hybrid vehicle to the City's fleet to understand the performance and maintenance requirements of current hybrid vehicles; and
- presented, on July 29, 2010 as part of the Environmental Sustainability Annual Strategic Plan Update, a report produced by Utah State University's Energy Dynamics Lab and the Jon M. Huntsman School of Business. Part of the report included analysis of alternative fuels, including CNG, for Park City's transit system. A copy of the report can be found here: http://www.parkcitygreen.org/Community/Community-Footprint/Documents/Renewable-Energy-Park-City-Study.aspx) This report was provided at no cost to Park City Municipal.

Below is a comparative analysis of the current alternative fuels and the alternative fuels that are within the near-term horizon:

Park City Fuel Strategy Matrix

Fuel	Financial	Environmental
Biodiesel	~ Current biodiesel fuel costs are around $4/gallon ~ As with all fossil fuels, global demand is increasing and locations for resource extraction are becoming more challenging and expensive (e.g., offshore drilling, mountaintop removal mining, hydraulic fracturing)	~ Park City's current bus fuel is a 5% soy bio mix in the winter and 20% soy bio mix in warmer months ~ There is concern with using food options (e.g., soy) as fuels due to the pressure this places on prices and the global food market ~ The current B5/B20 mixes for Park City have GHG and particulate emissions profiles similar to diesel ~ Future advances in biofuels may lead to sharp declines in food-for-fuels concerns and also significantly improve GHG emissions
Compressed Natural Gas (CNG)	~Infrastructure costs very high (Top Stop slow fill station is not viable for fleet operations). ~ Current fuel prices for natural gas may be up to one-third cheaper than diesel options ~ All things being equal, domestic supplies of natural gas are expected to be sufficient as a transportation fuel for the next few decades - however, the recent shift away from coal-fired electricity to natural gas will exert another new pressure on the natural gas market	~ CNG vehicles offer clear reductions in tailpipe criteria pollutants relative to current gasoline and diesel options ~ CNG vehicles may offer reductions in GHG emissions relative to diesel - however, new research from EPA suggests that lifecycle emissions of natural gas may only be 25% cleaner than coal (the most GHG-intensive energy option) ~ Hydraulic fracturing ("fracking") is a major environmental concern with natural gas extraction due to lifecycle environmental impacts and fracking's current exclusion from the federal Save Drinking Water Act
Hybrid Electric	~ Hybrid vehicles offer improved MPG and lower exposure to energy inflation concerns than strictly fossil fuel-powered options ~Battery pack replacement (3 year cycle) approximately $50,000 each	~ Hybrid electric buses offer an improvement in MPG and fewer criteria / GHG emissions than non-hybrid diesel and gasoline options ~ There is concern about ongoing availability of rare materials which go into certain hybrid battery components - DOE recently offered $30MM in grants for R&D to help resolve these rare materials concerns
All Electric	~ Powering an electric vehicle requires a fraction of the "fuel" cost relative to gasoline or diesel at current market rates ~ Utah currently enjoys very low electricity rates - however, it has been indicated by Rocky Mountain Power that rates may double in the next decade and move more in line with the national average	~ Electric vehicles produce no emissions, either in the form of criteria pollutants or GHGs, at the tailpipe making them an appealing option for mitigating local air quality problems ~ Electric vehicles do, however, contribute to air quality problems and GHG emissions depending on how the electricity is generated ~ According to EPA, in 2005 electricity generated in Utah was 81.6% coal and 15.8% natural gas - this type of electricity mix would likely increase overall GHG emissions compared to current biodiesel blends ~ Similar to hybrids, there is concern about availability of rare materials to produce electric vehicle batteries - DOE is investing in R&D to help resolve this
Hydrogen	~ Expensive infrastructure costs are a major concern with hydrogen as a fuel option - additionally, transporting hydrogen to fuel stations requires ongoing resources and expenditures ~ Similar to electric vehicles, hydrogen fuel cells could derive their energy from electricity or some other source with currently low market rates	~ Hydrogen fuel cells are an energy carrier, rather than an energy source (like fossil fuels) - given this, fuel cell technology relies on external energy sources such as electricity to power the vehicle ~ Similar to electric vehicles, there are no emissions at the tailpipe, but significant air quality and GHG concerns which depend on the energy source utilized

Note: numerous other fuels are technically available for use; however, these were not analyzed so more focus could be given to fuels of more immediate interest to Park City. Some fuels not considered include ethanol, LNG, propane, and methanol.

Sources for Environmental Info

North Carolina Clean Fuel Advanced Technology: http://www.ncsc.ncsu.edu/cleantransportation/docs/Factsheets/CFAT_Matrix.pdf
Scientific American: http://www.scientificamerican.com/article.cfm?id=climate-benefits-natural-gas-overstated
Southwest Energy Efficiency Project: http://www.swenergy.org/publications/category.aspx?CategoryID=4

Utah Transit Authority (UTA) is planning a test of CNG in approximately 13% of its fleet (100 busses). UTA has a total fleet size of 750 busses. According to discussions with UTA, the primarily reason for the pilot program is the low cost of CNG as compared to diesel. Because of the large size of its fleet, it is financially feasible for UTA to conduct this test while not putting its entire fleet at risk. It is important to note that CNG fueling infrastructure costs for this project are forecasted to be in the range of $4.5-5 million.

The local bus system in Park City is funded by Park City Municipal, Summit County and funding is also received from the US Department of Transportation. Park City runs a comparatively small bus system with a total of 34 buses in the fleet.

The main concerns with moving Park City's fleet to CNG or conducting a pilot program:

- The price of a pilot program would be too high: To conduct a pilot, Park City would need to purchase one to four busses. That is not a sufficient volume to get a price discount from bus manufacturer.
- Fueling infrastructure forecasted to be in $2.5 to $3 million range.
- The price of CNG is likely to increase significantly in the future due to a significant increase in demand, fueled by the growth in new CNG-powered electric plants(since it is difficult to impossible to get a new coal-fired power plant approved)..
- CNG will never be a carbon-free solution
- The replacement schedule for our 35' busses does not allow for a reasonable test. The buses have a 12 year lifecycle and because capital funding for buses is provided by the US Department of Transportation, any early retirement of a bus requires reimbursement to the federal government for that bus. The replacement schedule is as follows:
    - 2014 3
    - 2015 7
    - 2016 1
    - 2017 7
    - 2018 4
    - 2019 1
    - 2020 5
    - 2021 1
- Natural gas is retrieved from the ground via an extraction method called hydraulic fracturing or "fracking". The fracking process utilizes chemicals that are harmful to human health, as well as a significant amount of water. The federal Energy Policy Act of 2005 precludes any federal regulation of natural gas extraction. Because of groundwater contamination concerns, as well as the lack of federal regulation, many citizens will likely have concerns about switching our bus system to CNG.
- Fuel technology is changing very quickly right now. Going with CNG at this juncture will be a 12 year commitment. Moving to CNG at this point will preclude moving to other options in the future, such as hybrid electric, which are also being piloted in many US cities. (Las Vegas has 60 hybrid electric rapid transit coaches (buses) in its fleet, along with 50 other hybrid vehicles.

