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### Summit County Service Area #3

**March 25, 2019**  
**Public Meeting**  
**5:30 p.m.**  
629 E. Parkway Drive, Suite 1, Park City, UT 84098

*** Please turn off all cell phones ***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Presenter(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Welcome and call meeting to order**  
   a. Review of February 25 meeting minutes *  
   b. Approval of minutes | 5:30 – 5:45 | Vince Pao-Borjigin |
| **2. Administrative & Financial:**  
   a. Staff reports*  
   b. Open house date and proposed agenda*  
   c. Invoice review*  
   d. Franchise agreement update  
   e. Legislative update  
   f. Easements | 5:45 - 6:30 | Marla, Chris, Eileen, Nathan |
| **3. Road**  
   a. Drainage plan for water mitigation  
   b. Silver Creek road issues  
   c. Road fee schedule discussion*  
   d. Easements  
   e. 2019 Road construction bid update and discussion*  
   f. Approved vendor list discussion and RFQ*  
   g. Wolff contract renewal | 6:30 – 7:00 | Chris, Marla, Nathan |
| **4. Water**  
   a. Water request 725 Parkway Drive  
   b. Water filtration RFP proposal review discussion #  
   c. Review RFP for rate study and discussion*  
   d. Semi-annual Arsenic Report and draft concurrency report review*  
   e. Tank inspection RFP and bids* | 7:00 – 7:30 | Marla, Chris |
| **5. Strategic Plan**  
   a. Vision and mission | 7:30 – 8:00 | Vince, Marla |
| **6. EMERGENCY MEETING**  
   a. Mountain Regional request for water | 8:00 – 8:10 | Chris |
| **7. Public Comment** – limited to 3 minutes each | 8:10 – 8:15 | Public |
| **8. Voting:**  
   a. Invoice Approval  
   b. 2019 road construction vendor award  
   c. Water rate RFP approval  
   d. Water filtration RFP approval  
   e. Approved vendor list  
   f. Wolff contract  
   g. Open house date  
   h. Emergency Water Supply to Mountain Regional | 8:15 – 8:30 | Board |
| **9. Adjournment** | 8:30 | Vince |

* Documents provided in the packet  
# Document sent separately

Minutes, agenda and policies available at:  
[http://summitcounty.org/923/Documents](http://summitcounty.org/923/Documents)  

2019-03-25
WELCOME
and
CALL MEETING
TO ORDER
Summit County Service Area #3
February 25, 2019
PENDING MEETING MINUTES
BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING
629 E. Parkway Drive, Suite 1,
Park City UT 84098

BOARD OF TRUSTEES
Vince Pao-Borjigin, Chair
Suzanne Carpenter, Vice Chair
Larry Finch, Clerk
Robert Olson, Treasurer

Eileen Galoostian
Michael Montgomery
Peter Keblish

In Attendance (Board): Vince Pao-Borjigin, Chair; Suzanne Carpenter, Vice-Chair; Bob Olson, Treasurer; Larry Finch, Clerk.

Not in Attendance (Board): Mike Montgomery; Peter Keblish; Eileen Galoostian

Electronically: No participants.

In Attendance (Staff/Contractors): Marla Howard (GM); Chris Bullock (Roads Manager and Water Operator); Eileen Haynes (Assistant Clerk); Nathan Bracken (Legal), Ben Miner (HAL).

Public Meeting Attendees: Linda Kelsch (SL-A-29 and SLA-30); Scott Sharp (SS-18-17).

1. Welcome and call meeting to order: Suzanne called the meeting to order at 5:32pm.
   a. Review of January 28 and February 4 meeting minutes: Bob provided corrections to minutes for both dates which are included in today’s packet. Suzanne amended January 28 minutes Section 3.c to read “most qualified vendor at the lowest price”.

   b. Approval of minutes: Larry motioned to approve the January 28th minutes as amended. Bob seconded the motion and approval was unanimous except for Vince’s abstention. Larry motioned to approve the February 4th meeting minutes as amended. Suzanne seconded the motion and approval was unanimous.

2. Administrative & Financial:
   a. Update on current projects and staff reports:
      • Greenfield Well Property: Marla summarized that a deed had not been recorded for our Greenfield well location as it should have been, and the Greenfield HOA has been paying taxes on it in the amount of $67 per year since 2005. They shouldn't have been as it is tax exempt as a property dedicated to public use. Nathan reviewed the property research performed noting, in 2005 this lot was approved by the County: Assessor, Planning Commission, Engineer and Attorney and, in his opinion clearly shows the intent is to give title to the Service Area as noted on the plat amendment which states “dedicated to SCSA#3 concurrent with plat recordation”. When you make a dedication, you are either giving an easement or fee simple title. This plat does not indicate which but other language makes clear it is not an easement because paragraph 14 states “the well site located on this plat is owned by SCSA#3 for the potential drilling of a water well.” It was clearly intended to give title to SCSA3. However, a separate legal question remains, can you dedicate land to a Local District when the code specifically states municipalities and counties? In his opinion,
believes it is legally acceptable through a plat because the intent is to dedicate this land to the public entity most able to provide that service. There is no question a deed is necessary and desirable, and he affirmed the property should be tax exempt. Larry wants to correct this issue. Nathan will pursue this angle with Jami Braken, Deputy County Attorney, and ask for the County to quit claim the parcel to SCSA3. Nathan asked, is this land sufficient to contain the proposed arsenic treatment plant? Bob responded, it is if you put the existing well in the building.

- **Capstone Project:** the selected student declined the job offer due to feeling unprepared. Staff are working on other alternatives.
- **Peter Keblish resignation:** Marla reported the Keblish property sold and closed on February 14th, but we don’t know if he continues to live in the area or has relocated somewhere else. We heard from a neighbor he moved into Park City proper. Vince also reached out to Peter regarding his plans and has not heard back. Vince recommended, we amend the proposed newspaper ad to include “Lower Silver Creek”. Larry has one potential candidate from Unit I. Nathan noted, the interviews and selection discussions are open to the public. No matter where Peter lives, by law he may serve until his position is filled. You can base the 90-day replacement window on his February 14th closing. Before placing an ad, Nathan recommended the Service Area send Peter a letter, an email and a text with a hard deadline, as well as keep copies of all of our attempts at communication, stating we are going to act on this date unless we hear from you. Larry suggested the letter be sent uncertified to his old address for forwarding.
- **Elections:** Eileen H reported she has been in touch with the County Election office and they will have a meeting with us in April to review the 2019 election process.
- **Utah Water Users Workshop:** Nathan recommended staff attend this workshop over any other water meeting. The entire board supports Chris and Marla’s attendance.

b. **Branding and Logo:** Marla presented five logos. Larry prefers Logo #2 in san-serif. Summit County and Service Area #3 should be the same size font, bolder type and in black. Suzanne likes the logo in two lines. Vince wondered if the logo should include the words “Silver Creek”. Marla replied, staff discussed this at length concluding it is important for our brand identity that we position ourselves as a separate entity from the Silver Creek HOA and the Silver Creek subdivision; we are water and roads. Larry suggested a tagline “serving the residents of Silver Creek Estates”. Chris suggested something like that is appropriate in the banner of a newsletter. Vince suggested the same tagline be used in the letterhead. He also asked that flood mitigation be placed on the agenda in March.

c. **Financial review:** Marla presented the current financial accounting noting we are operating well within our budget for both our regular and general fund. She has notified the auditors we are ready to begin the audit. The accounts receivable past due has been greatly reduced. Larry requested an updated Fund Balance. Marla agreed.

d. **Franchise agreement discussion:** Marla stated, she is uncomfortable approving the FFA noting it does not accurately reflect our statutory agreement with the County. She prefers to present our objections to the County Council. Nathan stated, he sent an email to Dave Thomas, Chief Civil Deputy Attorney, noting his conceptual issues that the Service Area is different. Dave emailed back stating he recognized that the Service is different and to please forward Nathan’s redlines as the County Council is asking for this. To avoid incurring unnecessary legal fees, Nathan advised, this is a
discussion between elected officials and recommended the SCSA3 go to the County Council and explain why the SCSA#3 Board feels the FFA is inappropriate because the FFA is written for entities who do not have road managing authority. Also, an Interlocal Agreement might be a better vehicle to address the Council’s concerns. Our preference is to not spend the time and money creating additional governing documentation while their needs are covered by our statutory authority. Omit any mention of your Attorney. Larry recommended that Marla write a letter to the County Council explaining why we feel the FFA is inappropriate, citing the relevant codes and memorandum. Nathan agreed, advising the letter include words to the effect that we want to work with you and if the Council continues to feel they need another agreement, it should be an Interlocal Agreement. Do not copy their attorney. Bob recommended that Nathan review the letter. Nathan agreed.

e. Open house date discussion: Marla proposed June after school has ended. Vince agrees.

f. Peter Keblish replacement: as discussed earlier.

g. Invoice review: Marla updated the Board regarding invoices enclosed in the packet. The legal invoice was sent via email earlier. The other invoices include two to Wolff for snow removal in the amounts of $20k and $25k. Year-to-date we have spent $65k of our snow removal budget of $80k and we have at least one more month of potential snowfall. Chris commented, we usually do not plow in April. Our snow removal budget in 2018 was $40k and in 2017 was $113k.

3. Water:

a. Water filtration RPF review, staff recommendation and discussion: Ben Miner, Engineer with HAL, discussed the status of the project. The role of the vendor is to do two things: design a technology to remove the arsenic and the selected vendor will manufacture the “unit”. As part of this process, you may go on field visits to tour active projects and they will come in for interviews. HAL will do the building, water-piping, valving, surveying and site work. Once you select the vendor and type of filtration technology, their design would be incorporated into our bid package distributed by the Service Area.

He stated, we are past the point of making assumptions and need to provide the vendors with the most up-to-date water quality information regarding iron and silica. Ben suggested we take the same parameters and sample them again. He also wants to identify the species of arsenic present. Larry observed, the well has not been run since July. Chris replied, the well has been running artesian for three months.

Ben recommended Chris run the well for an hour then HAL will remove several casings of water. Ideally it would be tested every 3-6 months. At least an additional data point is advisable. Vince requested graphs of accumulated data. Marla does not have any. Ben replied, we can easily put those together. You have data on the arsenic level. The Division of Drinking Water only requires testing on some items every few years and some only once therefore some data is not available. We have data on some metals and silica. Chris stated, he performed a ‘total inorganic’ in August which shows iron. We will have to do the species of arsenic. Larry and Nathan support Ben’s recommendation. Chris stated, he will drop off water sampling tomorrow. Vince recommended we develop and perform regular water testing. Larry suggested quarterly. Chris replied, the big one we do every five years while some are on a 9-year schedule. Ben agreed, the service area should have a
regular and more frequent time schedule. Chris stated, the inorganic testing cost about $900 while the arsenic is about $75. We want to avoid spending several thousand dollars every quarter. Ben stated, testing on a new well is very complete and costs about $2,000. It also includes herbicides, pesticides and radiation some of which won’t be an issue here. Your main issues, as he sees them, include general water quality such as metals and total dissolved solids. Larry stated, he is concerned about gaseous chlorine. Can we use something that does not require an operator license? Ben replied, some degree of licensing will be required. There are four popular Chlorine choices: 1) Gas is easy, cheap and dangerous. Most people use gas. 2) Liquid has worker safety issues. 3) Tablet circulated with water to achieve the correct concentration. 4) Electricity with salt; it is the safest. We can specify “no gas” initially or further into the process. Larry replied, he is concerned because we are in a residential neighborhood. Vince stated, although it is very rare, it is a concern and he wants each of the types to spell out the safety and costs. Larry stated, he was impressed with Salt Lake County Service Area #3 material waste disposal using the ‘Pure-Flow’ system which concentrates their solids. Ben recognized the Service Area does not want an expensive approach to waste disposal.

Vince inquired about ease of servicing and the availability of parts. Ben replied, there is a redundancy clause where he requested an extra ‘pressure vessel’ so you can remain at full capacity at all times. There is always something that can go wrong so it is impossible to be 100% covered. The local suppliers keep most supplies on hand. However, if you choose a supplier not in the area you never know what you are going to get. Larry asked, can HAL provide an evaluation matrix? Ben replied, yes, we have provided a point system. Larry asked for points to be assigned to the number of local references provided.

Vince formed a project committee including himself, Larry and Chris/Marla.

Ben invited the Board submit document corrections to him via email. Bob offered some corrections to the document such as missing apostrophe’s; document 52, page 1, paragraph 4.02 and 4.03 a letter was dropped. On page 2 of RFP, in the middle, why do we specify 4-parts-per-billion (ppb)? Is this necessary since we are going to be blending and given the costs? Ben replied, his logic for the 4-ppb standard is his observation that SCSA#3 values low levels of arsenic and the EPA has strongly considered lowering the threshold to 5-ppb. Therefore, he recommends SCSA3 is prepared for a lower arsenic standard. Vince replied, all the data shows that even 4-ppb could be hazardous to infants and pregnant women. Isn’t the current 10-ppb a compromise to keep costs down for the high-arsenic Western States? Water safety should be as low cost as is practical. Bob agreed but feels we should consider all the costs for the different data points. Vince replied, since we are an Enterprise Fund, he supports gathering the data.

Nathan stated, please keep in mind the current 10-ppb is not settled policy. Sooner or later it will come back. Vince stated, he has heard there is a study happening in Salt Lake City that the arsenic has to be below 5-ppb. Larry stated, this is a 50-year project. We are not in substantial debt; we own $180k in bonds. He finds 20% additional cost is acceptable and he does not want a future board to have to revisit this in 10-20 years. Vince agreed. Suzanne replied, more like 5-years. Nathan agreed, you should get the costs. In his experience, the EPA is largely driven by staff in the East and all sides are unhappy with the current standard. As a practical matter, you cannot go lower than
4ppb. Ben agreed. We could put multiple standards in the RPF. You could change and adjust your standards over time depending upon the technology you should choose and how you operate it such as delay filter changes. Vince replied, he is supportive of that. Larry stated, let us go with 4-ppb and discuss further with the vendors. Vince agreed.

Larry enquired as to the depreciation. Ben replied, that is a good question. Vince stated, the reason we need a bond for this is the financing could be lower. Ben replied, getting a good interest rate on a loan is possible. Larry asked, what is the time frame on the pilot? Ben replied, probably about one week but he wants the vendors to indicate the time frame. They are accustomed to one week or longer. This will give them time to pull samples. Larry stated, we have to get going on a bond and a rate study.

Ben suggested, read through it and send me your notes and proposed dates. The vendors need at least a couple of weeks to review. He recommends a minimum of 2 weeks. Vince would like 3 weeks. The board will complete their reviews by Friday March 1st.

Vince reported his travel schedule will not slow down until April 2nd.

b. Fire-Flow RFP review and discussion, staff recommendation and discussion: Chris asked Nathan, he has not gone to the County for permits. Is this still the situation? Nathan stated that it is biggest concern with the FFA. Right now, you are not exempt from all permitting requirements with the County. You are subject to the Clean Water Act permit and the Storm Water Pollution Control Permit which the County administers. Chris asked, for the Fire Flow RFP, do I include these new potential permitting requirements or leave it out? Nathan replied, proceed the way that we are. You can build nuance in there.

c. Water rate study discussion and timeline: Marla reported that Nathan has reviewed it. Suzanne commented on Section I, item 4, “provide recommendation for allocation of each customer’s water allotment throughout the water-use year”. Do we want to add language regarding the allowance for the full .75-acre-feet? Nathan stated, he made some edits to include that. Suzanne stated, our objective is to allow our water users to fully utilize .75-acre-feet. Also, see Section III, item E. In Section II regarding Board Membership, update it to seven members. Nathan reviewed Section B, item 2. “Each home connected to the water system received an allotment of .75-acre feet”. Nathan reviewed Section I, item 1. Suzanne reviewed Section IV, items A 1, 2 or 3 for future Capital Expenditures and asked, do we need to add anything? Larry replied, they are going to have to understand how we depreciate assets. Otherwise, Suzanne stated, it was well done.

Nathan asked, do we need a section on how you evaluate or score proposals? The Board should think about how to weigh the criteria. Marla and Chris should make a proposal. Larry asked, how many people do rate studies? Nathan replied, Zions Bank and Barnett Consulting are the two that come to mind. Larry stated, do we need a value-added section for example if we change banks? Nathan replied, they are different sections of the bank. Vince and Larry would like to change providers.

4. Roads and Trails:
   a. Review of road capital plan RFP responses and staff recommendations: Chris stated, we received 2 bids for the Pulverization and Re-asphalting of Wasatch Way. They are about $500 apart. Larry
asked, how will you evaluate the vendors? Chris replied, we do not have a set evaluation system. Vince asked, does this include speed mitigation or traffic calming? Chris replied no. Marla stated, we have budgeted $120k for this work. We are going to ask for a level road base. At that time, we will ask them to do speed bumps and raised cross-walks. The speed bumps with the sidewalk is the most effective. Chris stated, we should amend the RFP to include traffic calming and leveling the road base and reevaluate at that time. Larry stated, that is why we need to have an evaluation point system. Vince agreed. Nathan confirmed this was drafted has a “bid” not an “RFP” so the lowest qualified bidder generally gets it, but it is not set in stone; you can still select the “lowest-priced qualified bidder”. Marla stated, completion should be by the middle of August. Larry and Suzanne stated, the fire-flow process will dig up the roads so we might not want to get it done by August. We should request additional information. Chris replied, we will make some changes.

b. Discuss 2019 Trail maintenance plan: Marla reported she and Chris believe we should wait until the snow melts in order to see the damage that has occurred. They suspect trail maintenance needs are going to be extensive this year. Suzanne replied, the last time we had this much snow it was 2011 and we now have 80 homes in our delta down here, so it is going to back up. Chris replied, he anticipates problems along the whole length of Redden Rd. Bob reported, all the ditches are filled with snow.

c. Roads policy review – including construction fees: Marla reported, she and Chris have been approved to review plans in the Summit County computer system which will allow them to determine home size. Some board members had expressed concerns about relating fees to home size etc. Others are concerned that our review process is simple. Larry replied, are going to require someone to pay a fee on a $30k re-roof, window or kitchen? What service are we providing a homeowner that reflects that non-refundable fee? Are we bringing the taxpayer value? Vince replied, he understands the fee is for impacts to our roads. Nathan agreed, the point of this to cover the administrative fee and impact to the roads. Your current fee system is that it is a one-size-fits-all approach. However, if you get into a tiered system you are going to make things harder. You should set the threshold value.