Options

1. Maintain the current Council-directed strategy of monitoring new developments in alternative fuels and drop the bio-diesel program, opting for 100% diesel with no bio-diesel in the mix;
2. Maintain the current Council-directed strategy of monitoring new developments in alternative fuels and maintain the current bio-diesel mix in the bus system;
3. Maintain the current Council-directed strategy of monitoring new developments in alternative fuels and return to Council at a later date with an analysis of the financial and environmental impacts of staying with biodiesel or moving to 100% diesel.
4. Return to Council at a later date with a proposal to conduct a pilot CNG project for our transit system.

Staff Recommendation

Staff recommends Option 2: In Park City we believe ourselves to be proactive verses reactive. We prefer to plan our future and then execute against this plan. Many scientist view CNG as a stepping stone fuel while renewable energy resources are being developed on a large scale. The pace of change in the fuels market is so rapid right now, that moving to a stepping stone fuel has the potential to stall adoption in Park City of newer and better alternatives that are expected within the next five-year timeframe. CNG is only a short-term strategy.

Department Review:

This entire staff report was reviewed by the Transportation and Sustainability Departments. The section on EV Charging Stations was reviewed by those two departments as well as Planning, Building, Public Works and the Parking Team within Transportation.

Significant Impacts:

Fuel strategy impacts have both financial and environmental consequences.

Recommendation:

Staff recommends that Council provide feedback on Council's current policy and the staff recommendation on fuel strategy for the City's fleet and City/County bus system.

Attachments:

Exhibit A: 2009 Visioning Paper on Fleet (and fuel strategy)

Exhibit A
2009 Visioning Paper: Fleet

Background:
In the past year, the volatility in the petroleum market and concern about carbon emissions has caused many Fleet Managers to research alternatives to gas/diesel powered vehicles as well fuel reduction strategies.

At the direction of Council, Park City's Transportation team has been working with the Environmental Sustainability team to develop a carbon reduction strategy. The two primary goals are:

1. Reduce vehicle emissions
2. Reduce Fleet Operating Costs

Based on these two goals, the team is approximately 75% to completion a draft of the Park City Municipal Strategic Fuel Conservation Plan and plans on presenting this plan to Council in spring 2009, along with carbon reduction plans from other departments. This Fuel Conservation Plan will focus early efforts on the "low hanging fruit" – the strategies and systems that will yield the greatest carbon reduction at the lowest cost. Under the Plan, each department that has operational responsibility for one or more vehicles will be selecting the most appropriate department-specific fuel conservation tactics. These tactics fall under four specific categories:

1. Vehicle Maintenance: Reduce vehicle fuel consumption through modifications and/or improvements in the maintenance of vehicles.
2. Policy Development: Develop policies within the City that can result in the reduction of fuel consumption.
3. Vehicle Procurement: Reduce vehicle fuel consumption by selecting the most fuel efficient vehicle that is appropriate for the task.
4. Driving Behavior: Develop training and policies that influence driver behavior such that a driver reduces the amount of fuel his or her vehicle consumes through changes in driving habits. This includes evaluation of alternative transportation.

Process for Evaluating New Technology
Previously, the Transportation Department did not employ a formalized process for evaluating new technologies and new systems – although lack of a formal process did not prevent the department from testing and adopting the use of biodiesel and evaluating other potential fuel-saving systems. However, as the number of alternatives increases, Transportation's ability to test and embrace new technologies will be limited by both time and budget. Additionally, as a small city with factors that limit transportation choices (such as climate, elevation, minimal fleet maintenance staff terrain and proximity to a variety of retailers), we cannot afford to adopt "bleeding edge" technologies and instead need to make carefully considered choices that meet our location challenges along with our carbon goals. Therefore, the Strategic Fuel Conservation Plan will also suggest a more formal process for the evaluation and adoption of new technologies.

Specific Comments on Alternative Fuel Vehicles
The rapid increase in gas prices was the catalyst for the significant growth in popularity of compressed natural gas (CNG) and electric vehicles. In Utah, the growth has also been spurred by a tax credit and by what are the lowest natural gas rates in the country – until the Utah's PSC recent announcement of rate hikes that will take CNG prices from about 80 cents a gallon to $1.43 per gallon in six months.

Staff conducted limited research on either purchasing natural gas vehicles (NGV) or converting some of the fleet to dual fuel. At this time, staff does not recommend integrating NGV(s) into the City fleet. Staff recommends implementation of the findings of the Fuel Conservation Plan first, and if Council should direct staff to look at NGVs, the aforementioned process of evaluating new technology would be employed to track new opportunities in the market.

There are some specific factors that caused staff to put CNG and electric vehicles on the back burner for now:

- The Honda Civic GX is the only production natural gas vehicle currently available in the United States, and this vehicle is not appropriate for our fleet;
- Converting vehicles to CNG is a possibility, but staff would need time to understand the costs, payback period and the impact of the fuel price hikes on payback; and
- Previous City experiments with NGV(s) have not been positive. Staff ran a trial program with NGV vehicles (trolley and several SUV's). These tests indicated the technology was not dependable enough for City fleet operations.
- Because of the popularity of CNG vehicles in Utah and the fact that a CNG tank gets filled at the station by the equalization of pressure between the tank at the station and the vehicles' tank, there have been problems with vehicles only half filling at the pump (because the tank in the ground at the station does not have time enough to repressurize between fills).
- Electric vehicles do hold promise, but electric vehicles appropriate for our fleet are not yet available.

Impacts: If Council has an interest in one or more of these programs, Council may direct staff to come back with an estimate of resource requirements.

Alternatives:

1. Council could choose to direct staff to continue on the current course of action;
2. Council could direct staff to research alternative, but similar programs;
3. Council could direct staff to prioritize acquisition of alternative fuel vehicles;
4. Council could direct staff to pursue purchasing carbon offsets until technology allows the fleet to meet carbon reduction goals; or
5. Council could direct staff to do nothing.

Policy Questions:

Does Council want staff to estimate the time and cost to determine the true viability of CNG conversions for the Park City Municipal fleet?

Next Steps:

Staff recommends the City complete development of a Fuel Conservation Strategic Plan before implementing new technologies into its fleet operations.

Exhibit B

Energy Dynamics Lab and Park City IPT Demonstration Project

Letter of Intent

This non-binding Letter of Intent ("LOI") outlines the expectations and understandings of Energy Dynamics Laboratory (EDL) and Park City as they begin to form a partnership for the development efforts of a Phase I Demonstration of wireless charging of electric vehicles using Inductive Power Transfer Technology (IPTT).

Summary

1. EDL, a division of Utah State University Research Foundation, has partnered with world class academic, research and technology organizations and is a global leader in developing IPTT;
2. EDL has invested in and assembled a team of scientists, engineers, business development specialists and administrative personnel to design and execute IPT demonstrations.
3. EDL has defined a three Phase Demonstration program to introduce this technology to markets, investors, manufacturers and consumers on a national and global basis;
4. EDL and Park City share a common interest in promoting IPT technology to reduce the use of petroleum, increase energy independence and decrease greenhouse gas emissions and pollution;
5. EDL and Park City wish to partner on the successful deployment of the first public demonstration of this technology in the United States.

Definitions:

"Development Efforts" mean activities that Energy Dynamics Laboratory (EDL), will engage in during the next 6-12 months to promote the public demonstration of IPTT. Such activities shall include: strategic partnership identification, grant proposal writing to state and federal agencies, public relations and marketing, technical development activities, fundraising for demonstration projects, and positioning of the demonstration project.

"IPTT" means Inductive Power Transfer Technology which is a technology that transfers energy wirelessly over an air gap and will be used in this demonstration specifically for electric vehicle charging systems.

"Partnership" means the collaborative efforts between Park City and EDL that include the Phase I Demonstration Project, and the related activities.

"Phase I Demonstration" means the first US demonstration projects of IPTT, one of which will be conducted by Park City and EDL, the specifics of which will be determined and defined through this partnership.

Terms:

1. EDL will commit additional resources (from those identified in Summary #2 above) including in-kind contributions of personnel and work hours, university research and direct financial contributions. These amounts will be determined as the project moves forward.
2. Park City will commit resources which may include in-kind contributions of personnel work hours, media relations and direct financial contributions. Park City will commit up to $140,000 in direct monetary contributions for project costs and to cover 50% of the cost for a project manager that

will report to the City, but be a part of EDL staff. The commitment of up to $140,000 is contingent upon agreement on terms and allocation of costs as provided in the LOI.

3. EDL will lead the development effort and take responsibility for overall project design and delivery with the support and direction of Park City and other partners.
4. Park City will commit to leverage their status and brand to achieve maximum global media attention. This includes media exposure and announcements at such events as the Sundance Film Festival, the Park City Arts Festival and other appropriate venues, provided all such public relations are consistent with any applicable contracts including but not limited to the Sundance Film Festival Master License Agreement, the U.S.O.C. Olympic Marks License Agreement and Park City Arts Festival Master Festival Agreement.
5. EDL and Park City will share jointly in the technological assessment of the project and in the determination of the size and scope of the demonstration.
6. EDL and Park City will share jointly in the development of partnerships with local, state, national and/or global entities that will provide public relations, industrial, political and/or financial support.
7. EDL and Park City agree to work together to examine and execute this project in a timely manner with the following timelines serving as guidance.
    a. September 2010: Determine feasibility and define scope and scale of project, and make public announcement of the Partnership
    b. September-January 2011: Develop secondary partners, design PR campaign, assess technological requirements and define budget expectations
    c. February 2011: First Public Announcement for launch of the Phase I Demonstration
    d. March-November 2011: Bus Retrofit, In-road Construction, NEV Retrofits, and Engineering
    e. December 2011: Trolley fully operational
8. For all funds acquired and/or contributed, the Parties will agree in advance for a formula on how such funds will be used and how value will be assigned to each party.
9. EDL and Park City will conduct the project in compliance with all applicable FTA, UDOT and any other federal or state grant/funding requirements.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF this non-binding Letter of Intent has been executed by the following individuals and will remain effective until December 2011 at which point it can be reviewed and considered for revision and/or renewal:

SIGNED BY ________________________________ [print name]

For and on behalf of the Utah State Research Foundation

____ [signature]

DATE: ____________________

SIGNED BY ________________________________ [print name]

For and on behalf of the city of Park City, Utah

____ [signature]

DATE: ____________________

PARK CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION NOTES
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 26, 2011

Present: **Mayor Dana Williams; Council members Alex Butwinski; Joe Kernan; Cindy Matsumoto; Dick Peek; and Liza Simpson**

Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Mark Harington, City Attorney; Troy Johnston, Budget Intern; Jed Briggs, Budget Analyst; Chad Root, Chief Building Official; Roger Evans, Building Inspector; Matt Cassel, City Engineer; Thomas Eddington, Planning Manager; Nate Rockwood, Budget Analyst; Craig Sanchez, Director of Golf; Ken Fisher, Recreation Manager; Linda Tillson, Library Director; Jon Pistey, Ice Operations; Scott Robertson, IT Manager; Clint McAffee, Water Analyst; Kent Cashel, Transportation Manager; Phyllis Robison, Public Affairs Manager; Bret Howser, Budget Manager; Michael Kovacs, Assistant City Manager

1. Council questions/comments. Cindy Matsumoto spoke about visiting Durango and suggested that it be considered for a future summer tour destination. Dick Peek reported that he attended the Library Board meeting, Mayor Williams shared SBWRD business.

2. Monthly financial update. Troy Johnston reported that there was a slight decrease in sales tax this past month, recreation fees are down almost 30% because of the Recreation Building construction. He described looking at sales tax information on an interactive model which is on-line. Sales tax year to date is up 8.3% from last year. General Fund expenditures are under projections. He reviewed enterprise funds.

3. Operating expenditures. Jed Briggs discussed the Budgeting for Outcomes sessions which spanned from July to January with results being presented in February at Visioning. Teams prioritized options for departments and were asked to offset options. Approved options in 2012 totaled $1.6 million, not including revenue offsets or capital changes, debt service, inter-fund transfers, etc. In FY 2013, options dropped by $500,000.