Chris summarized, we are returning to a $50k threshold which will eliminate fees for the remodels and re-roofs, and it is capturing a gut-and-remodel as well as additions. Nathan stated, if it is a building permit with a $50k price-tag and it involves 5,000sf or more of work then you pay $1 per sf additional. Your policy does not address commercial construction. Vince summarized the triggers include: permit application, $50k or above costs, and square footage on remodels or new-build above 5,000 sf. Nathan stated, you could just exempt remodels. Suzanne and Vince do not want to do that. Chris asked, would it be helpful to have a waiver clause? Larry, Nathan and Vince do not like it because it would be treating people differently.

Suzanne suggested a table. Vince proposed that Marla and Chris revised this further and distribute for review. Larry added “new living space”. Nathan stated, he will look into commercial exemptions.

Larry motioned to end the Working Session at 7:32pm and move into Public Comment. Suzanne seconded this motion and approval was unanimous.

5. Public Comment:
**Linda Kelsch (SL-A-29+30):** Linda asked, there were over 100 big dump trucks going into our area a couple of years ago. Did they pay fees for that? Chris replied, we did not collect any fees from that project. Larry replied, we did not have a mechanism to do that. Bob added, and we also did not have the truth. Vince shared the new processes being created with the County and the Service Area to capture fee opportunities. Marla stated, the new system still will not capture the situation Linda mentioned. Linda stated, when she was on the Board, big trucks were limited to a certain season they could drive into the area due to the roads.

**Scott Sharp (SS-18-D):** Scott expressed concern regarding the potential for flooding on Redden Rd. Chris stated, Redden Rd is one of the higher priorities due to drainage for the Service Area. The Board invited Scott to consider applying for an opening on the Board.

Larry motioned to end the Public Comment at 7:39pm and move into Voting. Suzanne seconded this motion and approval was unanimous.

6. **Voting:**
   a. Filtration RFP approval: tabled.
   b. Fire flow RFP approval: tabled.
   c. Road RFP award approval: tabled.
   d. Open house date approval: tabled.
   e. **Item 2.g Invoices:**
      • Larry motioned to approve the Smith-Hartvigsen legal invoice for $5,106.40 as approved by Marla Howard and seconded by Suzanne. Approval was unanimous.
      • Larry motioned to approve the TCB Landscaping invoice for $3,118 and $1,100 as approved by Marla Howard and seconded by Bob. Approval was unanimous.
      • Larry motioned to approve the Wolff Excavation and Snow Plowing invoice for $19,998.08 as approved by Marla Howard and Chris then seconded by Suzanne. Approval was unanimous.
      • Larry motioned to approve the Wolff Excavation and Snow Plowing invoice for $24,225.00 and seconded by Suzanne. Approval was unanimous.

7. **Adjournment:** Larry motioned to adjourn the meeting at 7:42pm which was seconded by Suzanne. Approval was unanimous.
ADMINISTRATIVE & FINANCIAL
Summit County Service Area #3

STAFF REPORT

From: Marla Howard

Date: March 18, 2019

Subject: Fund Balances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Account</th>
<th>3/18/2019</th>
<th>3/31/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>2029</td>
<td>63,661.72</td>
<td>41,143.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTIF</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>396,752.97</td>
<td>570,602.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTIF</td>
<td>8712</td>
<td>120,684.15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>581,098.84</td>
<td>611,746.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>2037</td>
<td>102,995.59</td>
<td>81,898.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xpressbillpay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,658.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTIF</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>543,441.15</td>
<td>559,221.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTIF</td>
<td>5944</td>
<td>20,074.28</td>
<td>36,317.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTIF</td>
<td>5945</td>
<td>20,074.28</td>
<td>36,317.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PTIF</td>
<td>5946</td>
<td>111,123.09</td>
<td>108,488.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>797,708.39</td>
<td>826,903.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll</td>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>7,345.53</td>
<td>4,209.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escrow</td>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,007.50</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summit County Service Area #3

STAFF REPORT

From: Marla Howard
Date: March 18, 2019
Subject: Letterhead designs

STATUS:
Attached are two proposed letterhead designs. We went this direction because if and when we need to record a document with the county, this leaves the top right hand portion open for the county’s stamp.

RECOMMENDATIONS:
SUMMARY:

Chris and I attended the Utah Water Users Conference in St. George on March 18-20, 2019. The conference included some general sessions in addition to 7 workshop sessions with a wide variety of topics. Nathan presented on the proposed Water Banking in Utah. Very few of the workshops were held more than once and unfortunately there were about 55 different classes with some compelling topics. I felt that the topics were very relevant to us, and the final presentation was from representatives of the National Weather who spoke about the weather, snow pack and the impact on the drought. [https://www.drought.gov/drought/regions](https://www.drought.gov/drought/regions) Currently the state is in an abnormally dry condition (D0), but if the weather continues to be wet, then we should return to normal for Utah. This will have a positive impact on the state and the expectation is that most reservoirs will fill this spring. A concern was that the snow would ‘ripen’ too soon and melt too quickly but March has been a cooler than normal month which is good news for the snow pack.

I was able to make some good contacts with the state and got the name of a staffer whose sole job is to update the water rights. I have her contact and I will reach out to here regarding the rights I was unable to connect to a property. I am hoping that we will be able to get some water through this avenue.

I was able to meet our team at SKM and spend some time talking with Nathan.

I felt that for me, this was a good learning and networking opportunity. Chris feels that the rural waters association conference held each January would be a better choice for him, but he attended a few classes that he found to be informative.
Recommendation:

We are proposing the Monday, June 3 for the date of the open house. This is before school lets out so we anticipate getting better attendance.

The proposed topics are:

- General welcome and introductions
- Presentations:
  - Accomplishments
  - Vision, mission, logo and taglines
  - Fire prevention (PCFD)
  - Arsenic treatment study
  - Fire flow project
  - Civic Center Goals
- HAL to have examples of Arsenic treatment facilities
- Road plan
- Trail plan
February 27, 2019

Mrs. Marla Howard, General Manager  
Summit County Service Area No. 3  
629 East Parkway Drive  
Park City, Utah 84098

RE: SCSA No. 3 - 2019 Water Lines Project (Fire Flow Projects)  
Project No: 358.09.100

STATEMENT

Dear Mrs. Howard:

Attached is an invoice for engineering services provided from January 16, 2019 to February 15, 2019 in connection with the above referenced project. Within this invoice period, the following work was performed:

1. Project phone calls, emails and general project coordination.
2. Land surveying research and base map preparation (Addition field survey remains to be completed once monument are visible).
3. Request and receive existing utility location information. Add utilities to base map.

We appreciate the opportunity to work with you on this project. Please call if you have any questions regarding this invoice, or if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

HANSEN, ALLEN & LUCE, INC.

______________________________
Benjamin D. Miner, P.E.
Principal
Summit County Service Area No. 3
629 E. Parkway Dr.
Park City, UT 84098
Marla Howard

Invoice number 39636
Date 02/26/2019
Project 358.09.100 2019 Water Line Projects

Professional Services for the Period: 01/16/2019 to 02/15/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Fees</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Billed Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin D. Miner</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>392.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradly D. Deley</td>
<td>34.00</td>
<td>4,329.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garrick D. Stephenson</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>1,598.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon L. Jones</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>78.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Fees subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>6,400.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reimbursables</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Billed Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mileage</td>
<td>88.00</td>
<td>67.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invoice total **6,457.84**

All invoices are due upon receipt. A late charge of 1.5% will be added to any unpaid balance after 60 days.
Marla Howard  
General Manager  
Summit County Service Area # 3  
629 East Parkway Drive  
Park City, Utah 84098  

RE: General Water Services  
Project No: 358.01.001  

February 28, 2019  

STATEMENT  

Attached is an invoice for engineering services provided from January 16 to February 15, 2019 in connection with the above referenced project. Within this invoice period, the following work was performed:  

2. Help with fire hydrant testing.  
3. Update model with new fire hydrant test data.  
4. Research and request costs from tank divers for tank inspection estimates.  
5. Meet with Marla and Chris on February 1, 2019 to review arsenic treatment planning and design process, 2019 water line project and other general issues.  

Please call if you have any questions regarding this invoice, or if we can be of further assistance.  

Sincerely,  

HANSEN, ALLEN & LUCE, INC.  

[Signature]  
Gordon L. Jones, P.E.  
Principal/Project Manager
Summit County Service Area No. 3  
629 E. Parkway Dr.  
Park City, UT 84098  
Bob Olson

Invoice number 39700  
Date 02/28/2019  
Project 358.01.001 General Water Services

Professional Services for the Period: 01/16/2019 to 02/15/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Fees</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Billed Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin D. Miner</td>
<td>17.50</td>
<td>2,747.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon L. Jones</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>785.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyler C. Cozzens</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>524.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William S. Bigelow</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>213.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Fees subtotal</strong></td>
<td><strong>28.75</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,270.14</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Invoice total 4,270.14

All invoices are due upon receipt. A late charge of 1.5% will be added to any unpaid balance after 60 days.
Member #: 14070  
Summit County Service Area #3  
7215 N. Silver Creek Road  
Park City, UT 84098  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
<th>Billing Type</th>
<th>Statement Date</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Invoice Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Total Due:** $7,450.00

Make checks payable to: Utah Local Governments Trust

\[ \text{Signature} \]

\[ 10 \times 4510 = 3278^{a} \]
\[ 51 - 10510 = 3278^{a} \]
**Please subtract this credit from your premiums due.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Net Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Trust Premium Relief Credit - General Liability</td>
<td>894.00</td>
<td>894.00 CR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amount: 894.00 CR

Balance Due: 894.00 CR
Member #: 14070  
Summit County Service Area #3  
7215 N. Silver Creek Road  
Park City, UT 84098  

---  

### Property Policy Invoice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Expiration Date</th>
<th>Billing Type</th>
<th>Statement Date</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Invoice Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Premium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,698.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$26.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Due:** $1,725.47  
Make checks payable to: Utah Local Governments Trust  

---  

**Signature:**  
(Handwritten)
### Annual Property Premiums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Invoice Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Building Value</th>
<th>Building Premium</th>
<th>Contents Value</th>
<th>Contents Premium</th>
<th>Bus. Int. Value</th>
<th>Bus. Int. Premium</th>
<th>Total Premium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>MAIL HOUSE</td>
<td>7115 NORTH SILVER CREEK RD</td>
<td>$28,800</td>
<td>$135.05</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$28.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>PBV VAULT/BUILDING</td>
<td>7921 SILVER CREEK RD</td>
<td>$38,800</td>
<td>$47.71</td>
<td>$25,500</td>
<td>$36.36</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$84.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>PUMPHOUSE/WELL</td>
<td>ECHO LN</td>
<td>$86,700</td>
<td>$120.78</td>
<td>$27,800</td>
<td>$39.53</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$160.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>PUMPHOUSE/WELL</td>
<td>SILVER CREEK RD &amp; WASATCH WAY</td>
<td>$75,400</td>
<td>$94.18</td>
<td>$41,900</td>
<td>$59.58</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$153.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>SILVER BULLET TANK</td>
<td>1100 EAST WHILE AWAY</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$397.23</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$397.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>VAULT</td>
<td>8150 HIGHFIELD RD</td>
<td>$18,600</td>
<td>$23.23</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$4.27</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$27.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>WATER STORAGE TANK 500,000 GAL</td>
<td>8150 HIGHFIELD RD</td>
<td>$721,200</td>
<td>$90.78</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$90.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Invoice Date</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Premium</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Equipment</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>Radar Spd</td>
<td>7215 N Silver Creek Rd, Park City Ut. 84060</td>
<td>$10,099</td>
<td>$17.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Equipment</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>04/07/2019</td>
<td>Solar Radar Speed</td>
<td>8200 N Silver Creek Rd</td>
<td>$4,980</td>
<td>$8.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TCB LANDSCAPING  
PO Box 982126  
PARK CITY, UT  84098 US  
tcblandscaping@msn.com

BILL TO  
Summit County Service Area  
#3_  
7215 N. Silver Creek Rd.  
Park City, UT  84098

INVOICE 11002  
DATE 02/28/2019  TERMS Due on receipt  
DUE DATE 02/28/2019

P.O. NUMBER  
FEBRUARY WATER MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/01/2019</td>
<td>WATER OPERATOR: ARSENIC MEETING, HAL</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/04/2019</td>
<td>WATER OPERATOR: BOARD MEETING - WATER POLICIES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/11/2019</td>
<td>WATER OPERATOR: WELL METER GARY KELCH</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/2019</td>
<td>WATER OPERATOR: WATER RIGHT REVIEW</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/27/2019</td>
<td>WATER OPERATOR: WATER SAMPLES GREENFIELD</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>122.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/28/2019</td>
<td>WATER OPERATOR: WATER SAMPLES</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DUE: $507.50
TCB LANDSCAPING
PO Box 982126
PARK CITY, UT 84098 US
tcblandscaping@msn.com

BILL TO
Summit County Service Area #3
7215 N. Silver Creek Rd.
Park City, UT 84098

INVOICE 11003
DATE 02/28/2019   TERMS Due on receipt
DUE DATE 02/28/2019

P.O. NUMBER
ROAD MANAGEMENT FEBRUARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>QTY</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>AMOUNT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02/11/2019</td>
<td>ROAD MANAGER: ROADS W/ WOLFF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/12/2019</td>
<td>ROAD MANAGER: ROADS W/ WOLFF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/25/2019</td>
<td>ROAD MANAGER: BOARD MEETING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>105.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL DUE   $175.00
To: SCSA#3 Board of Trustees and Marla Howard, General Manager

From: Nathan Bracken, Legal Counsel

Date: March 21, 2019

Re: Key Bills that Passed during the 2019 Legislative Session/Compliance with SB 28

For my legislative update to the Board on March 25, 2019, I will go over two issues: (1) a summary of the notable bills that passed during the 2019 general legislative session; and (2) requirements pertaining to a local government registry created under SB 28, which the Legislature passed in 2018 and which will go into effect this year and will require the Service Area to provide specific information to the Lieutenant Governor before July 1, 2019.

A. NOTABLE BILLS THAT PASSED IN 2019

HB 26 – Political Subdivision Lien Amendments
This bill amends a provision regarding the priority of certain political subdivision liens to be consistent with existing code.

HB 63 – Local Government Financial Amendments (UASD Bill/UASD Supported)
This bill: 1) encourages a local district with a certain budget to obtain liability insurance; 2) modifies the balance a local district may accumulate in the district's general fund.

HB 64, 3rd Substitute – Lobbyist Expenditures Amendments (UASD Amended/UASD Supported)
This bill: 1) defines terms; 2) modifies provisions relating to an approved activity; 3) requires a lobbyist to file certain reports related to the lobbyist's expenditure on a local official or education official; 4) establishes limits for a lobbyist's expenditures on a local official or education official; 5) establishes provisions for the disposal of a publication that qualifies as an expenditure; 6) establishes criminal and civil penalties; 7) grants rulemaking authority to the director of elections within the Office of the Lieutenant Governor; and 8) makes most of the provisions of the Lobbyist Disclosure and Regulation Act applicable to expenditures for a local official or an

education official by incorporating those provisions into a Local Government and Board of Education Lobbyist Disclosure and Regulation Act.

72, 1st Substitute – Local District Board Amendments (UASD Bill/UASD Supported)  
This bill: 1) amends provisions related to a county legislative body appointing one of the body’s own members to the board of trustees of a local district in certain circumstances; 2) establishes the procedure for filling open board member positions when the number of board members increases; 3) addresses when the term begins for a board member who joins a board because the number of board members increases; 4) requires adjusting the lengths of terms of new board members who join a board because the number of board members increases to ensure that term expiration occurs biannually; 5) clarifies a provision related to a county or municipal legislative body that serves as the local district board of trustees; 6) addresses the entity that appoints members to a mosquito abatement board of trustees; 7) requires certain notice in the event of a vacancy on a local district board of trustees.

HB 86 – Service Area Board of Trustees Amendments (UASD Supported)  
This bill: 1) allows a municipal governing body to petition to appoint a member of a service area board of trustees in certain circumstances; 2) provides for the appointment and term of a municipal governing body appointee on a service area board of trustees; 3) allows a service area board of trustees to rescind the board’s approval of a municipal petition to appoint a member of the board.

HB 240 – Money Management Act Amendments (UASD Supported)  
This bill: 1) authorizes public funds to be invested in negotiable brokered certificates of deposit, subject to rules made by the State Money Management Council.