Chief Building Official Chad Root explained changes in personnel and moving a contract position from the Building Department to the Planning Department in order to assist with work load. He believed that 2007 construction levels will return by 2013 and it is recommended that the Building Analyst II position be moved to the Planning Department which is a result of prioritizing community objectives including the General Plan update. Roger Evans confirmed that constructions numbers will swing back up. Thomas Eddington clarified that the $140,000 contract position moved from Building is intended for a one year contract planner, consulting services for the General Plan and other long range planning. Some of the money is reserved for historic preservation training and services. The architect/planner will be the Historic District Coordinator focusing on coordination of Historic District Design Review, consulting services, Historic Site Inventory update, and any other associated activities. The Mayor pointed out that Kayla Sintz is a LEED certified architect and he didn't want that effort lost. Mr. Eddington clarified that she will still be working with the Department on other responsibilities and all planners will be working on Historic District applications. Matt Cassel spoke about Engineering sharing a position with Public Works and the water team providing field inspection services for the next few years. The other request was to provide landscaping maintenance for Sandridge and Hillside Avenue in the amount of $2,600 a year.

Michael Kovacs explained that the Executive/Legal Team has more property to insure with different projects and infrastructure coming on–line and there is some election expense this year. Nate Rockwood stated that the victim advocate position supported by the Legal Department is contingent on receiving a grant from the Federal Government in the amount of $25,000. The program will be housed in the Police Department and the budgeted amount represents a portion of the matching funds from the Legal Department with some police oversight time and volunteer hours and about 50% is matched including in-kind services. The total cost of the program, not including in-kind, would be about $36,000. Mr. Kovacs stated that Senior Recorder Cindy LoPiccolo will be leaving the City after about 15 years of service. It is proposed to split functions of her position with safety programs going to Engineering and insurance to the Legal Department. Executive would conduct Elections and receive a part-time entry level position. Some funds will be transferred to Legal to offset contract expenses. It is estimated that there will be a $13,000 savings with this approach returning to the General Fund. Developing safety programs and saving on workmen's compensation claims were discussed.

Craig Sanchez presented his options including $10,000 in increased inventory for retail which is offset by tournaments, the second is a professional development plan for a Class A PGA Professional which is offset by fees and staff; changing the Golf Manager's position and his current role from 70-30 split in the Golf Fund and City to a 50-50 split and more City-wide functions. There is an increase of $2,700 to the golf cart repair and maintenance. He explained that in order to host state-wide open tournaments, a certified PGA Professional must be at the facility. In response to a question from Dick Peek about competitively pricing merchandise, Mr. Sanchez explained that most pro shops return about 40% to 50% and more is sold for tournament and non-resident play. Ken Fisher, Recreation Manager, spoke about moving an Analyst II to III. He detailed initiating a birthday party service at the Recreation Building which he believes will generate significant revenue. The new facility will include a pro shop which is a $95,000 option offset by $110,000 in revenue. There is a $1,500 request for group fitness by adding a third studio. Ms. Matsumoto questioned if recreation should get into the retail business with those numbers. Discussion ensued on the mark-up on clothing and equipment and impulse buying. Mr. Sanchez pointed out the importance of customer service and providing retail items is more than just a return on investment.

Ken Fisher referred to the building maintenance option to service a building 30% larger than the Racquet Club. There is a request for maintenance of Creekside Park and $20,000 for handling the bubble offset through increased tennis fees. Mr. Fisher noted a $2,000 day camp option for certification of workers and addressed the option of increasing the number of maintenance hours to 20 at the dirt jump park offset by reduced front desk coverage. Liza Simpson strongly expressed concerns about maintaining a good level of customer service at the new facility. Mr. Fisher referred to the youth soccer option where prices have simply increased for uniforms and an adjustment to the pro shop. Library Director Linda Tillson stated that the most important option is to upgrade the on-line catalog software. Another option is offering night and weekend children's story time and teen programs for working parents using Library Assistants. Liza Simpson suggested using Friends of the Library for volunteer work.

Jon Pistey, Ice Arena, explained that the first option is for $26,000 for staffing a seasonal outdoor ice sheet on the Zoom patio. Alex Butwinski stated that the HPCA is not in favor of the proposal and he questioned its feasibility. The capital side may be better used for a street light at Marsac. He doesn't believe this represents a good test for a rink at the top of the street. Ms. Matsumoto understood that Sky Lodge was to receive the first $15,000 in profits which seems somewhat inequitable. Mr. Pistey explained that the Sky Lodge has agreed to put forth capital for site improvements and he felt this is a great amenity for Main Street. The City would be spending $25,000 on equipment which can be used at the main rink. In response to a question from Ms. Matsumoto, he confirmed the Sky Lodge is spending $15,000 on initial staffing but is uncertain about the scope of improvements on the property to accommodate the rink. Dick Peek encouraged that the Council review drawings of the project before committing to the project and asked a number of questions, including whether the shade structures will obscure Zooms. This was discussed at length. Mr. Butwinski cautioned rushing into this project and felt that waiting a year will be helpful. The Mayor expressed concerns about the terms of the arrangement as the City will be putting up five times the money than the Sky Lodge and the first $15,000 generated goes to them. He would rather consider an economic development grant for a business than have the City staff and operate a private concession. He pointed out that the rink is not yet out of the red. There is really no excess money to experiment with and he is not supportive at this point. Liza Simpson agreed with the Mayor. Mr. Pistey explained that there are few revenue opportunities at the rink left to explore and he felt the satellite rink was a creative option to bring in some new revenue. The Mayor believed that the City should be paid first and the Sky Lodge reimbursed later. Alex Butwinski questioned the estimate of 60 skaters predicted per day on a small rink. Mr. Pistey advised that for other small facilities 60 patrons a day is realistic. Joe Kernan stated that he is comfortable with the Mayor's suggestion that the Sky Lodge is not reimbursed its $15,000 until the City's costs are covered. The rink will be a good draw for the Sky Lodge and it should take on more risk in the first year. Mr. Peek reiterated that he would like to see plans acknowledging that staff, the Planning Commission and the HPB will be involved, but based on available information, he is not supportive of the proposal. The majority of members were not in favor of moving forward with the Sky Lodge rink but agreed to consider it next year. Members were supportive of the remaining options.

The acquisition and use of the scissor lift was discussed. Scott Robertson reviewed the IT budget; there were no questions or concerns.