HB 311, 1st Substitute – Governmental Immunity Revisions  
This bill: 1) waives governmental immunity for injury resulting from certain claims of sexual battery; 2) provides an additional basis for disallowing a governmental entity to challenge the timeliness of a notice of claim; 3) modifies the time for filing an action against a governmental entity; 4) modifies provisions relating to a governmental entity’s response to a notice of claim; 5) modifies a provision relating to a plaintiff’s filing of an undertaking in an action under the Governmental Immunity Act of Utah; 6) increases the aggregate limit on injury claims against governmental entities; 7) provides for the board of examiners to require a special master proceeding for excess damages claims that the board of examiners considers; 8) authorizes the use of money in the General Fund Budget Reserve Account to pay for claims approved by the board of examiners.

SB 145 – Legal Notice Revisions (UASD Amended/UASD Supported)  
This bill: 1) defines average advertisement rate; 2) permits a person to satisfy a part of legal notice publication requirements, in certain circumstances, by serving legal notice directly on all parties to whom legal notice is required; 3) amends restrictions on newspapers in relation to legal notices.
SB 179, 3rd Substitute – Truth in Taxation Amendments Revisions (UASD Amended/UASD Supported)
https://le.utah.gov/~2019/bills/sbillamd/SB0179S03.pdf

This bill: 1) places limitations on the other items a taxing entity can place on an agenda for a meeting during which the taxing entity will hold a public hearing to discuss a proposed tax rate increase; 2) requires a public meeting addressing the general business of the taxing entity that occurs on the same date as a public hearing to discuss a proposed tax rate increase to conclude before the public hearing on the proposed tax rate increase begins; 3) prohibits unreasonable restriction on the number of individuals who offer public comment; and 4) prohibits a taxing entity from holding a public hearing to discuss a proposed tax rate increase on the same date as another public hearing, other than a taxing entity's budget hearing, a local district's or special service district's fee hearing, or a town's enterprise fund hearing.

B. LOCAL GOVERNMENT REGISTRY REQUIREMENTS

In 2018, the Legislature passed S.B. 28, which enacted Utah Code Ann. § 17B-1-103(6) to require all local districts to register with the Lieutenant Governor as part of a statewide registry of local government entities. At some point in 2019, the Lieutenant Governor will send the Service Area an initial “notice of registration,” which will ask the Service Area to provide the following information before July 1, 2019. I recommend that the Service Area begin collecting this information now so that it will be prepared to respond before the deadline on July 1, 2019.

1. The resolution or other legal or formal document creating the Service Area, (i.e., Title 2, Chapter 27 of the Summit County Code);

2. A map or plat showing the geographic boundaries of the Service Area, a metes and bounds description, or another legal description that identifies the boundaries of the Service Area;

3. The Service Area’s name;

4. The type of local district (i.e., a Service Area under the Service Area Act, Section 17B-2a-901, et seq.);

5. The Service Area’s governmental functions (i.e., Section 2-27-1 of the Summit County Code);

6. The Service Area’s physical address and phone number, including the name and contact information of an individual whom the Service Area has designated as the primary contact for the Service Area (likely the General Manager);

7. The names of the Trustees, Officers, and other applicable managers, as well as an explanation of how the Trustees are elected and how any officer are elected by the Board; and

8. The Service Area’s source of revenue.

After submitting this initial information, the Service Area will receive a “renewal notice” each year from the Lieutenant Governor pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 67-1a-15(5). This renewal notice will ask the Service Area to update any of its previously submitted information or certify that its information is correct.
Failure to respond to the initial “notice of registration” and the subsequent annual “notices of renewal” could subject the Service Area to enforcement by the State Auditor and the withholding of the Service Area’s funds under Utah Code Ann. § 51-2a-401. Thus, it is important that the Service Area comply with these notices in a timely manner.
ROADS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Base Fee</th>
<th>Over 5,000 sq feet</th>
<th>over 5 truckloads in a period of 3 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Commercial construction up to 5,000 sq feet</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1 per sq ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Residential Construction up to 5,000 sq feet</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1 per sq ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel impacting over 2000 sq ft and over $50,000</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
<td>$1 per sq ft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remodel under $50,000 exceptions: reroofing</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill/grading</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>$25/ truckload</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasatch Way</td>
<td>Pulverize, regrade, asphalt</td>
<td>Install 2&quot; roadbase</td>
<td>TOTAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Paving</td>
<td>94,190.40</td>
<td>12,153.60</td>
<td>106,344.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Rock</td>
<td>93,644.00</td>
<td>17,555.20</td>
<td>111,199.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To: Service Area #3  
Address: Park City, UT

Contact:  
Phone:  
Fax: 

Project Name: Wasatch Way - Summit Country Service Area #3  
Project Location: Wasatch Way, Park City, UT

Bid Number: 392009  
Bid Date: 2/22/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Estimated Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Total Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>Pulverize, Regrade, Install 3” Asphalt</td>
<td>60,768.00</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$1.550</td>
<td>$94,190.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Furnish And Install 2” Roadbase On Top Of Pulverized</td>
<td>60,768.00</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>$0.200</td>
<td>$12,153.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Bid Price: $106,344.00

Notes:
- Final billing will be based upon actual in place quantities that will be field measured upon completion
- Bid includes one mobilization unless otherwise noted
- Bid using PG 64-22 or PG 58-28
- Bid excludes bonds, permits, fees, traffic control, flogging, prime coat, herbicide and sawcutting unless otherwise noted
- Bid excludes quality control and quality assurance testing.

Payment Terms:

Net due in 30 days following date of invoice, including monthly payments equal to the evaluation of work performed in any preceding month, interest at the rate of 11/2% per month charged on all past due accounts. This is an annual percentage rate of 18%. Purchaser agrees to pay reasonable legal fees, if it becomes necessary to place account for collection.

All material is guaranteed to be as specified. All work to be completed in a workmanlike manner according to standard practices. Any alteration or deviation from above specifications involving extra costs, will be executed only upon written orders and will become an extra charge over and above the estimated. Contractor shall not be responsible for breakage of curb, gutter and sidewalk when existing conditions require crossing concrete. All agreements contingent upon strikes, accidents or delays beyond our control, Owner to carry fire, tornado, and other necessary insurance. Our workers are fully covered by Workmen’s Compensation Insurance. Advanced Paving & Construction and its affiliates are not responsible for any work performed between October 15th and April 1st.

ACCEPTED:
The above prices, specifications and conditions are satisfactory and are hereby accepted.

Buyer: ____________________________  
Signature: ________________________  
Date of Acceptance: _______________

CONFIRMED:
Advanced Paving and Construction, LLC.

Authorized Signature: ____________________________  
Estimator: Justin Petty  
(801) 430-1125 justin@advancedpaving.net

3/5/2019 11:51:00 AM
Chris,

Do I need to put this on any specific paper work? Here is the amount below.

2" Commercial UTBC on Top of Pulverized Road – 6752 SY @ $2.60 per SY = $17,555.20.

Let me know if you have any questions.

THANKS,

JOSEPH SERRE
Area Construction Manager
GENEVA ROCK PRODUCTS, INC.
CELL (801) 440-4168
JSERRE@GENEVAROCK.COM

From: Chris Bullock <chris@scca3.org>
Sent: Friday, March 15, 2019 2:00 PM
To: Joe Serre <jserre@genevarock.com>
Cc: gm@scca3.org
Subject: Re: Pulverize Asphalt and Re-asphalt Proposal

joe
Will you please give me a call.
We are looking for an additional line item bid for 2" of road base to be added and compacted on top of the pulverized material as a leveling course.
Thank you
Chris Bullock
Summit County Service Area #3
435-731-0107

On Fri, Feb 22, 2019 at 8:45 AM Joe Serre <jserre@genevarock.com> wrote:

Chris,
be placed at the entrance of each location & throughout the project where construction is taking place. 4. 
CLEAN UP A. The Contractor shall promptly clean up oil over sprays, fuel, chips or any other spills caused by 
the contractor during the course of the project including material run off into gutters, drainage ditches, 
driveways or manhole lids and valves that are not covered. B. Sweep and clean up any loose remaining 
material from each location after the application process, including curb and gutters, drainage ditches, 
driveways, sidewalks and trails.

Wasatch Way Road Construction - Pulverize, Grade and Compact. 3" Asphalt for Summit County Service Area 
#3

The undersigned, after having personally and carefully examined the site of the work, the Specifications and 
form of the agreement, all of which are made a part hereof, proposes to furnish all labor, equipment, tools and 
machinery, and to furnish and deliver all materials not specifically mentioned as being furnished by the local 
agency, which are required in the construction of to Pulverize Existing Asphalt, Re-grade and Compact Material, 
Furnish And Install 3" Asphalt on Wasatch Way from Silver Creek Road to Redden Road intersection, located 
in Summit County Service Area #3

BID PROPOSAL CONTRACTOR:  
Geneva Rock Products, Inc.

Business License Number: 00004520  
State Contractor

License Number: 239696-5501

Name Date Address City, State, Zip Phone
SUMMIT COUNTY SERVICE AREA #3 Bid Proposal Wasatch Way

3

The undersigned, after having personally and carefully examined the site of the work, the Specifications and 
form of the agreement, all of which are made a part hereof, proposes to furnish all labor, equipment, tools and 
machinery, and to furnish and deliver all materials not specifically mentioned as being furnished by the local 
agency, which are required in the construction of the 2019 Pulverize and Asphalt Wasatch Way from Silver 
Creek Road to Redden Road intersection for Summit County Service Area #3. For the total sum of

Ninety Three Thousand Six Hundred Forty Four Dollars ($ 93,644.00), as 
detailed on the Bidding Schedule. The undersigned further proposes to execute the attached agreement within 
five working days after the date of the award, and to begin work within five working days after being notified to 
do so by the local agency, weather pending, and to complete the same on or before August 15, 2019, after the 
signing of the agreement by both parties. It is understood that Summit County Service Area #3 has the right to 
reject this bid or to accept it at the price listed above and/or the individual prices located in the Bidding 
Schedule.  
Joseph Sene  
Area Manager  
Signature of the Preparer  
Title of Preparer BIDDING SCHEDULE Pulverize, 

Grade and Compact, 3" Asphalt Lump Sum Total $ 93,644.00  
Price per Square Yard $ 13.10  
Note: Actual payment for the work shall be based upon the actual work 
completed, approved and accepted by Summit County Service Area #3. Summit County Service Area #3 
reserves the right to eliminate portions of work from this bid and contract because of budget constraints. 

CONTACT: Chris Bullock; chris@scsa3.org; (435) 731-0107

Submit bids by February 22, 2019 by 5:00 p.m. 
by delivering to 
629 Parkway Drive, Suite B, Park City, UT 84060 
or by emailing to gm@scsa3.org or chris@scsa3.org.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Summit County Service Area No. 3
FROM: Nathan Bracken and Richard Snow
RE: Procedure for establishing an approved vendors list (SU010-002).
DATE: September 7, 2017

This memorandum is intended to provide a step-by-step overview of the statutory process SCSA#3 needs to follow to create an approved vendor list under Utah’s Procurement Code.

The benefit of an approved vendor list is that it gives the Service Area more flexibility in selecting approved vendors to provide services in accordance with the maximum cost thresholds set forth in Section VI(B) of the Purchasing Policy. Most notably, for construction projects under $25,000, if an approved vendor list is in place, the SCSA#3 can solicit bids from three vendors on the list rather than doing a request for proposals.

OVERVIEW

SCSA#3 can establish an approved vendor list for: (1) a specific, fully defined procurement item; or (2) a future procurement item that is not specifically and fully defined, if the request for statement of qualifications ("RSQ") contains a general description of the procurement item and the type of vendor that SCSA#3 seeks to provide the procurement item.1

A “procurement item” is a supply, service, or construction.2

A “vendor” is a person who is seeking to enter into a contract with SCSA#3 to provide SCSA#3 with its requested procurement item.3 This term includes bidders, offerors, approved vendors, and design professionals.4

STEP 1 – ISSUE AN RSQ5

To begin the process, SCSA#3 must first issue a RSQ inviting interested vendors to submit statements of qualifications. The RSQ must include:

1. A general description of, as applicable:
   a. The procurement item or service that SCSA#3 seeks to acquire;
   b. The type of project or scope or category of work;

---

1 Utah Code § 63G-6a-507(3).
2 Utah Code § 63G-6a-103(58).
3 Utah Code § 63G-6a-103(b)(9).
4 Utah Code § 63G-6a-103(96)(b)(I) through (iv).
5 Utah Code § 63G-6a-410(3) – (5).
c. The process SCSA#3 will use to acquire the procurement item; and
d. The type of vendor SCSA#3 seeks to provide the procurement item or service.

2. The criteria SCSA#3 will use to approve vendors for the list and how it will score the vendors’ statements of qualifications.

3. A statement that the approved vendor list will include only responsible vendors that:
   a. Submit a responsive statement of qualifications; and
   b. Meet the criteria described in the RSQ.

4. A statement indicating that only vendors on the approved vendor list will be able to participate in the procurements identified in the RSQ.

5. A statement indicating whether SCSA#3 will use a performance rating system for evaluating the performance of vendors on the approved vendor list, including whether a vendor on the approved vendor list may be disqualified and removed from the list.

6. A statement indicating whether SCSA#3 will be using a closed-ended approved vendor list (a list with a set expiration date of no more than 18 months)\(^6\) or an open-ended approved vendor list (a list without an expiration date). For an approved vendor list to do small construction projects, SCSA#3 would likely want to do an open-ended list so that it could use the list as needed when construction projects arise.

7. A description of any other criteria or requirements specific to the procurement item or scope of work that is the subject of the procurement.

**STEP 2 – PROVIDE NOTICE OF AN RSQ\(^7\)**

SCSA#3 must provide notice of the RSQ at least seven days before the statements of qualifications are due.\(^8\) It is recommended that SCSA#3 provide the public with notice at the same time it issues the RSQ instead of waiting until seven days before the deadline. The public notice must include:

1. SCSA#3’s name;
2. Information on how to contact SCSA#3;
3. The date of the opening and closing of the solicitation;
4. Information on how to obtain a copy of the procurement documents; and

---

\(^6\) For closed-ended approved vendor lists, the RSQ must include the deadlines for when: (1) a vendor is required to submit a statement of qualifications, and (2) the approved vendor list will expire. Utah Code § 63G-6a-410(5)(f)(ii)(A).

\(^7\) Utah Code §§ 63G-6a-410(6) and 63G-6a-112(2)(a). See also Utah Code § 63G-6a-507(5)(b)(i).

\(^8\) SCSA#3 can shorten the seven-day period if its procurement officer signs a written statement that (1) states that a shorter time is needed and (2) determines that competition from multiple sources may be obtained within the shorter period of time. Utah Code § 63G-6a-112(4)(a) and (b).
5. A general description of the procurement items that will be obtained through the standard procurement process.

SCSA#3 can publish the notice in a newspaper of general circulation in the state or in SCSA#3’s service area, on its website, or on the state’s public notice website.

SCSA#3 must keep a copy of the solicitation documents available for public inspection on its website until the award of the contract or the cancellation of the procurement.

If SCSA#3 issues a RSQ as part of an approved vendor list that results in the establishment of an open-ended vendor list, SCSA#3 must keep the RSQ posted on its website or the state’s website during the entire period of the open-ended vendor list.

**STEP 3 - APPOINT AN EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

The Board must appoint an evaluation committee of at least three people are familiar with the technical requirements of the procurement item or the need for the item. In addition, SCSA#3 must ensure that each member of the committee:

1. Does not have a conflict of interest with any vendor that submits a statement of qualifications;

2. Can fairly evaluate each statement of qualifications;

3. Does not contact or communicate with a vendor concerning the evaluation process or procurement outside the official evaluation committee process; and

4. Can conduct or participate in the evaluation in a manner that ensures a fair and competitive process and avoids the appearance of impropriety.

The Board could also designate itself as the evaluation committee, provided that each member can satisfy the above requirements.

**STEP 4 – EVALUATION COMMITTEE REVIEW**

In evaluating RSQs, the evaluation committee must evaluate and score statements of qualifications submitted in response to the criteria in the RSQ. The committee cannot use any criteria not included in the RSQ.

SCSA#3 may, with approval of the Chair, interview vendors to clarify information contained in their statements of qualification. These interviews may only be used to explain, illustrate, or interpret the contents of the vendor’s original statement of qualifications. They cannot be used for any other purpose.10

---

9 Utah Code § 63G-6a-410(9).

10 For a specific list of what the evaluation committee cannot do with the discussions, interviews, or viewings of presentations with applicant vendors, see Utah Code § 63G-6a-410(9)(d)(ii)(A) through (G).
STEP 5 – EVALUATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Utah Code vests the Chair with the responsibility of reviewing the evaluation committee’s recommendations.

After the evaluation committee evaluates the statements of qualifications, it must submit the scored statements of qualifications to the Chair, or another person designated by the Board, for review and a final determination of vendors to be included on an approved vendor list. The Chair of SCSA#3 must then:

1. Review the evaluation committee’s scores and correct any errors, scoring inconsistencies, and any other noncompliance with the Utah Procurement Code; and

2. Make a final approved vendor list consisting of those vendors who meet the minimum mandatory requirements, evaluation criteria, and applicable score thresholds set out in the RSQ and reject any vendor who failed to meet those requirements, criteria, and thresholds.

3. The final list must be either a closed-ended approved vendor list or an open-ended approved vendor list.
   a. If it is a closed-ended approved vendor list, it must expire no later than 18 months after its publication. SCSA#3 can set a time for the list to expire sooner.
   b. If the list is an open-ended approved vendor list, SCSA#3 must require approved vendors to submit an updated statement of qualifications for evaluation no later than 18 months after the vendor was added to the list. SCSA#3 can require a vendor to update its statement of qualifications sooner than 18 months.

If there is only one vendor that meets the RSQ’s criteria, SCSA#3 must cancel the RSQ. It also cannot establish an approved vendor list based on the canceled RSQ or on statements of qualifications submitted in response to the RSQ. If SCSA#3 cancels an RSQ, it must make available for public inspection a written justification for the cancellation, e.g., there was only one vendor that met the RSQ’s requirements.

STEP 6 – PUBLISH NOTICE OF THE FINAL APPROVED VENDOR LIST

Once final, SCSA#3 must publish the approved vendor list before using the list.

11 Utah Code § 63G-6a-410(9); Utah Code § 63G-6a-507.
12 Utah Code § 63G-6a-507(5)(b)(i).
13 Utah Code § 63G-6a-507(5).
14 Utah Code § 63G-6a-507(7).
REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Summit County Service Area #3
Request for Qualifications

SUMMIT COUNTY SERVICE AREA #3
629 E. Parkway Drive, Suite 1
Park City, UT 84098
(435) 649-7949
www.scsa3.org

March 25, 2019
General Information

Introduction

Summit County Service Area #3 (the “Service Area”), located in western Summit County Utah, is soliciting Statements of Qualifications for annual snowplowing for the roads within the Service Area from qualified road contractors.

Scope of the Project

The Service Area is responsible for approximately 24 miles of roads within the Service Area. The nature of the roads and terrains varies within a mountain setting. The proposed work will provide snowplowing services and expertise for the roads within the Service Area beginning at approximately 5:00 a.m. to clear snow in excess of two to three inches accumulated overnight, or during the day during heavy snowfall. The roads will be plowed down to two inches of snow and sand applied where necessary. Services will be available on an as needed basis.

Project Timeline

The following schedule is the anticipated timeline of the project.

- RFQ advertised March 26, 2019
- Proposals due April 15, 2019 at 12:00 pm (noon)
- Evaluation and Selection April 22, 2019

Proposal Requirements and Contents

Statement of Qualifications

The Service Area is interested in the experience of the proposed staff and their experience performing snowplow services on approximately 24 miles of neighborhood roads in a mountain setting. Please provide a concise Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) describing your firm’s experience on similar projects and the expertise of your staff to complete the components included in the scope of work.

Method of Snowplowing

Provide a detailed outline of methods, equipment, and manpower necessary to complete each task in a safe and efficient manner. Please note any cost, reduction of risk, or efficiencies to be gained by the Service Area by employing the contractor’s methods.

Minimum Qualifications

- The Offeror must be licensed to practice their profession within the State of Utah.
- The Offeror must be incorporated for a minimum of five (5) years.
- Demonstrated experience in snowplowing of neighborhood roads whether improved or dirt roads.
- Services are required 24/7 from October 1 to April 30 including all holidays.
- Equipment required to include two all-wheel drive dump trucks with snow blades and two graders.
Fee Proposal

Please provide a fee proposal in the form attached to the RFQ. Provide a detailed fee breakdown reflecting the scope of services including:

- Hourly charge-out rate table for all anticipated personnel classifications.
- Mobilization and demobilization costs, including potential savings gained from timing work to coincide with that carried out by the contractor in nearby water systems.
- All specialized equipment, travel, and related expenses, and other indirect costs.

Inquiries

Questions must be submitted in writing and received no later than 4:00 p.m., April 11, 2019. Email inquiries are strongly encouraged. Questions concerning this request for proposals should be submitted to:

Summit County Service Area #3
Attention: Marla Howard, General Manager
629 E. Parkway Drive, Suite 1
Park City, UT 84098
gm@scsa3.org

Any interpretation of the documents will be made by Addendum duly issued. Verbal answers, oral explanations, or instructions given before the award of the contract or at any time will not be binding on the Service Area. Addenda shall be issued within a reasonable time, but not less than two (2) working days prior to receipt of proposals.

Submittal Delivery

- To be considered, submit one (1) copy of your proposal in a sealed envelope clearly marked: “REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS FOR SNOWPLOW SERVICES” either by delivery or by mail to:

Summit County Service Area #3
Attention: Marla Howard, General Manager
629 E. Parkway Drive, Suite 1
Park City, UT 84098
gm@scsa3.org

- Sealed proposals must be received by mail, hand-delivery, or email no later than April 15, 2019, at 12:00 p.m. (local time).
- Facsimile submittals will not be accepted.
- The Service Area assumes no responsibility for delayed or undelivered mail or express packages. Additionally, the use of a File Transfer Protocol site to download the proposal will not be considered responsive. Proposals which are not delivered to the Service Area by the above specified time and date will not be considered.

Additional Proposal Requirements
Proof of insurance as outlined in the sample Construction Agreement attached hereto as Exhibit “A” as well as proof of worker’s compensation or exemption.

Written affirmation that the firm has a policy of nondiscrimination in employment because of race, age, color, sex, religion, national origin, mental or physical handicap, political affiliation, marital status, or other protected class, and has a drugfree workplace policy and an equal opportunity employer and being otherwise qualified by law to enter into the Construction Agreement.

Proposal Limits

- Please provide a fee proposal in the form attached to the RFQ.
- Please limit the statement of qualifications (“SOQ”) to five (5) pages including cover page, resumes, table of contents, dividers, etc.

Provider Service Agreement

The Service Area is expecting to enter into a Service Agreement with the selected Contractor (offeror) for services necessary to provide and complete the Summit County Service Area #3 Road Snowplow Services. A sample of the Service Agreement is attached. The offeror selected to provide the services/products shall be required to enter into a written agreement in substantially the form as shown in the attached sample agreement which shall be the basic form used to develop the final agreement.

- Signature on an offeror’s proposal acknowledges that the offeror is willing to enter into the agreement if awarded the contract. Offerors are advised to read thoroughly the sample agreement, as the selected offeror will be required to comply with its requirements.
- If offeror takes exception to any term or condition set forth in this proposal and/or the sample agreement and any of its exhibits and attachments, said exceptions must be clearly identified in the response to this RFQ. Exceptions or deviations to any of the terms and conditions must be submitted in a separate document accompanying offeror’s proposal (included in Section I of the proposal) identified as “Exceptions.” Such exceptions shall be considered in the evaluation and the award process. All questions about the insurance requirements or indemnification language found in Paragraphs 3 and 11 of the sample Construction Agreement must be resolved prior to submitting an SOQ. The Service Area shall be the sole determiner of the acceptability of any exception.
- It is the Service Area’s express desire to enter into a Service Agreement which includes all services necessary for this project, whether or not the services are specifically outlined in this RFQ.

Preparation of Qualifications/Proposals

- Failure to Read. Failure to read the Request for Proposals and these instructions will be at the offeror’s own risk.
- Cost of Developing Qualifications/Proposals. All costs related to the preparation of the qualifications/proposals and any related activities are the sole responsibility of the offeror. The Service Area assumes no liability for any costs incurred by offerors throughout the entire selection process.

Confidentiality
All responses, inquiries, and correspondence relating to this RFQ and all reports, charts, displays, schedules, exhibits, and other documentation produced by the offeror that is submitted to the Service Area, as part of the proposal or otherwise may be considered public information under applicable law, including but not limited to the Government Records Access and Management Act, Title 63G, Chapter 2, Utah Code Annotated. The Service Area generally considers proposals and all accompanying material to be public and subject to disclosure.

Any material considered by the offeror to be proprietary must be accompanied by a written claim of confidentiality and a concise written statement of reasons supporting the claim. Blanket claims that the entire RFQ is confidential will be denied. The Service Area cannot guarantee that any information will be held confidential. Under Section 63G-2-309 of the Government Records Access and Management Act, if the offeror makes a claim of confidentiality, the Service Area, upon receipt of a request for disclosure, will determine whether the material should be classified as public or protected, and will notify the offeror of such determination. The offeror is entitled under the Government Records Access and Management Act to appeal an adverse determination. The Service Area is not obligated to notify the offeror of a request, and will not consider a claim of confidentiality, unless the offeror's claim of confidentiality is made in a timely basis and in accordance with the Government Records Access and Management Act.

Proposal Selection

Selection Process

- The Service Area intends to award a contract to the highest ranking firm based on the selection process and evaluation criteria stated below.
- The selection process will proceed on the following schedule.
- A selection committee comprised of the Service Area staff and Board of Trustees will review the submitted Statements of Qualifications, rank them according to the following evaluation criteria, and make a selection.
- The Service Area General Manager will present a recommendation to the Service Area Board of Trustees to enter into a Construction Agreement with the selected firm(s). Award of the contract is subject to approval by the Service Area Board of Trustees.
- The Service Area’s General Manager will negotiate a contract with the top ranked consultant. In the event that negotiations are not successful, the Service Area reserves the right to enter into negotiations with other ranked firms.

Qualification/Proposal Information

- **Discussions With Offerors.** The Service Area reserves the right to enter into discussions with the offeror(s) determined to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for award, or to enter into exclusive discussions with the offeror whose proposal is deemed most advantageous, whichever is in the Service Area’s best interest, for the purpose of negotiation. In the event that exclusive negotiations are conducted and an agreement is not reached, the Service Area reserves the right to enter into negotiations with the next highest ranked offeror without the need to repeat the formal solicitation process.
- **Equal Opportunity.** The Service Area will make every effort to ensure that all offerors are treated fairly and equally throughout the entire advertisement, review, and selection
process. The procedures established herein are designed to give all parties reasonable access to the same basic information. Service Area’s policy, subject to federal, State, and local procurement laws, is to provide reasonable attempts to support Service Area’s businesses by purchasing goods and services through local vendors and service providers.

- **Notice of Award.** The Service Area will notify the Offeror the award of the project via email and in writing.
- **Notice to Proceed.** The Service Area will notify the Offeror the notice to proceed with the project via email after consultation with the Offeror regarding schedule.
- **Proposal Ownership.** All proposals, including attachments, supplementary materials, addenda, etc., shall become the property of the Service Area and will not be returned to the offeror.
- **Rejection of Proposals.** The Service Area reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received and disqualify incomplete or late proposals. Proposals lacking required information will not be considered. Furthermore, the Service Area shall have the right to waive any informality or technicality in proposals received when in the best interest of the Service Area. No proposal shall be accepted from, or contract awarded to, any person, firm or corporation that is in arrears to the Service Area for any obligation. Offerors may be required to submit satisfactory evidence that they have the necessary financial resources to perform and complete the work outlined in this RFQ.
- **Service Area’s Best Interest.** The Service Area reserves the right to take any steps deemed necessary to act in the Service Area’s best interest.
- **GRAMA.** All submittals shall be public records in accordance with government records regulations ("GRAMA") unless otherwise designated by the applicant pursuant to UCA § 63G-2-309, as amended.
- **Proposal Term.** Proposals shall be good for six (6) months from submittal deadline.
- **Reservation of Rights.** Summit County Service Area #3 reserves the right to cancel or modify the terms of this RFQ and/or the project at any time and for any reason preceding contract award and reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals submitted pursuant to this request for proposals. The Service Area will provide respondents written notice of any cancellation and/or modification. Furthermore, the Service Area shall have the right to waive any informality or technicality in proposals received when in the best interest of the Service Area.

**Evaluation Criteria**

Statements of Qualifications and Fee Proposal will be evaluated by the selection committee on the criteria and the corresponding weight factors listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Rate Structure and Fee</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Safety and Efficiency of Methods of Inspection and Cleaning</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sample Condition Assessment Report</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Level of contractor Staff Experience/Qualifications, with respect to inspection, cleaning and condition assessments.</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Information Obtained from References and Other Factors Deemed Relevant by the Selection Committee.</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Points</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Price may not be the sole deciding factor.

**Protests**

Offerors are directed to the Appeals Procedure contained in Service Area’s Contracting and Purchasing Policy.
WATER
SUMMIT COUNTY
SERVICE AREA NO. 3

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

GREENFIELD WELL
ARSENIC REMOVAL SYSTEM
AND PILOT STUDY

DRAFT v.2

MARCH 2019
I. PURPOSE

Summit County Service Area #3 ("Service Area") is accepting competitive sealed proposals for a cost of service and rate design study. The intent of the study is to:

1. Independently analyze and assess the Service Area’s current water rate structure;
2. Determine an updated cost of service, which includes:
   - Rate provision that will strongly promote water conservation and
   - Immediately recover the costs associated with arsenic treatment;
3. Provide recommendations for equitable, sustainable cost recovery; and
4. Provide recommendations for allocation of each customer’s water allotment throughout the water use year.

The study is to be based on a comprehensive review of the Service Area’s water reserves and budget, planned capital improvement projects, current usage data by class or type, future planned growth of the area with the Service Area, arsenic treatment requirements and any other information deemed necessary.

II. DESCRIPTION OF ORGANIZATION

The Board of Trustees of Summit County Service Area #3 (Service Area) was established on September 8, 1964 (Resolution No. 57) by the Summit County Commission. The Board, which is elected and consists of seven residents, governs the Service Area in accordance with the provisions of Title 17B, Utah Code, including the power to levy a property tax under 17B-1-1002(1)(i)(iii), 17B-2a-902, 17B-2a-903, 17B-2a-904, 17B-2a-905, 17B-2a-907, and 17b-1-306.5, subject, however, to certain exceptions set forth within the Service Area.

The Service Areas owns and manages water rights, water shares and water contracts used in providing water to the residents of Silver Creek Estates (SCE). It provides water service through a culinary system to approximately 270 residences or by providing water rights to approximately 195 lots that are used for private wells. Currently, the Service Area operates two wells, one year-round with the second well used only during the summer months due to higher arsenic levels. The Service Area is exploring the costs of implementing an arsenic treatment process.

Water resources in the Snyderville Basin are limited making growth or high water use difficult. This scarcity has required the implementation of strict county and state regulations.
III. DESCRIPTION OF CURRENT WATER RATES AND FEES

A. The Service Area’s current water policy may be accessed at http://summitcounty.org/733/Service-Area-3.

B. The Service Area concluded its last Cost of Service Study in ???? . At that time, ???? an outside consultant, examined all rates and charges and develop a rate structure in which:

1. The annual service charge for wells using Service Area’s rights was established at $72.
2. Each home connected to the water system received an allotment of 0.75 acre-feet. This allotment was then evenly allocated to a monthly allotment of 20,000 gallons.
3. A base charge of $81 per month was established for water use up to 20,000 gallons a month, with usage charges as follows:
   a. 20,000 to 40,000 usage at $ 6.2 per 1,000 gallons
   b. 40,000 to 60,000 usage at $10.20 per 1,000 gallons
   c. 60,000 to 80,000 usage at $17.20 per 1,000 gallons
   d. 80,000 to 100,000 usage at $30.20 per 1,000 gallons
   e. 100,000 to 999,999 usage at $55.20 per 1,000 gallons

C. Current rates and charges became effective on the customers’ bills beginning in ????.

D. Commercial or institutional rates are negotiated based on the estimated water consumption as developed by a water engineer.

E. The Service Area is seeking an updated cost of service study:

1. To ensure annual water sales revenues cover annual operating, capital and debt services expenses without incurring new debt; and
2. To evaluate and select a rate structure or modification to the Service Area’s current rate structure that will continue to encourage water conservation, including both residential and non-residential rates; and
3. To address customer concerns that low water users are penalized by what they perceive as a high ready-to-serve charge.

F. The Service Area has committed to conducting regular cost of service studies.

IV. SPECIFIC SERVICES TO BE RENDERED – The Service Area has identified several key requirements that must be included in a cost of service and rate design study. The successful proposer will be required to provide, at a minimum, the following:

A. Long Range Financial Forecast – Prepare cash flows, forecasts and projections
and review them with Service Area staff for agreement on assumptions, interpretation of data, and completeness of approach. Identify need for financing, if necessary.

1. The long-range financial forecast shall span ten years.

2. The recommended rate structure shall be planned for at least three years.

3. Electronic files of the worksheets generated for these forecasts shall be provided to the Service Area for future reference and use.

B. Water Rate Study and Comprehensive Fee Analysis – Develop strategies for supporting the Service Area’s anticipated operations and other financial activities with revenues generated from regular water sales and related Service Area functions. Examine the Service Area’s current water usage rates, monthly basic service charge, and other related fees and charges for appropriateness. When analyzing costs and revenues, consider customer usage in terms of category and meter size to ensure equitable treatment of all customer classes.

1. The consultant will assemble the information necessary to understand and describe the Service Area’s current financial situation, to understand its current rate and fee structure, and its ability to finance capital projects and operations.

2. The objects of this investigation and data collection are to develop an understanding of the individual characteristics of the Service Area, its financial profile, and the operations to be supported. With this knowledge, the consultant will be able to reach an agreement with the Service Area on the basic assumptions to be used in the study.

3. The recommended rate structures shall be based on cost of service and shall be sufficient to meet the revenue requirements of the Summit County Service Area #3.

4. In the event that significant rate changes are in order, provide implementation strategies to reduce adverse impact on specific consumer groups (i.e. minimum usage customers). The benefits of any proposed modifications shall be weighed against the financial impacts on ratepayers.