Clint McAffee pointed out an increase in the Quinns Water Treatment Plant operation and maintenance due to revised estimates on costs which is offset with the elimination of a reservation fee and an increase associated with the fixed base meter reading system for connection fees, lease fees, etc. This is a level of service reduction affecting maintenance on meters and asset management monitoring. Ms. Simpson stated that she is not excited about reduction in service, especially a new asset management program. Mr. McAffee explained it will be a 20% reduction in refurbishing meters and the City Manager suggested looking at other options but explained that staff was asked to identify offsets and this was a low ranking program. The Mayor hoped that offsets would not always be reductions in service. Tom Bakaly stated that because the Water Fund is an enterprise fund, if costs are not offset, water rates are impacted. Liza Simpson felt that it is important to have an efficient water system and is willing to raise rates including the $9,400 offset just discussed rather than reduce service. Bret Howser discussed modifying the Water Fund model and after discussion members decided not to adjust rates for the offset in the Water Fund since there is no impact to the water customer. Jed Briggs pointed out the new cost for utilities at the water treatment plant but the inter-fund administrative transfer for water is going down somewhat. Mr. McAffee explained that a $100,000 contingency has been established the result of the Thaynes event last summer and serves to cover unexpected emergency expenses.

Kent Cashel addressed an increase for maintenance to accommodate the new transit building which is offset by a reduction in contract services and a contribution from the County for a portion of the costs. The addition of a planner in transit has reduced the need for outside contract services and service delivery will not change. Bus Driver IV is a new position and the transit marketing plan is budgeted. Bret Howser described technical adjustments which originate from outside sources, like URS.

Chief of Police Wade Carpenter described a personnel move from Analyst I to Analyst II based on added responsibilities associated with the Fire Marshal duties. He spoke about a new program providing redundancy in the CAD system with Summit County which has no financial impact. There was no review or questions for his remaining options.

Alex Butwinski pointed out the $250,000 number in the General Fund lump merit pool and Bret Howser explained that it is the additional 3% to the existing 4%. There were a few questions for Phyllis Robinson of Sustainability. Unfinished work session business was partially covered in the regular meeting.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

PARK CITY COUNCIL MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MAY 26, 2011

I ROLL CALL

Mayor Dana Williams called the regular meeting of the City Council to order at approximately 6 p.m. at the Marsac Municipal Building on Thursday, May 26, 2011. Members in attendance were Dana Williams, Alex Butwinski, Joe Kernan, Cindy Matsumoto, Dick Peek, and Liza Simpson. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Tyler Poulson, Sustainability Analyst; Phyllis Robinson, Public Affairs Manager; Tommy Youngblood, Special Events Coordinator; Bret Howser, Budget Manager; Nate Rockwood, Budget Analyst; Troy Johnston, Executive Intern; and Mark Harrington, City Attorney.

II COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES FROM COUNCIL AND STAFF

None.

III PUBLIC INPUT *(Any matter of City business not scheduled on agenda)*

None.

IV WORK SESSION NOTES AND MINUTES OF MEETING OF MAY 12, 2011

Alex Butwinski, "I move we accept the work session notes and minutes of May 12th". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

V CONSENT AGENDA *(Items that have previously been discussed or are perceived as routine and may be approved by one motion. Listed items do not imply a predisposition for approval and may be removed by motion and discussed and acted upon under "Additional Discussion – Agenda Items")*

Alex Butwinski, "I move to approve the Consent Agenda, Items 1 and 2". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

1. Consideration of a Resolution designating June 11 to June 18, 2011 as Summit County Invasive Weed Awareness Week in Park City, Utah – Staff recommends approval.

2. Consideration of a Resolution adopting an amended Federal Transit Authority Substance Abuse Policy for Park City Municipal Corporation – Staff recommends approval.

VI NEW BUSINESS *(New items with presentations and/or anticipated detailed discussions)*

1. Consideration of an Ordinance approving a plat amendment for 811 Norfolk Avenue, Park City, Utah – The Mayor opened the public hearing. There was no response from the audience. Dick Peek, "I move that we continue 811 Norfolk Avenue plat amendment to a date uncertain". Joe Kernan seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

2. Consideration of an Ordinance approving a plat amendment for 817 Norfolk Avenue, Park City, Utah – The Mayor opened the public hearing; there was no input. Dick Peek, "I move

we continue the plat amendment for 817 Norfolk Avenue to a date uncertain". Alex Butwinski seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

3. Consideration of a Master Festival License for the MTB Race Series to be held in Round Valley on June 25, 2011 – Tommy Youngblood described elements of the event which is recommended for approval. Bob Saffold of MTB Productions explained that they have a partnership with the Huntsman Cancer Institute where $5 is contributed from each entry fee and there are other fund-raising opportunities. Mr. Youngblood stated that Round Valley will be available to the public during the race. Meeting the 60 day time frame for applications was discussed and it was pointed out that everyone is treated equally. If an event does not meet the timeline, it will be noted in the staff report. The Mayor opened the public hearing; there were no comments. Lisa Simpson, "I move that we approve a Master Festival License for the MTB Race Series on Saturday,June 25, 2011 from 4 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. based on the findings of fact, conclusions of law, and conditions of approval and waiving the time restraint for application, if needed". Joe Kernan seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

4. Consideration of a Master Festival License for the Classical Concert Series in City Park to be held on July 18 and 25 and August 8 and 15, 2011 – Tommy Youngblood explained that the applicant is Mountain Town Stages. There is no amplified music and about 100 spectators are estimated at performances. Parking will be carefully monitored for each show. Mayor Williams discussed the lack of a written policy for City Park and Tom Bakaly responded that events are examined individually so specific impacts are addressed and mitigated. Tommy Youngblood advised that a use policy for all public areas is underway and events are not turned down without seeking operational solutions first. Mark Harrington interjected that Council holds approval ability, not staff. The Mayor opened the public hearing; there was none and the public hearing was closed. Liza Simpson, "I move we approve the Master Festival License allowing the City Park Classical Concert Music Series". Cindy Matsumoto seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