5. The study shall provide at least two and preferably three recommended rate alternatives, one of which shall be budget-based, and should deal with conservation pricing/rate structure and identifiable charges for arsenic treatment.
6. The recommended rate structures should consider and make provisions for the following factors:

i. Current and future costs of providing water in accordance with established and anticipated standards and regulations.

ii. Projected demands.

iii. Availability of water supply (short and long-term).

iv. Provide options emphasizing equity among customer classes.

v. Encourage water conservation.

vi. Funding requirements for all current and long-term liabilities and debt obligations (bonds and loans) are sustained.

vii. Provide for the Service Area's infrastructure.

viii. Present a straightforward approach that communicates and explains the rates and the required changes to Service Area customers.

ix. Shall assume a “base plus consumption” format.

x. Annual average debt:revenue ratio; the emergency reserve balance; other reserve balances; preference to avoid new debt and level of liquidity should all meet Service Area covenants, policies and operational needs.

xi. The Service Area’s existing billing system shall be able to handle any proposed rate structure.

xii. Provide data supporting conclusions and observations made for each of the areas cited above and reference within the study.

C. Reporting and Presentation at Board Meeting

1. Meetings - A minimum of three meetings between the consultant and the Service Area are required through the course of the study, including public workshops and/or meetings. At the Service Area’s discretion, meetings may be conducted via teleconferencing.

2. Preliminary Report

i. Prepare a preliminary report including tentative rate structures.

ii. Submit preliminary report. Reports shall be submitted electronically using Microsoft Excel and/or PDF formats.
iii. Present report and tentative rate structures to staff, Finance Committee and Board of Trustee for comments.

iv. Explain and summarize the impacts that the proposed rate structures will have on future consumption patterns, and the resulting impact on the cost of providing the service, including all currently known future requirements by the EPA, the Utah Department of Natural Resources, the Utah Department of Environmental Quality, the Summit County Department of Health, and other applicable regulatory bodies.

3. Final Report
   i. Incorporate changes made pursuant to the Preliminary Report presentation.
   ii. Submit final report. Reports shall be submitted electronically using Microsoft Excel and/or PDF formats.
   iii. Present the final report and recommended rate structures to the Service Area’s Board of Trustees and members of the public at a public hearing held at a regular Board of Trustee Meeting.

V. GENERAL REQUIREMENTS - Firms submitting a proposal shall meet the following requirements:

The staff that the proposer intends to assign to this project should be of sufficient size and have the experience and educational background necessary to manage a project of this scope. Ideally, the Service Area would like the proposer to possess significant experience not only in the area of cost of service analysis and recommending appropriate alternatives and successful solutions, but also with regard to the development of practical, creative and effective conservation pricing alternatives.

VI. QUESTIONS

Questions regarding the requested services or the contents of this RFP must be submitted in writing by 12:00 noon on May 31, 2019 and directed to the individual listed in the "VII. CORRESPONDENCE" section. All questions will be answered and copies of both the question and answer will be disseminated to all RFP recipients.

VII. CORRESPONDENCE

All correspondence, including proposals, is to be submitted to:

Marla Howard, General Manager
VIII. PROPOSAL TIMELINE

Release RFP: April 30, 2019
Deadline for Submission of Questions: May 31, 2019, noon
Deadline for Proposals: June 28, 2019, 5:00 pm.
Tentative Date for Notification of Award: August 1, 2019

IX. FORMAT FOR PROPOSAL

Respondents are required to mail 5 (five) copies of their proposal to the address listed in section VII by the above deadline. Responses must be complete and presented in the format detailed below. Failure to meet any of these requirements may cause the response to be rejected. No proposal shall be rejected, however, if it contains a minor irregularity, defect or variation if it is considered by the Service Area to be immaterial or inconsequential.

A. Transmittal Letter: General introduction and brief statement that the proposer’s understanding of the services to be performed; a positive commitment to perform the service within the time period specified; the name(s) of the person(s) authorized to represent the proposer, title, address, and telephone number.

B. Firm Qualifications and Staff Experience: Describe your firm’s in-house capabilities to perform the requested work. Provide résumés for all individuals performing significant elements of the work. Indicate team members’ responsibilities for the tasks or phases of the proposed work plan.

C. Similar Engagements with Other Government Entities: Provide a list of not less than three client references for which services similar to those outlined in this RFP have recently been provided. For each reference listed, provide the name of the organization, address, and telephone number of the responsible person within the reference’s organization.

D. Report Format: Please provide a copy of at least one final report developed as a result of a recent rate development and/or cost of service study prepared for a
client. The copy will be returned at the conclusion of the process if requested.

E. **Work Schedule:** Supply a timeline for developing an arsenic treatment surcharge/rate/fee and for the work leading up to the presentation of conservation rate/tier/other pricing alternatives and the presentation of the preliminary and final reports. The timeline for completion should consider timing for the distribution of all applicable notices, required public hearings and any other mandatory public contacts and communications so that proposed increases to rates, fees and charges, if any, can become effective January 1, 2020.

F. **Rates by Partner, Supervisory and Staff:** The cost proposal shall include detailed information regarding the estimated number of hours to be dedicated to the Service Area’s engagement, delineated by staffing level and the hourly rate of each.

G. **Additional Services:** If it should become necessary to request additional services, such additional services shall be performed at the hourly rates for key personnel listed in the consultant’s response to this proposal. The proposal shall identify any subcontracting firms to be used to prepare this study.

H. **Total All-Inclusive Maximum Price:** The dollar cost bid should contain all pricing information. The total all-inclusive maximum price to be bid is to contain all direct and indirect costs including all-out-of-pocket expenses.

I. **Insurance Requirements:** During the entire term of its engagement, the Firm agrees to indemnify, defend and hold harmless the Service Area and its authorized officers, employees, agents and volunteers from any and all claims, actions, losses, damages and/or liability arising from the Contractor’s acts, errors or omissions and for any costs or expenses incurred by the Service Area on account of any claim therefore, except where such indemnification is prohibited by law. The Firm also shall secure and maintain throughout the Agreement the following types of insurance with limits as shown:

1. **Workers’ Compensation** – A program of Workers’ Compensation insurance or a State-approved Self-Insurance Program in an amount and form to meet all applicable requirements of the Labor Code of the State of Utah.

2. **Comprehensive General and Automobile Liability Insurance** – This coverage to include contractual coverage and automobile liability coverage for owned, hired and non-owned vehicles. The policy shall have combined single limits for bodily injury and property damage of not less than one million dollars ($1,000,000) and $3,000,000 in the aggregate.

J. **Proof of Coverage:** The Contractor shall furnish certificates of insurance to the Service Area evidencing the insurance coverage prior to the commencement of
performance of services hereunder, which certificates shall provide that such insurance shall not be terminated or expire without thirty- (30) day written notice to the Service Area. The Contractor shall maintain such insurance from the time the Contractor commences performance of services hereunder until the completion of such services.

K. Proprietary Information: All responses and materials submitted become property of the Service Area and are subject to the Utah Public Records Act, provided that proposers must mark any proprietary information contained in their proposals that are not to be disclosed to the public or used for purposes other than the evaluation of the proposals. A dedication must accompany the proposal stating the reasons the information should not be disclosed. Any proposal that is marked confidential in its entirety will be questioned. Pricing and service elements of the successful proposal will not be considered proprietary. All materials will also become the property of the Service Area and may only be returned at the Service Area’s discretion.

X. EVALUATION

A. Evaluation Criteria: An evaluation and selection committee will consider all responsive proposals and rank the proposals pursuant to the criteria listed below. The committee will notify respondents whose proposals are eliminated during the process in writing. Proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the Utah Procurement Code and pursuant to the following:

B. Evaluation Process:

1. The evaluation committee will review all proposals that the Service Area timely receives and will eliminate all proposals that are not responsive or do not otherwise comply with the requirements of this RFP.

2. A 100 point scale is used to evaluate the three (3) main parts of the proposal response. Typically, the percentage allotment is:

   i. Technical 50% 50 points
   ii. Experience 30% 30 points
   iii. Cost 20% 20 points

3. The evaluation committee will evaluate and score any proposals that it does not eliminate in accordance with the criteria listed above.

4. If necessary, the evaluation committee will conduct discussions with responders in person or by telephone and may adjust the scores awarded under phase 2, if justified. If the evaluation committee determines, in its
sole discretion, that discussions are unnecessary, it may accept proposals without discussions.

5. The evaluation committee will select the highest scoring proposal, provided, however, that the Service Area reserves the right in accordance with the Utah Procurement Code to award the contract to a responder that scored lower than the highest scoring responder, if based on cost-benefit analysis required by the Utah Procurement Code, the highest scoring responder will not provide the best value to the Service Area.

C. Contract: Pending successful negotiations, the Service Area will award a contract to the responder whose proposal is the most advantageous to the Service Area in accordance with the Utah Procurement Code.

XI. PROPOSAL CONDITIONS

Responses to this Request for Proposal must be submitted in a sealed envelope or container stating on the outside: Vendor Name, Address, Telephone Number and “RFP for Water Rate Study.” The Service Area realizes that conditions other than price are important and will, therefore, award this agreement based on the proposal that best meets the needs of the Service Area. The Service Area may reject any or all proposals, any portion of a proposal, and may waive any informality or immaterial irregularities in a proposal. The final authority to award an agreement as a result of this RFP rests solely with the General Manager of the Summit County Service Area #3.
Ms. Emily Frary  
Arsenic Compliance Manager  
Utah Division of Drinking Water  
P.O. Box 144830  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4830  

January 31, 2019

RE: Summit County Service Area No. 3, System #22105 Quarterly Arsenic Report for the 4th Quarter 2018, Greenfield Well (WS002)

Dear Ms. Frary,

Summit County Service Area #3 (Service Area) provides drinking water to customers in the area of Silver Creek Estates. The Service Area owns and operates two wells. The first of the Service Area’s wells is the District Well (WS001). The District Well was drilled and equipped in 1963 and produces about 170 gpm. Water from the District Well has an arsenic level of about 4 ppb. In 2003, the Service Area drilled the Greenfield Well (WS002), which produces about 280 gpm. Water from the Greenfield Well has an arsenic level of about 14 to 22 ppb.

An operating permit for the Greenfield Well was approved by the Utah Division of Drinking Water (DDW) on February 23, 2012 and revised via correspondence dated October 23, 2012. Because the arsenic level in water from the Greenfield Well is above 10 ppb, the operating permit outlined specific arsenic testing and reporting requirements associated with using the well. Additionally, quarterly arsenic sampling is required at the District Well, the Greenfield Well, and at Silver Creek Estates Lot 278. The sampling is typically performed monthly and the results are averaged for each quarter, although samples have been taken more frequently during the most recent quarter. A running annual average is computed using the averaged results. The running annual average is to be maintained below the arsenic MCL of 10.0 ppb.

The Greenfield Well’s operating permit specifies that monitoring results are to be reported at the conclusion of each quarter. This letter contains the report for the 4th quarter of 2018.

ARSENIC SAMPLING RESULTS

Water samples were collected by Service Area personnel and submitted to Chemtech-Ford Laboratories for analytical testing. The analytical results of the last four quarters are presented
in Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 for SS278, WS001 and WS002, respectively.

**TABLE 1**
SS278 ARSENIC SAMPLING RESULTS AND SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Arsenic Level (ppb)</th>
<th>Quarterly Average (ppb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter 2018</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter 2018</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter 2018</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>4.4*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>6.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter 2018</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>4.1*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>3.9*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes averaged data due to multiple tests performed during the month.

From the data in Table 1, it may be observed that the annual average arsenic level is at 6.1 ppb, which maintains the level lower than the MCL of 10 ppb. The arsenic levels reported for October and December were averages of multiple test dates throughout the month. November had no data listed and is therefore not included in the annual average.
### TABLE 2
**DISTRICT WELL (WS001) ARSENIC SAMPLING RESULTS AND SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Arsenic Level (ppb)</th>
<th>Quarterly Average (ppb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter 2018</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter 2018</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter 2018</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>4.1*</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>3.9*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>4.2*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter 2018</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>4.1*</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes averaged data due to multiple tests performed during the month

**Annual Average** | **3.9**

### TABLE 3
**GREENFIELD WELL (WS002) SAMPLING RESULTS AND SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Arsenic Level (ppb)</th>
<th>Quarterly Average (ppb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter 2018</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter 2018</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter 2018</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>15.5*</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>18.6*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>17.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter 2017</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>18.9*</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>18.0*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes averaged data due to multiple tests performed during the month

**Annual Average** | **17.8**
WATER USE DATA

The arsenic compliance plan described in the operating permit letter requires the reporting of the Greenfield Well and the District Well water use data. The reported water use is based on data provided by the SCSA No. 3 SCADA system. Water use data for the Service Area’s two water sources is summarized in Table 4. Table 5 presents weekly production data for the 4th quarter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Greenfield Well (gallons)</th>
<th>District Well (gallons)</th>
<th>Quarterly Total (gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Quarter 2018</td>
<td>January</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,325,620</td>
<td>3,754,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>February</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,123,320</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>March</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,305,060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Quarter 2018</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,253,000</td>
<td>8,148,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,316,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,578,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Quarter 2018</td>
<td>July</td>
<td>936,000</td>
<td>4,453,000</td>
<td>14,932,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August</td>
<td>1,530,000</td>
<td>3,497,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>September</td>
<td>1,415,000</td>
<td>3,101,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th Quarter 2018</td>
<td>October</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1,694,760</td>
<td>4,017,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>November</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,155,258</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,166,655</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,881,830</strong></td>
<td><strong>26,969,793</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,851,623</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* denotes averaged data where one or more constituent samples is missing
TABLE 5
4TH QUARTER 2018 WEEKLY WATER USE DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Greenfield Well (gallons)</th>
<th>District Well (gallons)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1 - 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>474,235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7 - 13</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>457,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 14 - 20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>318,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 21 - 27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>277,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 27 - November 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>309,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 4 - 10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>231,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 11 - 17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>322,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 18 - 24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>217,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 25 - December 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2 - 8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>253,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 9 - 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>324,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 16 - 22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>263,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 23 - 29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>243,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 30 - 31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>81,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>830</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,016,673</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CONCLUSION

The available data show that the water delivered to water system customers complies with drinking water standards. The annual running average at SS278 (7765 N. Silver Creek Road) is 6.1 ppb.

Please contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Sincerely,

HANSEN, ALLEN & LUCE, INC.

[Signature]

Benjamin D. Miner, P.E.
Principal
# Annual Summit County - Water Supply/Demand Report

**Water System:** Summit County Service Area #3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>SUPPLY (Gallons In)</th>
<th>DEMAND (Gallons Out)</th>
<th>BALANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Source(s) Production</td>
<td>All Contract Purchases</td>
<td>TOTAL SUPPLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Jan 2018 1,295,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feb 2018 1,078,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,078,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mar 2018 1,296,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,296,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apr 2018 1,336,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,336,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May 2018 2,492,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,492,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jun 2018 4,981,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,981,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jul 2018 5,627,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,627,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aug 2018 4,472,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,472,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sep 2018 5,147,999</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,147,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oct 2018 1,777,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,777,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nov 2018 1,191,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,191,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dec 2018 1,172,998</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,172,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>31,802,996</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31,802,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in Acre-Feet</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Metered M&I's Served (at End of Year):**
- 203,177

**Total Metered M&I Customers Served (at End of Year):**
- 203,177

**Total Annual % Water Loss:**
- 4.69%

**CALCULATED**
- Water Loss as a % of M&I Water: 4.88%
- Current M&I ERC Commitments (Not yet Connected): 51%
- M&I Demand's Call on SUPPLY Peaking Factor: 2.12
- Average SUPPLY Gallons per ERC: 150,401
- Average SUPPLY per ERC in Acre-Feet: 173,852
- Average PEAK DAY SUPPLY GPM per ERC (Demand Factor): 0.46
- ADDITIONAL ERC's THAT COULD CURRENTLY BE SERVED: 229
- Percent of Capacity Currently Utilized: 50.47%
- FUTURE ADDITIONAL ERC DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY: 36

**APPROVED**
- 4.88%
- 51%
- 2.12
- 150,401
- 173,852
- 0.46
- 229
- 50.47%
- 36
## CURRENT WATER SOURCE INVENTORY and TESTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source or Contract Name</th>
<th>Well (Y/N)</th>
<th>Production in Gallons for the Year 2018</th>
<th>Sept. 1st Week TDS for 2018 (mg/l)</th>
<th>August Ave. Static Well Level 2018 (ft.)</th>
<th>Aug Ave. Dynamic Well Level 2018 (ft.)</th>
<th>Developed or Requested GPM</th>
<th>State 33% or Other Req. Reduction GPM</th>
<th>Concurrency 15% Reduction GPM</th>
<th>* Approved Rating in GPM</th>
<th>10 YEAR PROJECTED DEMANDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Well</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>27,880,996</td>
<td>612 (9/19)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Well</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3,922,000</td>
<td>444 (9/19)</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31,802,996</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>NA</strong></td>
<td><strong>470</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>345</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### QUESTIONS (Provide an explanation of any YES answers on a Page 4 and/or separate page)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Select Answer)</th>
<th>QUESTIONS</th>
<th>10 YEAR PROJECTED NEW SOURCE DEVELOPMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Do you have any Water Quality issues with ANY of your water sources?</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Have you shut-off or curtailed the water use of ANY customer this past year due to lack of supply?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Have you seen a reduction in water production capability from ANY Source or Contract?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Do you anticipate any water source or contract reductions in supply next year?</td>
<td>YEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Have you seen a non-typical reduction in Static or Dynamic Well Levels for any Source?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Have you failed to provide a current water conservation plan with the State as per State Rules?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CERTIFICATION:

I declare to the best of my ability that this report, and all information submitted with this report, is true, complete, and accurate to the best of my knowledge. Should any information or representation submitted in connection with this report be questionable, incorrect, or untrue, I understand that the County Health Department may request an audit of this data and/or rescind any approval. I also certify that all water sources meet State Division of Drinking Water standards and that I have sufficient water rights and other necessary means to deliver the full legal capacity of the same at the peak day flows stated above. I hereby acknowledge that all costs associated with a possible water concurrency assessment study or audit of this data will be borne by the county. I grant permission for County Health Department staff, agents, or consultants to review any pertinent water system data necessary for the preparation or verification of this report, including any necessary water source or system testing and study. I also certify that I have obtained and read the most recent County concurrency ordinance and that all provisions thereof will be complied with. I further understand that this record will become a permanent record on file with the County.