5. Consideration of extending a line of credit in the amount of $100,000 to Habitat for Humanity for the construction of affordable housing in Park City, Utah – Phyllis Robinson introduced Shelly Barrus, Program Manager and Jeff Graham, Board Member. This line of credit is for 154 Marsac Avenue which was donated by the City a few years ago. The application has gone through all planning processes and is fully permitted at this point. It has been a challenging time to raise funds for many non-profits, including Habitat who initially requested a larger line of credit for both houses. Since only one house is moving forward at this time, staff is recommending this amount and she spoke about other promissory notes to Mountainlands Community Housing Trust which have been successfully repaid to the City. There are conditions of approval outlined in the staff report and staff is recommending a 12 month loan with the potential of automatic six month extensions based upon successful performance of the note. The Legal Department is comfortable with the 2.5% per annum rate on the note based on our current earnings rate at the state. She stated that the City will be monitoring the draw request which will be limited to capital expenses with proof of payment and in the event of default, the land returns to the City. Alex Butwinski asked about establishing a policy for extending credit and Ms. Robinson explained that a loan program policy has not been pursued because the City doesn't want to create expectations. Tom Bakaly added that loan criteria has been used in the past. Mr. Butwinski believed it is important to treat everyone the same and Ms. Robinson pointed out that every loan is structured differetly. Ms. Simpson stated that she has been comfortable with prior requests. The Mayor invited public input; there was none. Ms. Robinson advised that the $100,000 is coming from the affordable housing CIP. Joe

Kernan, "I move we approve New Business Item No. 5 providing a letter of credit to Habitat for Humanity". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

6. Consideration of a Professional Service Agreement with Avail Technologies, Inc in the amount of $1,235,008 for the purchase and installation of an Automated Vehicle Location Global Positioning System, in a form approved by the City Attorney – Kent Cashel explained that the GPS will provide real time bus location information in a variety of formats. It also creates data for improved analysis and reporting. There is an 80% FTA grant going toward the purchase, 20% will come from local funds and the County is participating in a proportionate share. The procurement spanned over two years and he believed staff negotiated a fair and reasonable price for the product. There is extensive training but no additional staffing is needed. Mr. Cashel answered a number of questions for Liza Simpson. Cindy Matsumoto, "I move that we authorize the City Manager to execute a professional service agreement with Avail Technologies, Inc in the amount of $1,235,008 for the purchase and installation of an AVL GPS System". Liza Simpson seconded. Motion unanimously carried.

7. Consideration of a Resolution adopting a tentative revised budget for fiscal year 2011 and the budget for fiscal year 2012 for Park City Municipal Corporation and its related agencies – The Mayor opened the public hearing and with no input, continued it to June 2, 2011. The work session discussion was continued. Troy Johnston pointed out that the three major enterprise funds Golf, Water and Transit and the General Fund receive services from department programs. The last inter-fund transfer study was done ten years ago and was an indirect cost analysis. Adjusted totals reflect a reduction of $76,000 for the Water Fund, increase of $3,000 for Golf and a decrease of $60,000 for Transit for a total reduction of $133,000. Enterprise funds will now be made directly responsible for janitorial and utility costs and some fees processed by the Finance Department are being directly allocated to the General Fund. He stated that the administrative inter-fund plan will be updated every two to three years.

Nate Rockwood referred to the Transportation and Parking Fund study completed this year. In recent years, there has been discussion about moving the Resort Cities Sales Tax from the Transportation Fund to the General Fund. The bulk of the study consisted of creating the transit fund model and analyzing service levels without federal financial assistance. It was determined that without federal funding, the fund would still be able to cover all of its current services which has been a long-term goal. Additional services in the future, however, add challenges mainly because of the timing of capital projects. Mr. Rockwood stated that it is anticipated that in the short term the Fund will continue to add to the fund balance and that federal funding will continue, but maybe not to the degree it has been in the past. The Transit Department is currently working to provide the short range transit plan which will recommend services to be added. In response to a question from Liza Simpson about staffing, Kent Cashel detailed hiring seasonal employees. Mr. Rockwood noted that paid parking is also addressed in the study.

Bret Howser described the Marsac Avenue street light request which has gone through the RELS process where it was recommended to send it through the capital improvement team again, as it was determined that it is not an elevated service. The CIP committee looked at it again and reaffirmed its original decision to deny, but Council can override this decision. Funding options including cutting another capital project or drawing on the fund balance. All members were supportive of overturning the decision. Alex Butwinski referred to discussions about authorizing the City Manager to manage a CIP contingency account to handle these types of requests. Mr. Howser stated that about $200,000 exists in the contingency fund and there is a policy on how this money is accessed including emergencies or short-term service requests.

It is not recommended to use more than 50% during the course of the year. Members agreed to fund the street light with CIP contingency funds.

Liza Simpson brought up awarded special service contracts, specifically the one for general performances at the Egyptian Theater, not youth programs. She didn't feel it meets criteria and sets precedence. The second concern is Habitat for Humanity's grant for a capital project as many non-profits have capital needs. Nate Rockwood explained that the committee struggled with Habitat's request for funding a capital project but he clarified that it is a non-profit providing services which happen to be capital projects. This is different than non-profits asking for money for a new building, for instance. Habitat is providing a capital project which then is included in the affordable housing inventory. Ms. Simpson stated that she is uncomfortable with both grants unless the parameters for special service grants are expanded to include these types of requests. Mark Harrington suggested that this be scheduled on an upcoming agenda so that applicants can attend as they weren't anticipating this discussion. Ms. Simpson believed that grants can't be given to performing companies for performances. Mr. Rockwood explained that arts is a category included in the criteria and the award to the Egyptian is within the scope of the policy. Liza Simpson felt that all performing organizations would have been applying if they were under the impression they could. The City Attorney pointed out that there have been several in the past and the proposal has to be written to deliver a public benefit. She asked for more information on the Egyptian. A majority of members were not supportive of reopening this issue.

VII ADDITIONAL DISCUSSION – AGENDA ITEMS

VIII ADJOURNMENT

With no further business, the regular meeting of the City Council was adjourned.

MEMORANDUM OF CLOSED SESSION

The City Council met in closed session at approximately 2 p.m. Members in attendance were Mayor Dana Williams, Alex Butwinski, Joe Kernan, Cindy Matsumoto, Dick Peek, and Liza Simpson. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager; Diane Foster, Sustainability Manager; Tom Daley, Deputy City Attorney; Jason Christensen, Legal Intern; Joan Card, Enviornmental Consultant; Jon Weidenhamer, Economic Development Manager; and Mark Harrington, City Attorney. Cindy Matsumoto, "<u>I move to close the meeting to discuss property, personel and litigation</u>". Liza Simpson seconded. <u>Motion carried unanimously</u>. The meeting opened at approximately 3:30 p.m. Alex Butwinski, "<u>I move to open the meeting</u>". Joe Kernan seconded. <u>Motion unanimously carried</u>.

The City Council convened in closed session at the adjournment of the regular meeting. Members in attendance were Mayor Dana Williams, Alex Butwinski, Joe Kernan, Cindy Matsumoto, Dick Peek, and Liza Simpson. Staff present was Tom Bakaly, City Manager and Mark Harrington, City Attorney. Liza Simpson, "<u>I move to close to discuss personnel</u>". Alex Butwinski seconded. <u>Motion unanimously carried</u>.

The meeting for which these minutes were prepared was noticed by posting at least 24 hours in advance and by delivery to the news media two days prior to the meeting.

Prepared by Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING THE ROAD RESPECT CAMPAIGN IN PARK CITY, UTAH

WHEREAS, for more than a century, the bicycle has been an important part of the lives of most Americans; and

WHEREAS, Today, millions of Americans engage in bicycling because it is a viable and environmentally-sound form of transportation, an excellent form of fitness and provides quality family recreation; and

WHEREAS, the education of cyclists and motorists as to the proper and safe operation of bicycles and road rules is important to ensure the safety and comfort of all users; and

WHEREAS, the Road Respect Program, the Zero Fatalities Program and cyclists throughout our state are promoting greater public awareness of bicycle operation and safety education in an effort to reduce accidents, injuries and fatalities for all.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of Park City, Utah supports the Road Respect Campaign and its message of promoting safety for bicycles and cars through adherence to the rules of the road.

Further, all 'Parkites' are encouraged to recognize the importance of bicycle safety and be more aware of cyclists on our streets and highways.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 9th day of June, 2011.

City Council Staff Report

Subject: Renewable Energy - 2011 Building Fee Waivers
Author: Tyler Poulson
Department: Sustainability
Date: June 9, 2011
Type of Item: Legislative

Summary Recommendations:
Staff recommends that City Council approve the Resolution provided in Exhibit A of this Staff Report. This Resolution would allow the City Manager to waive Building permit and site inspection fees, up to $1,000 per site, for renewable energy projects completed in 2011.

Background:
During the November 4, 2010 City Council meeting, staff recommended a Building permit and site inspection fee waiver for new renewable energy projects completed in 2011. City Council directed staff to proceed with the fee waiver and provided commentary on how it should be structured (see Exhibit B).

Staff has received feedback from the City Attorney that, per City policies, a Council Resolution is necessary to enable the City Manager to approve fee waivers on projects by private entities (e.g., those which aren't completed by the municipal government or a non-profit). Rather than returning to Council for each individual fee waiver, staff reviewed the direction provided by Council on November 4th and drafted the attached Resolution (Exhibit A). This resolution would allow the City Manager to waive up to $1,000 per site in permitting and site inspection fees for all new solar photovoltaic (PV), solar thermal, and small-scale wind projects completed within City limits this year. All local land use and building regulations would remain in effect for renewable energy projects and building permits would still be required. The waiver would apply to both residential and commercial projects.

Analysis:
The Building department received approximately 20 permit requests for renewable energy systems in 2010; however, this number includes 13 permits for the Snow Creek Cottages. As of June 1, 2011, Building has yet to receive a renewable energy permitting request this year and staff estimates that less than 15 requests will be received by year-end.

Permit and site inspection fees for renewable energy projects are based on project cost. For a typical residential system, the fee waiver has a value of roughly $400. For larger projects, such as the 80 solar panels installed on City Hall, the fee waiver can be $1,000 or more. The $1,000 fee waiver limit will cover projects ranging up to $80,800 in total value. Based on these fee waiver values, and the estimated number of new projects, staff forecasts that Building will forego roughly $5k - $10k in fee revenues over the course of 2011.

The objective of the fee waiver, as proposed, is to encourage the development of local renewable energy projects in the near-term. Staff will report back to Council after year-end to provide updates on the program and ask Council whether the incentive should be extended into 2012.

Department Review:
Sustainability, Building, Legal, and the City Manager have reviewed this Staff Report and their commentary has been included.

Alternatives:

A. **Approve (Staff Recommendation):** Council may approve the attached Resolution which allows the City Manager to waive Building permit and site inspection fees, up to $1,000 per site, for renewable energy projects completed in 2011.
B. **Deny:** Council may choose to deny the Resolution and not formally pursue a fee waiver for renewable energy.
C. **Modify:** Council may provide additional input and direct staff to return at a future date with a modified Resolution.

Significant Impacts:
The fee waiver is anticipated to have a small impact on 2011 Building department revenues ($5k - $10k), yet will be an innovative way for Council to promote clean energy and advance goals contained in the Environmental Strategic Plan. The proposed resolution (Exhibit A) will provide the City Manager with administrative authority to approve fee waivers within the stated parameters. Authorizing City Manager approval for the waivers will be more efficient than staff to returning to Council each time Building receives a new permitting request.

Recommendation:
Staff recommends that City Council approve the Resolution provided in Exhibit A of this Staff Report. This Resolution would allow the City Manager to waive Building permit and site inspection fees, up to $1,000 per site, for renewable energy projects completed in 2011.

Attachments:
Exhibit A – Resolution for Building Department Fee Waivers on New Renewable Energy Projects in 2011
Exhibit B – Meeting Minutes from November 4, 2010 City Council Meeting

Exhibit A – Resolution for Building Department Fee Waivers on New Renewable Energy Projects in 2011

Resolution No. __-11

Resolution authorizing the City Manager to waive building related fees for renewable energy projects in 2011

WHEREAS, Commercial and residential buildings use 42% of Utah's total energy; and

WHEREAS, the current energy mix for electricity generation in Utah includes a high reliance on finite fossils fuels, including 82% coal and 15% natural gas; and

WHEREAS; the deployment of clean, renewable energy technologies contributes positively to a wide variety of environmental, social, and economic goals; and

WHEREAS; Park City Municipal Corporation has completed four separate clean energy projects on City-owned buildings in the past two years and encourages similar development within the community;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Park City, UT as follows:

1. <u>Building Fee Waiver</u>. The City will waive Building Permit and Site Inspection fees, up to $1,000 per site, for new solar PV, solar thermal, and small-scale wind projects completed within City limits during 2011. The waiver will be handled on a project-by-project basis as an administrative approval by the City Manager. All local land use and building regulations will remain in effect for renewable energy projects and building permits will still be required.

2. <u>Expiration Date</u>. The fee waiver will remain in effect until December 31, 2011. Staff will return to City Council after this expiration date for direction on whether the waiver should be extended.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 9th day of June 2011.