Signature

Marla Howard, General Manager
Print Name and Title

Contact Phone (435/649) 7949
### MONTHLY SOURCE PRODUCTION (Gal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Well</td>
<td>1,295,000</td>
<td>1,078,000</td>
<td>1,298,000</td>
<td>1,336,000</td>
<td>2,428,000</td>
<td>4,819,999</td>
<td>4,627,999</td>
<td>5,472,000</td>
<td>3,587,000</td>
<td>1,777,000</td>
<td>1,121,000</td>
<td>1,172,998</td>
<td>27,880,996</td>
<td>85.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenfield Well</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>1,760,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,922,000</td>
<td>12.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,295,000</td>
<td>1,078,000</td>
<td>1,298,000</td>
<td>1,336,000</td>
<td>2,428,000</td>
<td>4,819,999</td>
<td>4,627,999</td>
<td>5,472,000</td>
<td>3,587,000</td>
<td>1,777,000</td>
<td>1,121,000</td>
<td>1,172,998</td>
<td>31,802,996</td>
<td>77.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MONTHLY CONTRACT PURCHASES (Gal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MONTHLY CONTRACT SALES (Gal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>System Resale</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Water</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>235,848</td>
<td>235,848</td>
<td>235,848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>721,544</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire hydrant break</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>544,000</td>
<td>235,848</td>
<td>235,848</td>
<td>235,848</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,771,544</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MONTHLY IRRIGATION SALES (Gal) [Enter Large Customer Sales or Uses which are Primarily Irrigation or Similar Uses Only]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (Rec)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational (ie Parks)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Irrigation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowmaking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Water</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(other - Specify)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### OTHER DOCUMENTATION and EXPLANATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Provide Detailed Explanation of &quot;Yes&quot; Answers or Any Other Relevant Comments</th>
<th>Attached Document References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do you have any Water Quality issues with ANY of your water sources?</td>
<td>The Greenfield Well produces water with arsenic levels above the MCL of 10 ppb. (The 2018 Q1 to Q4 annual average was 17.8 ppb.) The operating permit for the well outlines the conditions and monitoring requirements for operation. Utilizing the State approved Sample Averaging Method for monitoring, the annual running average at the designated sample station is 6.1 ppb (2018 Q1 - Q4 - 2018).</td>
<td>Approval Letter on file with State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you shut-off or curtailed the water use of ANY customer this past year due to lack of supply?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you seen a reduction in water production capability from ANY Source or Contract?</td>
<td>Beginning in 2018, the Service Area relocated the majority of the meters to the right of ways and installed Beacons on the meters. Since then, we are obtaining usage numbers monthly. However, the readings in April reflect some usage from 2017 until all the meters were relocated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you anticipate any water source or contract reductions in supply next year?</td>
<td>The Greenfield Well has limited use due to arsenic level. The operating permit is on file with the Utah Division of Drinking Water. The Service Area is investigating arsenic treatment courses.</td>
<td>Operating permit on file with State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you seen a non-typical reduction in Static or Dynamic Well Levels for any Source?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you failed to provide a current water conservation plan with the State as per State Rules?</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Stanby Fee Customers (or) Standby Fee Equivalent Residential Connections (ERC’s) and Projections Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>List Actual and Projected Quantities:</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Customers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prog Num</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Lot</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Subdivision</td>
<td>Lot Date</td>
<td>Project/Phase</td>
<td>Type of Development</td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Road to Site</td>
<td>Water to Site</td>
<td>Septic to Site</td>
<td>Permits Issued</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5/27/12</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>John Smith</td>
<td>123 Main St, Anytown, USA</td>
<td>4567</td>
<td>3/25/12</td>
<td>Phase 1</td>
<td>Single-Family House</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>Main Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5/27/12</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>Jane Doe</td>
<td>789 Oak St, Anytown, USA</td>
<td>1234</td>
<td>4/15/12</td>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>Single-Family House</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5/27/12</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Bob Jones</td>
<td>567 Maple St, Anytown, USA</td>
<td>5678</td>
<td>5/5/12</td>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>Single-Family House</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>Secondary Road</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/27/12</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>Mike Brown</td>
<td>321 Pine St, Anytown, USA</td>
<td>2345</td>
<td>6/10/12</td>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>Single-Family House</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5/27/12</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>Sally Lee</td>
<td>111 Elm St, Anytown, USA</td>
<td>6789</td>
<td>7/15/12</td>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>Single-Family House</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>Private Drive</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Additional notes about the development process, permits, and other relevant details.
District Name: Hansen Allen Luce Inc
Address 1: Benjamin Miner MPA PE

The following is our firm quote and specifies our conditions of services.
Our quote is based on the information you provided and the following assumptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dia or LxW</th>
<th>Water Depth</th>
<th>Max. Gallons</th>
<th>Surface area (S.F)</th>
<th>Cubic Yards Sediment</th>
<th>Price for Cleaning and Inspection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>concrete</td>
<td>116x40</td>
<td>16 FT</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>4640</td>
<td>14.26</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**: $2,000

1. Cleaning service includes removal of all sediment up to one inch deep. Calculated as an average depth over the reservoir floor.

2. Repairs are done on a basis of $300 per hour plus $20 per tube of epoxy. Repairs are done only with your authorization and are guaranteed.

3. Filtration is quoted.

4. This quote is valid on the tank(s) listed above for 90 days. Once quote is signed the work shall be accomplished at a mutually accepted date within one year.

5. We guarantee your satisfaction if the signee of the quote is not satisfied, we will return until you are.

6. All cleaning and inspections are done with high quality color camera and sound, recorded on dvd, ved, or swed, along with full computer generated reports with digital photos.

7. Inspection to include complete analysis of foundation, foundation substraight, exterior condition of tank shell, coating, and all associated welds, bolts, and hardware.

8. PDI complies with all AWWA and OSHA standards and requirements. Insured, Licensed, and Bonded.
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PO Number
The following is our firm quote and specifies our conditions of services.

Our quote is based on the information you provided and the following assumptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reservoir</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Dia or LxW</th>
<th>Water Depth</th>
<th>Max. Gallons</th>
<th>Surface area (S.F)</th>
<th>Cubic Yards Sediment 1&quot; deep</th>
<th>Price for Cleaning and Inspection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>Steel</td>
<td>25 FT</td>
<td>50 FT</td>
<td>200,000</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total $2,000

1. Cleaning service includes removal of all sediment up to one inch deep. Calculated as an average depth over the reservoir floor.
2. Repairs are done on a basis of $300 per hour plus $20 per tube of epoxy.
   Repairs are done only with your authorization and are guaranteed.
3. Filtration is quoted.
4. This quote is valid on the tank(s) listed above for 90 days. Once quote is signed the work shall be accomplished at a mutually accepted date within one year.
5. We guarantee your satisfaction if the signee of the quote is not satisfied, we will return until you are.
6. All cleaning and inspections are done with high quality color camera and sound, recorded on dvd, vcd, or svcd, along with full computer generated reports with digital photos.
7. Inspection to include complete analysis of foundation, foundation substraight, exterior condition of tank shell, coating, and all associated welds, bolts, and hardware.
8. PDI complies with all AWWA and OSHA standards and requirments. Insured, Licensed, and Bonded.

Proposal Acceptance
Signature Required
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HANSEN ALLEN & LUCE INC

Submitted To:
Benjamin D Miner, M.P.A., P.E.
Hansen, Allen & Luce, Inc.

Office Phone: (801) 566-5599
bminer@hansenallenuce.com

Submitted By:
POTABLE DIVERS, INC.
DAVID HARVEY OPERATIONS MANAGER
PO Box 474
Vernal, Utah 84078

Office Phone: (866) 789-3483
Office Fax: (866) 913-4905
E-mail: david@potabledivers.com

David Harvey, Operations Manager
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1.0 LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

Hansen, Allen & Luce, Inc.

Enclosed is our proposal for providing professional Underwater Services for the Tank Cleaning and Inspection diving services.

Our dive teams consist of a minimum three persons, and depending on the size and lengths of projects, five to six man teams are available.

David Harvey the President of Potable Divers Inc. will be the liaison for the City, and the onsite Diving Supervisor for all diving projects.

Our reputation precedes us in accurately estimating the time, resources and funds needed to complete a job. We take pride in the fact that all of our clients know we will complete the job on time and within a fixed budget.

With several dive teams located in the western states, and a dive team dedicated only to emergency responses we can be anywhere in the 12 western states in 24 hours or less.

PDI complies with all AWWA, and OSHA standards and requirements. We are insured, licensed, and bonded, and will comply with the insurance and indemnity terms without exception.

The combined staff has more than 40 years of experience, in the last year alone Potable Divers has serviced over 100 different clients ranging from Colorado to California, projects consisting of potable water reservoir cleaning, inspection, repair, cathodic protection installation and maintenance, dredging river intakes, inspection and rehabilitation of those intakes, dam gate, valve and stem retrofitting, dam trash rack removal and cleaning and general inspection, sediment removal and disposal in pipelines, vessels, and water tanks. With experienced office and diving staff Potable Divers is available 24/7, with a dive team dedicated only to emergency response we can be anywhere in the twelve western states within 24 hours, or less.

All divers are ACDE certified having graduated from an accredited school with a minimum of 700 hours of training, in addition to first aid, CPR, oxygen administration. Divers are certified in ASNT, NDT, and with the American Concrete Institute. Divers are required to have these certifications with them at all times while on the job site. All our services are provided with unbroken color video, color photos, and uninterrupted voice communications. We offer our clients the ability and convenience of leaving their facilities on line, and in full service without interruption, while we clean the floor, walls, support columns and appurtenances.

David Harvey President
2.0 PROCEDURES FOR PERFORMING SERVICES

2.1 METHOD OF APPROACH

Scope of Work:
The inspection of each tank will include the extent of coating and materials deterioration, area by area within each structure. The principle areas of consideration are the roof, the exterior wall and appurtenances, the interior underside of the roof and supporting columns and the non-immersed areas of the interior wall and appurtenances. To perform a complete inspection of the floor, cleaning of the sediment accumulation from the tank floor is highly recommended. Video documentation of the floor will be obtained prior to cleaning, which will indicate the amount of silt and sediment present. During the time of inspection, Water personnel shall raise and maintain water level to near overflow. This allows the divers headroom, yet enables easy access to document the interior roof, columns, etc. Interior inspection, both over and underwater, will be conducted to determine coating condition of the tanks’ interior walls, roof beams, columns, ladder, interior coating, depth monitoring equipment, cathodic protection equipment, etc.

Tank interior air sampling shall be performed and PDI confined space entry permit(s) will be completed prior to diver entry to the tank. Diver(s) shall be decontaminated per ANSI/AWWA C652-02 prior to entry.

A hi-resolution color video camera will be attached to the divers helmet and monitored at the surface dive station by the dive supervisor and, if desired, by representatives of the Water company. Direct communications with the diver will be maintained at all times.

Potable Divers Inc will offer the color digital still-photographs and video. Accordingly, information will be documented and provided digitally on a usb memory card. However, DVD, formats are available at the Clients’ option.

A typed report will be generated on the team’s findings referencing video related inspection information to location diagrams and an inspection overview. The report will include the existing condition of the interior and exterior of each reservoir and provide recommendations for repairs, if necessary and an evaluation of ongoing maintenance needs.

Safety Program:
Included for your review is a very brief summary of our safety policies and practices manual, this is due to the size and volume of the 300 plus page manual. A complete manual is available at each job site for the clients review.
The Policy of Potable Divers Inc, herein after called the “Company”, is to maintain the highest standards for the Safety and Health of all the Company employees and to conduct all activities with appropriate safeguards against exposure of the general public to risks against their safety and health. In order to meet this criterion the Company provides and maintains safe and healthy working conditions, equipment, and safe systems of work for all its employees, and to provide such information, training, and supervision, as they need for this purpose.
The Company accepts its obligations to seek to reduce the incidence of accidents, dangerous occurrences and hazards to the safety and health of its employees and other people who may be affected by our activities.

The Company requires that all employees shall regard safe working as a prime objective and take all possible steps to achieve it. Safety is the condition for the protection of life, property, and/or equipment against failure, breakage, or accidental loss. To aid in achieving this objective, every person involved must realize the potential consequences of accidents and comply fully with the Company Safety Procedures and applicable legislation.

In putting this Safety Policy into practice, the Safety Group is authorized to require the cessation of work where they deem Safety to have been compromised.

Potable Divers Inc is totally committed to SAFETY; it is the primary priority of the Company and shall not be compromised. The management and staff of the Company have adopted a "multi-faceted approach" to safety management in order to provide and maintain a safe and healthy working environment on all operations, while ensuring the objectives of the operation are achieved efficiently and with a minimum of risk to personnel.

In order to implement these goals, various policies, procedures, and guidance are promulgated in Company manuals. It is the intent that the Diving Operations Manuals will provide Codes of Practice for all Potable Divers Inc diving operations and it is a mandatory requirement that all personnel involved with diving operations familiarize themselves with the instructions contained therein.

Where National or Local Government legislation exists applicable to diving operations, it is intended that the procedures and practices quoted in the Diving Operations Manual will take precedence to the Government legislation, only in circumstances where the company policy is more stringent.

The wide scope of diving operations and variety of equipment used inevitably means those specific instructions for every situation and circumstance is not possible. These instructions, however, form the basis from which every operation will develop its individual procedures applicable to that operation.

Supervisors are directly responsible for the implementation of these policies and are to ensure that no unjustified deviations occur.

All personnel working on Potable Divers Inc diving operations will, in addition to any statutory obligation, comply with these policies except where authorized dispensation has been given.

No person may willfully, or without reasonable cause, do anything liable to endanger the safety of themselves, other personnel, plant, or equipment.

Diving is a potentially hazardous occupation, which requires constant alertness, discipline, and dedication to ensure the safety of all concerned.
Any persons discovering a hazard or equipment malfunction at their work place must report the fact immediately to their supervisor, who will report it to the Safety Department if necessary.

2.2 DOCUMENTATION OF STORAGE TANKS, PROPERTY, AND CATHODIC PROTECTION

All findings found are documented before, after, and during cleaning and inspection on the video report as well as still photos. Items to be documented will be any area of concern, corrosion, holidays, cracking, blistering, pitting, inconsistency, all tank/reservoir plumbing, fittings, joints, seams, columns, panels, interior coating, floor plates/bases and so forth. A video in a format chosen by the client such as DVD, MPEG4, CD, etc. will be provided as part of the report along with still digital photos, and a computer generated report of all findings. Video and audio will be live while the diver is in the water this is for the divers' safety as well as the clients' convenience.

Video camera is mounted to the divers' helmet, to provide uninterrupted video for the topside personnel. The video camera has high resolution and fixed focus technology with 200 watt lighting. Still photos are taken with digital hand held camera with 16m with flash technology. Inspection will begin at the 12:00 o'clock position and will proceed with the inspection in a clockwise manner.

3.0 EQUIPMENT

3.1 VACUUM-CLEANING HEAD

For the last few years Potable Divers Inc. has put a lot of time and research into our underwater vacuum system, saving our clients more time, water, and money. Our system being made of glass gives us several unique capabilities, glass can be decontaminated more efficiently than a porous metal, glass also allows our clients and our divers to observe both inside and outside the vacuum system, thus assuring the floor is completely cleaned during the "scrubbing" process with the brush. The "scrubbing" process is the most critical part of the cleaning, as experience has proven the vacuum system must be able to provide adequate power for the scrubbing process. Suction driven and in some cases motor driven vacuum heads do not provide adequate power when introduced to heavier sediments such as mud, sand, or clay. Even small amounts of silt and small debris (such as rocks) can cause the brush to slow down not providing the vigorous scrubbing needed to remove the bacteria biofilm that lives under the sediment. Potable Divers' proprietary vacuum has the capability to be controlled by the diver and/or topside personnel to increase the power of the vacuum-cleaning head. To make sure the brushing is adequate, it is observed through the glass housing by our divers as well as our clients, and can be adjusted accordingly. The brush can be controlled to revolve from 50 revolutions per minute to 5000 revolutions per minute. The proprietary vacuum system was designed to create no turbidity, as all sediment is enclosed in the glass housing and removed with high power suction as it is vigorously brushed.
3.2 DIVERS EQUIPMENT

1. All equipment and clothing used is dedicated to potable water.
   A. Equipment and clothing used is stored in a manner that prevents both chemical and bacteriological contamination.
   B. Only dry diving helmets will be used.
   C. Only Vulcanized rubber dry suits will be used, free from tears, scrapes, and un-repaired areas of other imperfections that may impair the integrity of the suit. Dry suits shall be variable volume with push button air inflation and shall have automatic over-inflation/exhaust valve.
   D. Only surface supplied air equipment shall be used, with a secondary bottle back up with 8 hour minimum storage capacity. Accompanied by a diver carried back up bottle.

2. Disinfection of all Equipment
   A. All equipment used will be disinfected using a minimum of 200ppm+ Chlorine immediately prior to entering system
   B. Method of equipment disinfection will be spraying with and/or scrubbing disinfection solution.
   C. The disinfection solution shall have a minimum of 200mg/L free available chlorine. The strength of the disinfectant solution shall be verified with a HACH model CN21P 10-200 mg/L Chlorine test kit.

3. Post Dive Procedure Disinfection
   After all personnel and equipment have been removed from the water storage tank the dive team shall test the water for total chlorine content utilizing a HACH chlorine test kit to determine the post dive total chlorine level. These finding will be reported to the Contract Liaison.

3.3 VIDEO AND VOICE COMMUNICATION EQUIPMENT

1. Communications
   A. Communications between divers and tender shall be by full time four way conference hardwired systems with two way push to talk hardwire system as a backup.
      Never will a push to talk be used as a primary communications system.

2. Video Recorded on DVD HDD
   A. Uninterrupted video will ensure the quality of the water and cleaning procedure is satisfactory.
   B. Helmet mounted video Cameras with adequate lighting have infinite focus as to show the entire view of the tank as to make sure all areas are cleaned.
   C. Video is high resolution color video with real time imprint and time log so areas of concern are easily identified.
   D. Video is narrated live by divers, on-site support personnel, or by client personnel at time video is recorded.
   E. Still color photos are taken in 16 mega pixels by digital camera with built in flash.
3. Dive Hat
   A. Only on demand breathing hats mated to the dry suit with positive pressure will be used. This is to reduce background noise caused from free flow hats and to ensure diver safety.
   B. Only surface supplied air equipment shall be used, with bottle back up with an 8 hour minimum storage capacity.

3.4 DECHLORINATION PROCESS

Dechlorination process is performed using ascorbic acid in a tablet form in conjunction with a tablet feeder. These tablet feeders are used at thousands of installations worldwide. Dosage is regulated simply and efficiently through the controlled erosion of the ascorbic acid tablets which varies based upon the level of water which will fluctuate based upon flow. The entire flow passes through the tablet feeder where thorough mixing of water with a controlled amount of ascorbic acid takes place. This means a more effective dechlorination process. The tablet feeder maintains a tightly controlled dissolve rate, without breaking, wicking or leaching. There are no tanks, cylinders, external control devices or other moving parts. Our tablet feeders are rust and corrosion proof.

3.5 SEDIMENT FILTRATION BAGS

Filter bags will be used to contain and control sediment and debris removed from the tanks. Filter bags used consist of 10-ounce nonwoven geosynthetic material. The filter bags are custom made to any shapes and or sizes this allows us to more efficiently use the filter media with no waste and extra costs, while containing the sediment and debris removed.

4.0 REPAIR, UNDERWATER COATING PROCEDURES AND MATERIALS

Potable Divers Underwater coating procedures are performed in accordance with SSPC-SP-1 being wire brushed with a pneumatic die grinder down to white metal. Special consideration for underwater environments and the surrounding intact coating shall be feathered and abraded to provide an anchor profile for the epoxy. The epoxy is applied in accordance with the manufactures specifications being applied by brush and or roller techniques at 8-10 mils thick.

Epoxy Specifications
AquaPoxy™ A-6 and AquaPoxy A-6 Thick are solvent-free, 100% solids, corrosion resistant epoxy coatings that can be applied to dry or wet surfaces. Formulated for broad range corrosion protection as well as certified safe for potable water (NSF/ANSI Std. 61)
NSF: AquaPoxy A-6 and A-6 Thick are certified to the requirements of NSF/ANSI Standard 61-Drinking Water System Components.
USDA: AquaPoxy A-6 and A-6 Thick are acceptable as coatings for application to surfaces where there is a possibility of incidental food contact.
AWWA: AquaPoxy A-6 and A-6 Thick meet the physical and performance requirements of ANSI/AWWA C 210-82, "Liquid- Epoxy Coating Systems for the Interior and Exterior of Steel Water Pipelines".
5.0 SIMILAR SERVICES AND OTHER GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

a. City of Logan, UT
   Mr. Kurtis Williams
   435-716-9624
   Cleaning / Inspection / Repair
   Last Services 2005-2017

b. Mountain Regional Water Park City
   Mr. Brian Davenport
   435-640-5723
   Cleaning / Inspection / Repairs
   Last Service 2010-2017

c. City of Kaysville UT
   Mr. Cody Thompson
   801-544-8112
   Cleaning / Inspection
   Last Services 2010-2017

d. Zion National Park UT
   Mr. Dave Brooks
   435-772-7637
   Cleaning / Inspection / Repairs
   Last Services 2017

e. City of Ogden City
   Mr. Ted Bullock
   801-629-8321
   Cleaning / Inspection / Repair
   Last Service 2016

f. City of South Salt Lake
   Mr. Jason Taylor
   801-412-3202
   Cleaning / Inspection
   Last Service 2011, 2016

g. West Corrine Water, UT
   Mr. Carry McFarland
   435-744-5160
   Cleaning / Inspection
   Last Service 2007-2017

h. Hill Air Force Base, UT
   Mr. Mark Persico
   801-732-7016
   Cleaning / Inspection
   Last Service 2009

i. City of Lindon
   Mr. Brad Jorgensen
   801-796-7954
   Cleaning and Inspection
   Last Service 2017

j. City of Provo
   Mr. Ryan York
   801-852-7789
   Cleaning and Inspection
   Last Service 2017

k. City of Springville
   Mr. Jake Nostrom
   801-420-0421
   Cleaning / Inspection
   Last Service 2007-2017

l. Town of Manila
   Mr. Jerry Muir
   435-784-3143
   Cleaning / Inspection / Repair
   Last Service 2005-2017
6.0 Staffing Plan

In accordance with Federal OSHA regulations, Potable Divers Inc. utilizes a 3-man dive team to conduct all diving operations. The 3-man team consists of a Dive supervisor, lead diver, and a tender/diver, all in current standing with the ADC.

The combined staff has more than 35 years of experience, in the last year alone Potable Divers has serviced over 100 different clients ranging from Colorado to California, projects consisting of potable water reservoir cleaning, inspection, repair, cathodic protection installation and maintenance, dredging river intakes, inspection and rehabilitation of those intakes, dam gate, valve and stem retrofitting, dam trash rack removal and cleaning and general inspection, sediment removal and disposal in pipelines, vessels, and water tanks. With experienced office and diving staff Potable Divers is available 24/7, with a dive team dedicated only to emergency response we can be anywhere in the twelve western states within 24 hours, or less.

All divers are ACDE certified having graduated from an accredited school with a minimum of 700 hours of training, in addition to first aid, CPR, oxygen administration. Divers are certified in NACE and ASNT NDT, and with the American Concrete Institute. Divers are required to have these certifications with them at all times while on the job site. All our services are provided with unbroken color video, color photos, and uninterrupted voice communications. We offer our clients the ability and convenience of leaving their facilities on line, and in full service without interruption, while we clean the floor, walls, support columns and appurtenances.

Potable Divers will use no Sub Contractors for this work.

The following three man Dive team will be assigned to this project.

David Harvey  
Project Manager / Diving Supervisor  
18 Years specifically in Potable Water Services  
ASNT, NDT, Industrial Coatings Consultant, Certs, Etc..  
Emergency Contact Jennifer Harvey 801-879-0228

Andy Johnson  
Lead Diver  
11 years as lead diver for Potable Divers Inc  
ASNT, NACE, NDT, American Concrete Institution, Certs, Etc..  
Emergency Contact Melina Mendez 520-559-9065

Ian Bigelow  
Diver / Trainer  
2 Years with Potable Divers as a Commercial Diver  
Concrete Inspector, ASNT, NDT, Certs, Etc..  
Emergency Contact Barry Bigelow 801-698-2917
QUOTE INSTRUCTION

1. All information provided to us is correct. Reservoirs are accessible by truck pulling a 16 foot trailer. Entry hatches are a minimum of 22” in diameter or width.

2. During cleaning and inspections reservoirs are to be kept at or near full capacity.

3. Removed water and materials will be the responsibility of the district unless otherwise specified in quote.

4. Cleaning service includes removal of accumulated bottom sediments. Materials other than normal sediments (wood, metal, concrete, etc.) are removed at $300 per hour, with the first hour at no charge.

5. Quotes for cleaning assume that the sediment is no more than indicated above in any of the tanks. If there is more sediment the price is adjusted by a factor of $35 per cubic yard in excess over the original estimate, unless otherwise quoted.

6. Surfaces out of the water will not be cleaned. All submerged horizontal surfaces and berms will be cleaned. Other surfaces must be specified by the district (such as walls) at the time of quote or estimated by on site personnel at time of service.

7. If incorrect information inhibits our ability to accomplish the specified work, we will notify you of the problem and reserve the right to add to the quote for time lost and or additional time it takes to complete the job. This applies only to problems of your responsibility and not to our own equipment or ability to complete the job.

8. Laboratory analysis of water, coating, or debris samples is the responsibility of the district unless specified earlier.

9. Filtration or dechlorination are additional charges (if needed or wanted by clients) for cost of materials. Filtration is charged at $150 for each 30 foot (L) by 5 foot (D) filter bag. Dechlorination is a flat rate of $30 per tank.

   All disinfection, cleaning and training procedures are in accordance with AWWA and OSHA standards.

PDI is licensed bonded and insured.
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

Summit County Service Area #3 Water System Tank Inspection and Cleaning

SUMMIT COUNTY SERVICE AREA #3
629 E. Parkway Drive, Suite 1
Park City, UT 84098
(435) 649-7949
www.scsa3.org

March 25, 2019
General Information

Introduction
Summit County Service Area #3 (“SCSA#3”), located in Summit County Utah, is seeking the services of a qualified vendor for the purpose of providing potable water tank inspection and cleaning services.

Scope of the Project
The proposed work will provide inspections and cleaning of two (2) potable water storage tanks, one metal and one concrete, sampling of accumulated sediment, as well as a condition assessment report detailing observations, deficiencies, and recommended corrective actions.

The tanks are located within Silver Creek Estates and are accessible by graded dirt roads. The “Silver Bullet” tank is a 200,000 gallon metal tank located off Lower Crescent Road. The Highfield Tank is a 500,000 gallon concrete tank located along Highfield Road.

Work will be carried out in accordance with American Water Works Association and any other applicable Standards. Contractor will provide any necessary safety equipment and follow OSHA and any other applicable standards. Tanks must remain in service during the inspection, sampling, and cleaning.

The Contractor shall collect two 1-Pint water samples, in unpreserved lab supplied sample bottles, from the bottom of the tank and collect a 40 ml container of any solids with water from the bottom of the tank. At the Contractor’s request the Service Area will provide bottles with five (5) day notification. Each tank will be inspected for internal and external condition of structural material, reinforcing structures, paint and/or coatings, safety appurtenances, and sanitary/security equipment. The tanks will be assessed for seismic and corrosivity concerns as well as general maintenance items. The Contractor will provide recommendations for repairs that the Service Area should make.

Discharge of water as a byproduct of cleaning will be mitigated on site by the contractor. Access to the interiors of tanks must take place from Monday through Friday beginning no earlier than 7:30 a.m. and ending at 5:00 p.m. All inspections and cleaning must take place before significant snowfall occurs, generally in late October.

Project Timeline
The following schedule is the anticipated timeline of the project.

- RFP advertised May 8, 2019
- Proposals due June 7, 2019 at 12:00 pm (noon)
- Evaluation and Selection June 17, 2019
- 2019 Inspection and Cleaning Complete October 11, 2019
- Final report due November 8, 2019
Proposal Requirements and Contents

Statement of Qualifications

The Service Area is interested in the experience of the proposed staff and their experience performing tank inspections and cleanings. Please provide a concise Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) describing your firm’s experience on similar projects and the expertise of your staff to complete the components included in the scope of work.

Method of Inspection and Cleaning

Provide a detailed outline of methods, equipment, and manpower necessary to complete each task in a safe and efficient manner. Please note any cost, reduction of risk, or efficiencies to be gained by the Service Area by employing the contractor’s methods.

Sample Condition Assessment Report

The Service Area requires a sample of the proposed condition assessment report, as well as the format of the deliverable, including written and electronic (pictures and video) documentation. This will include details of what will be inspected as well as sample assessment data and written recommendations for repair and rehabilitation.

Schedule of Work

A schedule of proposed dates for the inspection and cleaning of each tank, as well as the estimated duration for each task must be provided.

Fee Proposal

Please provide a fee proposal in the form attached to the RFP. Provide a detailed fee breakdown reflecting the scope of services including:

- Hourly charge-out rate table for all anticipated personnel classifications.
- Mobilization and demobilization costs, including potential savings gained from timing work to coincide with that carried out by the contractor in nearby water systems.
- Inspection and cleaning costs per tank.
- All specialized equipment, travel, and related expenses, and other indirect costs.

Inquiries

Questions must be submitted in writing and received no later than 4:00 p.m., May 31, 2019. Email inquiries are strongly encouraged. Questions concerning this request for proposals should be submitted to:

Summit County Service Area #3
Attention: Marla Howard, General Manager
629 E. Parkway Drive, Suite 1
Park City, UT 84098
gm@scsa3.org

Any interpretation of the documents will be made by Addendum duly issued. Verbal answers, oral explanations, or instructions given before the award of the contract or at any time will not be
binding on the Service Area. Addenda shall be issued within a reasonable time, but not less than two (2) working days prior to receipt of proposals.

Submittal Delivery

- To be considered, submit one (1) copy of your proposal in a sealed envelope clearly marked: “PROPOSAL FOR WATER TANK INSPECTION AND CLEANING” either by delivery or by mail to:

  Summit County Service Area #3  
  Attention: Marla Howard, General Manager  
  629 E. Parkway Drive, Suite 1  
  Park City, UT 84098  
  gm@scsa3.org

- Sealed proposals must be received by mail, hand-delivery, or email no later than June 7, 2019, at 12:00 p.m. (local time).
- Facsimile submittals will not be accepted.
- The Service Area assumes no responsibility for delayed or undelivered mail or express packages. Additionally, the use of a File Transfer Protocol site to download the proposal will not be considered responsive. Proposals which are not delivered to the Service Area by the above specified time and date will not be considered.

Additional Proposal Requirements

- Proof of insurance as outlined in the sample Construction Agreement attached hereto as Exhibit “A” as well as proof of worker’s compensation or exemption.
- Written affirmation that the firm has a policy of nondiscrimination in employment because of race, age, color, sex, religion, national origin, mental or physical handicap, political affiliation, marital status, or other protected class, and has a drugfree workplace policy and an equal opportunity employer and being otherwise qualified by law to enter into the Construction Agreement.

Proposal Limits

- Please provide a fee proposal in the form attached to the RFP.
- Please limit the statement of qualifications (“SOQ”) to five (5) pages including cover page, resumes, table of contents, dividers, etc. The Sample Condition Report added to the back of the SOQ will not count against the five (5) page limit.

Provider Service Agreement

The Service Area is expecting to enter into a Construction Agreement with the selected Contractor (offeror) for services necessary to provide and complete the Summit County Service Area #3 Tank Inspection and Cleaning. A sample of the Construction Agreement is attached. The offeror selected to provide the services/products shall be required to enter into a written agreement in substantially the form as shown in the attached sample agreement which shall be the basic form used to develop the final agreement.
• Signature on an offeror's proposal acknowledges that the offeror is willing to enter into the agreement if awarded the contract. Offerors are advised to read thoroughly the sample agreement, as the selected offeror will be required to comply with its requirements.
• If offeror takes exception to any term or condition set forth in this proposal and/or the sample agreement and any of its exhibits and attachments, said exceptions must be clearly identified in the response to this RFP. **Exceptions or deviations to any of the terms and conditions must be submitted in a separate document accompanying offeror’s proposal (included in Section I of the proposal) identified as “Exceptions.” Such exceptions shall be considered in the evaluation and the award process. All questions about the insurance requirements or indemnification language found in Paragraphs 3 and 11 of the sample Construction Agreement must be resolved prior to submitting an SOQ.** The Service Area shall be the sole determiner of the acceptability of any exception.
• It is the Service Area's express desire to enter into a Construction Agreement which includes all services necessary for this project, whether or not the services are specifically outlined in this RFP.

**Preparation of Qualifications/Proposals**

• Failure to Read. Failure to read the Request for Proposals and these instructions will be at the offeror's own risk.
• Cost of Developing Qualifications/Proposals. All costs related to the preparation of the qualifications/proposals and any related activities are the sole responsibility of the offeror. The Service Area assumes no liability for any costs incurred by offerors throughout the entire selection process.

**Confidentiality**

All responses, inquiries, and correspondence relating to this RFP and all reports, charts, displays, schedules, exhibits, and other documentation produced by the offeror that is submitted to the Service Area, as part of the proposal or otherwise may be considered public information under applicable law, including but not limited to the Government Records Access and Management Act, Title 63G, Chapter 2, Utah Code Annotated. The Service Area generally considers proposals and all accompanying material to be public and subject to disclosure.