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION

____
Mayor Dana Williams

Attest:

____
Janet M. Scott, City Recorder

Approved as to form:

____
Mark D. Harrington, City Attorney

3. Community carbon mitigation projects.
One option is to provide a direct cash incentive or $1,000 for the next 27 solar PV or solar thermal installations in Park City. But staff does not recommend this option because any rebate provided discounts the amount of tax credit received by the consumer. An alternative recommendation to the rebate is to waive future building permit and plan review fees associated with renewable energy systems. This value is not discounted with regard to tax credits and is not a financial outlay for the City but rather represents foregone revenue.
…
[Tyler Poulson] addressed the recommendation to use the $27,000 for the carbon diet program and waiving future building permit and plan review fees associated with solar PV, solar thermal, and wind.
…
Candace Erickson felt it makes good sense to reimburse the Building or Planning Departments foregone fees. Joe Kernan liked the plan presented, especially encouraging the public to take advantage of the state's home performance program. He suggested that waivers be offered on a temporary basis or intermittently. Liza Simpson felt it would be helpful to implement the program for a couple of years and assess budget implications. Mr. Kernan felt that waivers should be strategically used as incentives. Diane Foster suggested capping waivers or extending them to residential units only. The Mayor suggested that installations over a certain size be considered on an individual basis.

City Council
Staff Report

Subject:	**Banking Services Contract**
Author:	**Lori W. Collett, Finance Manager**
Department:	**Finance**
Date:	**June 9, 2011**
Type of Item:	**Administrative**

FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Summary Recommendations:
Authorize the City Manager to enter into a Professional Services Agreement in a form approved by the City Attorney with Zions Bank for banking services.

Topic/Description:
Banking services include City checking accounts, ACH transaction processing (direct deposit), online banking and employee banking programs. The initial term of the contract will be for a three-year term commencing July 1, 2011. At the City's option, two (2), two-year extensions will be permitted with the same terms and conditions of the original contract or as amended, thereby providing for seven (7) years of banking services. The pricing agreed to for each type of banking transaction will be effective through June 30, 2014. The prices may be re-negotiated at that time. The approximate amount of the banking fees for the initial three-year term is $25,000. The amount is approximate because while the price of each type of banking transaction is a not to exceed price, the volume of each type of transaction can vary. For example, the number of direct deposit transactions can vary depending on the number of payrolls processed during the month and the number of employees utilizing direct deposit.

Background:
On April 15, 2011, the City sent out a Request for Proposal (RFP) for banking services to seven local banks: Chase Bank, Wells Fargo Bank, Frontier Bank, Key Bank, Mountain West Bank, US Bank and Zions Bank. The City also advertised the RFP in the local newspaper on May 4 and May 7, 2011 and on the City's website. Between April 15 and May 9, 2011, staff responded to questions about the RFP. At 4:00 PM on May 17, 2011, the City had received proposals from Chase Bank, Wells Fargo Bank, Key Bank, Mountain West Bank, US Bank and Zions Bank.

Analysis:
The six (6) financial institutions submitting proposals met the following required conditions of submitting a proposal:

- Full-service branch located within the Park City limits,
- Must be a qualified depository for public funds pursuant to the Utah State Money Management Act Section 51-7-11,
- Must be a member of the Federal Reserve System with access to all Federal Reserve services and insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (FDIC),
- Must submit with their proposal a copy of their annual financial report for the past two (2) years,

- Must have a rating of “Outstanding” or “Satisfactory” on its most recent Community Reinvestment Act (CRA) review (the CRA assesses a financial institution’s performance in helping to meet the credit needs of its community and evaluates in the context of information about the institution (capacity, constraints and business strategies), its community (demographic and economic data, lending, investment, and service opportunities), and its competitors and peers. CRA ratings are outstanding, satisfactory, needs to improve and substantial noncompliance),
- Must represent and warrant that the financial institution is familiar with local laws and ordinances and will conform to all local, state and federal laws, and
- Must have the ability to supply web-based information reporting systems and allow multiple users with different security level access, provide electronic images of cleared checks front and back, direct deposit services, wire transfers, cashier’s checks, electronic funds and automatic clearinghouse transfers.

Proposals were evaluated by a committee of Finance Department staff. All proposals were evaluated using the same criteria and weighting. Price was not the sole deciding factor. Criteria for evaluation of proposals included the following:

1. Legal and other qualifications have been met by the financial institution,
2. Proper submission and responsiveness to RFP,
3. Verification that a proposing bank is qualified under Section 51-7-11 of the Utah State Money Management Act as a designated depository and ranked based on maximum amount of uninsured Public Funds allowed per institution,
4. Bank and branch locations in the Park City Municipal city limits, and if applicable, additional branch locations in the Snyderville Basin area,
5. Experience, resources, and qualifications of the financial institution and individuals assigned to this account and relevant experience managing similar account relationships with public agency clients,
6. Scope of services offered including internet based services,
7. Financial strength and capacity of proposing institution based upon annual financial reports and other related information,
8. Type of references: local government vs. other type of entity; reference recommendations, if contacted,
9. Fees,
10. Agreement to the terms of the City’s Service Provider/Professional Services Agreement, and
11. Employee banking services package.

Zions’ proposal is the best overall choice for the City’s banking services. Zions is currently the City’s bank. Staff has been extremely satisfied with the service received from Zions over the past approximately twenty years. Staff recommends that Zions be awarded the contract to continue to furnish the City’s banking services.

	Zions	Key Bank	Wells Fargo	US Bank	Chase	MT West
RANKING	1	2	3	4-TIED	4-TIED	5

Department Review:
This report has been reviewed by the City Attorney and the City Manager.

ALTERNATIVES:

A. Approve the request:
The City Council could approve the contract for banking services in a form to be approved by the City Attorney with Zions Bank. This is the recommended action.

B. Deny the request:
The City Council could deny the request. This would require a “rebid” of the contract for banking services. Because the City’s current banking contract expires on June 30, 2011, the City Council would need to extend its current contract with Zions Bank until a new RFP process could be completed.

C. Continue the item:
The City Council could continue the item until the June 16, 2011, meeting and still take action on this item prior to the expiration of the current contract. Continuing the item past June 30, 2011, would require a contract extension with Zions Bank.

D. Do Nothing:
Same as continuing the item.

SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS:
The annual cost of the contract for basic banking services is approximately $8,300 per year depending upon the banking services selected by the City. Funds are budgeted in the Finance Department budget for these services.

CONSEQUENCES OF NOT TAKING THE RECOMMENDED ACTION:
Staff would need to rebid the RFP and this would delay the completion of the banking contract.

RECOMMENDATION:
Authorize staff to enter into a contract in a form to be approved by the City Attorney with Zions Bank for banking.