Any material considered by the offeror to be proprietary must be accompanied by a written claim of confidentiality and a concise written statement of reasons supporting the claim. Blanket claims that the entire RFP is confidential will be denied. The Service Area cannot guarantee that any information will be held confidential. Under Section 63G-2-309 of the Government Records Access and Management Act, if the offeror makes a claim of confidentiality, the Service Area, upon receipt of a request for disclosure, will determine whether the material should be classified as public or protected, and will notify the offeror of such determination. The offeror is entitled under the Government Records Access and Management Act to appeal an adverse determination. The Service Area is not obligated to notify the offeror of a request, and will not consider a claim of confidentiality, unless the offeror's claim of confidentiality is made in a timely basis and in accordance with the Government Records Access and Management Act.
Proposal Selection

Selection Process

- The Service Area intends to award a contract to the highest ranking firm based on the selection process and evaluation criteria stated below.
- The selection process will proceed on the following schedule.
- A selection committee comprised of the Service Area staff and Board of Trustees will review the submitted Statements of Qualifications, rank them according to the following evaluation criteria, and make a selection.
- The Service Area General Manager will present a recommendation to the Service Area Board of Trustees to enter into a Construction Agreement with the selected firm(s). Award of the contract is subject to approval by the Service Area Board of Trustees.
- The Service Area's General Manager will negotiate a contract with the top ranked consultant. In the event that negotiations are not successful, the Service Area reserves the right to enter into negotiations with other ranked firms.

Qualification/Proposal Information

- **Discussions With Offerors.** The Service Area reserves the right to enter into discussions with the offeror(s) determined to be reasonably susceptible of being selected for award, or to enter into exclusive discussions with the offeror whose proposal is deemed most advantageous, whichever is in the Service Area's best interest, for the purpose of negotiation. In the event that exclusive negotiations are conducted and an agreement is not reached, the Service Area reserves the right to enter into negotiations with the next highest ranked offeror without the need to repeat the formal solicitation process.
- **Equal Opportunity.** The Service Area will make every effort to ensure that all offerors are treated fairly and equally throughout the entire advertisement, review, and selection process. The procedures established herein are designed to give all parties reasonable access to the same basic information. Service Area's policy, subject to federal, State, and local procurement laws, is to provide reasonable attempts to support Service Area's businesses by purchasing goods and services through local vendors and service providers.
- **Notice of Award.** The Service Area will notify the Offeror the award of the project via email and in writing.
- Notice to Proceed. The Service Area will notify the Offeror the notice to proceed with the project via email after consultation with the Offeror regarding schedule.
- **Proposal Ownership.** All proposals, including attachments, supplementary materials, addenda, etc., shall become the property of the Service Area and will not be returned to the offeror.
- **Rejection of Proposals.** The Service Area reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received and disqualify incomplete or late proposals. Proposals lacking required information will not be considered. Furthermore, the Service Area shall have the right to waive any informality or technicality in proposals received when in the best interest of the Service Area. No proposal shall be accepted from, or contract awarded to, any person, firm or corporation that is in arrears to the Service Area for any obligation. Offerors may be required to submit satisfactory evidence that they have the necessary financial resources to perform and complete the work outlined in this RFP.
• **Service Area’s Best Interest.** The Service Area reserves the right to take any steps deemed necessary to act in the Service Area’s best interest.

• **GRAMA.** All submittals shall be public records in accordance with government records regulations ("GRAMA") unless otherwise designated by the applicant pursuant to UCA § 63G-2-309, as amended.

• **Proposal Term.** Proposals shall be good for six (6) months from submittal deadline.

• **Reservation of Rights.** Summit County Service Area #3 reserves the right to cancel or modify the terms of this RFP and/or the project at any time and for any reason preceding contract award and reserves the right to accept or reject any or all proposals submitted pursuant to this request for proposals. The Service Area will provide respondents written notice of any cancellation and/or modification. Furthermore, the Service Area shall have the right to waive any informality or technicality in proposals received when in the best interest of the Service Area.

**Evaluation Criteria**

Statements of Qualifications and Fee Proposal will be evaluated by the selection committee on the criteria and the corresponding weight factors listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Rate Structure and Fee</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Safety and Efficiency of Methods of Inspection and Cleaning</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sample Condition Assessment Report</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Level of contractor Staff Experience/Qualifications, with respect to inspection, cleaning and condition assessments.</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Information Obtained from References and Other Factors Deemed Relevant by the Selection Committee.</td>
<td>(20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Price may not be the sole deciding factor.

**Protests**

Offerors are directed to the Appeals Procedure contained in Service Area’s Contracting and Purchasing Policy.
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Summit County Service
Area #3
CHARTER
The Board of Trustees of Summit County Service Area #3 (Service Area) was established on September 8, 1964 (Resolution No. 57) by the Summit County Commission with an elected Board of Trustees which governs, in accordance with the provisions of Title 17B, Utah Code the properties and services of Summit County Service Area #3, including the power to levy a property tax under 17B-1-1002(1)(i)(iii), 17B-2a-902, 17B-2a-903, 17B-2a-904, 17B-2a-905, 17B-2a-907, and 17b-1-306.5, subject, however, to certain exceptions set forth within the service area.

Marla Howard, General Manager
BOARD OF TRUSTEES FOR SUMMIT COUNTY SERVICE AREA #3

MAYBE INSERT A MAP LOCATING THE COMMUNITY ALONG I-80.
Introduction

Silver Creek Estates (SCE), zoned rural-residential at its inception in 1964, began as a recreational retreat area. The roads were developed as narrow dirt off-road and snow mobile access to cabins and the large properties invited horses. The road layout was created without regard to the topography and soil conditions and most of the roads were dirt until approximately 2010. The terrain within SCE varies from wetlands to sections of rocky mountainside. If Silver Creek were developed today, the subdivision would look significantly different with road platting that is more sensitive to the terrain and it would include traffic calming measures through curves, mitigation of steep grades with terracing and switch backs, proper engineering in wetland areas, adequate shoulders and safe passage.

Summit County Service Area #3 (the “Service Area”) was created in 1982 by Summit County (Summit County Code § 2-27-1) to provide water service and to maintain about 24 miles of roads that are built on inadequate road base, on too steep of terrain, with little or no shoulders and inadequate safe pedestrian, bicycle, dog and horse passage. Funding for all maintenance and capital improvement is limited and was initially provided by Summit County property tax collection within the subdivision. SCE has 18 subsidiary roads that connect onto Silver Creek Road. Roads are utilized by residents, garbage and delivery trucks, snow plows and, during construction season, heavier building equipment such as cranes. In 1992, the county expanded the Service Area’s authority to provide and manage trails and parks within the Service Area’s boundaries.

For many years, SCE attracted residents looking for larger lots, with little or no restrictions on building other than that imposed by zoning. Currently, there is only one active Home Owners Association within Silver Creek Estates at East Creek Ranches, therefore, there are no building standards or enforcement so home sizes and types are varied. Over the past decade, SCE has evolved into a year-round and second home community with many multi-million-dollar homes and, sometimes, extensive outbuildings which place greater demands on the Service Area’s services. SCE is surrounded by newer exclusive developments limiting the access to the public and neighborhood trails.

SCE is almost completely built out and this increase in development, population and visitation to the area surrounding SCE has put greater demand on the roads and created the need for safe and easily accessible trails. Additionally, it is one of the two subdivisions within the greater Park City area that allows for horses, thus attracting equestrian enthusiasts who had early in the history of SCE, direct access to open, undeveloped land creating many of the networks of trails in the area and were able to travel freely on the dirt roads. Thus, SCE quickly became known and labeled by Summit County as an equestrian friendly community. In 2012 a trail system was developed and a trail plan drafted. The first significant improved trail was built along Silver Creek Road, the highest travelled road in the area. Many other existing trails follow the natural terrain along various roads in SCE.

In 2001, Summit County entered into an agreement with the Service Area to allocate Class B road funds to the Service Area for the paved roads within Silver Creek Estates. The distribution of Class B and C Program monies is established by state legislation and is administered by the State Department of Transportation. Revenues for the program are derived from State fuel taxes, registration fees, driver license fees, inspection fees, and transportation permits. Twenty-five percent of the statewide funds
derived from the taxes and fees are distributed to cities and counties for road construction and maintenance programs. It is unclear whether these Class B funds are enough, however, to continue maintenance of paved roads and requires more research for a conclusion.

Class B and C funds are allocated to each city and county by the following formula: 50% based on the population ratio of the local jurisdiction with the population of the State, 50% based on the ratio that the Class B Roads weighted mileage within each county and the Class C Roads weighted mileage within each municipality bear to the total Class B and Class C Roads weighted mileage within the state. Weighted means the sum of the following: (i) paved roads multiplied by five; (ii) graveled road miles multiplied by two; and (iii) all other road types multiplied by one. (Utah Code 72-2-108)

In 2016, the Service Area commissioned a SCE road study with the Local Technical Assistance Program (“LTAP”) based at Utah State University. The resulting study, “Analysis and Recommendations for Street Network” (Attachment A), evaluated all the roads within SCE and created a database through the Transportation Asset Management Software (“TAMS”). This study consisted of four basic parts: (1) inventory and analysis of existing conditions; (2) project future conditions; (3) make recommendations regarding the maintenance and remediation for the roads with an estimated cost to complete the work; and (4) development of a transportation master plan. A subsequent traffic study and sign study were performed to augment the original study. The LTAP study was adopted in 2018 by the Board as the Master Road Plan.

SCSA#3 owns and manages water rights, water shares and water contracts used in providing water to the residents of Silver Creek Estates (SCE). Water service is delivered through a culinary system or by providing water rights that are used for private wells. Currently, the Service Area operates two wells, the District well is year-round with the Greenfield well used only during the summer months due to arsenic levels. Water resources in the Snyderville Basin are limited making growth or high water use difficult. This scarcity has required the implementation of strict county and state regulations and the Service Area strictly manages its resources.

Growth within and around SCE is placing greater demands on the water system. As of 2018, approximately 22%, or about 97 of the lots, are vacant. Currently, the Service Area has sufficient access to water to service the existing residents and businesses, but the current trend of large new homes with outbuildings or the addition of outbuildings to an existing home is driving the need for more water resources. In 2018, the Service Area commissioned a study (Attachment B) by Hansen Allen and Luce, Engineers, regarding the existing water system. This study was adopted by the Board as the Water Master Plan. This plan recommended that an arsenic filtration system be implemented on the Greenfield Well to ensure adequate future sources of water for the upcoming water requirements.

Park City provides free public transportation that extends to areas within Snyderville Basin. Currently, no service is provided to SCE, although the Service Area has been invited to participate in the planning process with hopes that service will be extended to SCE. The Service Area has no funding to provide the necessary shelter or access for the public transportation system.
Vision Statement
Silver Creek Estate’s vision is to be a vital rural and equestrian friendly community recognized for our high quality of life related outdoor recreation, our natural and wildlife-rich environment and to encourage socio-economic and population diversity while maintaining Western-American values.

Mission Statement
Summit County Service Area #3’s mission is to deliver dependable quality domestic water to Service Area’s residents; provide safe and passable roads year-round; develop and maintain a safe soft-surface, non-motorized trail system that connects the majority of residents within SCE to each other, its current and future parks, the Rocky Point Preserve and, on a limited basis, to Snyderville Basin Recreation trails; and to manage our parks and facilitate mail and transit services in the most efficient, economical, and sustainable manner.

Methodology
The purpose of the Strategic Plan is to develop a set of guiding principles for the Service Area’s operations. Operating the Service Area is somewhat complex since water, roads, trails and parks are managed under one umbrella. Responsibilities delegated by the Service Area Board often require the management staff to act on behalf of the Service Area or represent Service Area priorities in advance of any opportunity for a full discussion and decision by the whole board.

The Strategic Plan will provide guidance to staff and a record of Board positions, guiding principles and priorities. It is considered a “living” document to be revised as needed.

Components of the Strategic Plan will incorporate professional studies regarding water, roads, trails, parks and community and input from residents in each of the operational areas of the Service Area.

Guiding Principles

Safety
Safety of the residents and visitors on the roads and trails and in parks, and in the culinary water we provide is paramount. The Service Area continually seeks effective initiatives to maintain and improve our road and trail system.

Quality
Quality is key to support safety in the services that we provide, whether it’s water, road, trails and parks or in the customer service. The Service Area invests in the culinary system to ensure that the water is safe and pure. We constantly monitor our systems to ensure that our water exceeds state and federal standards. The Service Area maintains or improves the roads to ensure the safety of residents and guests. The Service Area snow plows and sands all roads as necessary within SCE within a day of snowfall.
Reliability

Reliability of service is of high importance. The Service Area must maintain and strengthen trust of residents and reliability, supports this principal.

Sustainability

We strive to ensure the sustainability of our water sources and ability to provide water to our customers. We have developed fiscal, managerial and operations plans to be able to endure water shortage challenges, to maintain and improve our road and trail systems and manage our parks. The Service Area uses a systematic approach to maintain and improve the roads and trails and parks based upon availability of resources and obtaining the greatest value for the tax dollar.

Infrastructure

We invest in infrastructure to ensure water delivery, ensure mobility and accessibility for Service Area residents.

Accountability

We serve the Service Area’s residents with greater efficiency, effectiveness and accountability.

Transparency

We provide residents, Board Members and Staff with easily accessible information related to any and all issues, decisions, and items for consideration in a timely manner.

Community Input

We provide the community a forum for reviewing all Service Area issues, decision and items for consideration in a timely manner and the ability for residents to provide input and help shape the community.

Board Decision-making and Conduct

The Board will base their decisions upon the values outlined in this document as well as the goals established in the various planning documents and studies. Board members will treat each other with professional respect and courtesy and will honor the decisions made by a vote of the Board.

Major Goals that support the Vision of SCE

Roads

Create safe, passable roads year-round within the limitations of current mountain conditions and road development.

Trails
Create safe, passable soft-surface trails year-round in order to provide safe non-motorized travel alongside our roads (within the ROWs) whenever practicable, within our neighborhood and connecting residents to our parks and the outside communities.

Parks

Preserve the natural environment of our parks present and future to encourage continued wildlife habitation and recreation and enjoyment by non-motorized travel by cyclists, pedestrians, dogs, and horses.

Water

Provide affordable, quality water to all residents for culinary use, domestic and equine consumption and irrigation.

Major Initiatives and Strategic Plan Tactical Guidelines

Water Management and Resource Planning

- Manage day to day operations for delivery of culinary water.
- Manage water sources to ensure ability to deliver water year-round to our customers.
- Search for new and modern ways to meet future challenges.
- Pursue accurate, efficient, and economically sound practices for future operations.
- Manage customer and infrastructure based upon GIS and IT data.
- Analyze and construct required capital improvements to maintain and guarantee sustainability.
- Construct a water treatment plant at Greenfield Well to provide a redundant and reliable source of culinary water service for our customers.
- Manage compliance with all regulatory and contractual agreements for longevity and reliability of water rights and service.
- Protect existing, develop new, and maintain water rights, shares and contracts. Find and obtain additional water rights to protect against devaluation and support future growth.

Road Management

- Continually monitor and maintain Transportation Asset Management system (TAMS) for current road condition status.
- Preserve infrastructure and improve existing roads for effective use of taxpayers’ funds.
- Ensure the safety of residents by providing appropriate signage and road crossing according to transportation standards.
- Ensure that roadway improvements and maintenance are controlled for efficient traffic flow and maintain neighborhood character.
- Collaborate with Summit County regarding proposed additional egress and ingress road for Silver Creek.
- Continue to evaluate, improve and maintain existing drainage systems
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- Prepare maps of the various conditions of roads and trails within SCE to include but not limited to:
  - Topographical
  - Type/surface descriptions
  - Age
  - Cul-de-sacs/Turnarounds-existing and proposed
  - Roads built outside of platted course
  - Roads with grades greater than 4%.
  - Roads with no shoulders
  - Community density/demographics
  - Drainage

**Trail Management**
- Obtain an evaluation of the existing and potential trails within SCE evaluating for:
  - Topography
  - Type: rough cut trails, completed trails with crushed limestone, no trails
  - Locations
  - Potential locations
  - Areas that are impracticable to develop trails
- Create and adopt a Trail Master Plan that identifies key trails that serve the majority of residents safely and effectively.
- Identify a trail development hierarchy to ensure that trails are built in the right manner to fit the conditions of right of way or easement.
- Obtain necessary easements and funding to complete the designed trail system.

**Civic Center and Mail House Management**
- Design a civic center that expands mail house capacity, provides for safe school bus access and future county transportation service.
- Obtain funding for the civic center expansion.

**Community Development and Parks**
- Obtain community development studies/analysis of SCE
- Identify potential locations for children’s playground park.
- Identify potential location(s) for fenced dog park.
- Identify new and preserve existing natural parks.
- Obtain outside funding to build and maintain the parks features such as bridges, hitching posts, mounting blocks and trails.
- Continue to maintain and monitor the parks within SCE.
- Survey current park trails, easily accessible areas, ponds, creek, dam and structures and trailheads.
- Evaluate whether it’s necessary for re-classification of the beaver ponds as related to the dam...
- Develop a park plan that ensures the parks are kept as natural as possible
- Develop a park plan that encourages wildlife habitation through minimal disruption by visitors
- Maintain the current structures and entry points (bridges, dams, and trails, and trailheads)
- Develop a park plan that may include an off-leash dog park area

**Community Communications**

- Create community communication plan.
PUBLIC
COMMENT
VOTING
ADJOURNMENT