



**PARK CITY PUBLIC ART ADVISORY BOARD MEETING
SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
February 10, 2025**

The Public Art Advisory Board of Park City, Utah, will hold its regular meeting in person at the Marsac Municipal Building, Executive Conference Room, at 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, Utah 84060. Meetings will also be available online and may have options to listen, watch, or participate virtually.

Zoom Link: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87505710988?pwd=4hllHD85zpaNbZzzcEKtIKbNb6R99G.1>

CLOSED SESSION

The Public Art Advisory Board may consider a motion to enter into a closed session for specific purposes allowed under the Open and Public Meetings Act (Utah Code § 52-4-205), including to discuss the purchase, exchange, lease, or sale of real property; litigation; the character, competence, or fitness of an individual; for attorney-client communications (Utah Code section 78B-1-137); or any other lawful purpose.

REGULAR MEETING - 5:00 p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

II. PUBLIC COMMENT: Any Items Not on the Agenda

III. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

1. Consideration to Approve the Public Art Advisory Board Minutes from January 13, 2025.

IV. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS Chris/Jocelyn

1. City Updates
2. SCPAB/Arts Council- Jocelyn
3. Arts & Culture Master Planning efforts, Jasmine and Amanda consultants from Designing Local
4. Any other Staff or Board Communications

V. BUDGET/PROJECT UPDATES Stephanie

1. Community Center Update: Jess Moran, Lisa Benson, Landscape Architect with Landmark Design, Jeff Michalek with Spectra Systems, Inc. (PIP supplier) and Rhett McAliff, with Berlinger Play Equipment
2. Library Artist Update (Voting Item)
3. RFP Pool Fencing Update

VI. BUS STOP ARTIST FOLLOW-UP (Voting Item) Stephanie/Sarah

VII. ADJOURNMENT

Under the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify Stephanie Valdez at 435-640-1225 or stephanie.valdez@parkcity.org at least 24 hours before the meeting.



Public Art Advisory Board Minutes

For more information, go to www.parkcity.org

Date: Monday, January 13, 2024

Meeting Place: Marsac Executive Conference Room, 445 Marsac Avenue, Park City, UT 84060

Time: 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Minutes: Stephanie Valdez, Administrative Analyst/Art Coordinator

Next Meeting: Monday, February 10, 2025, at 5 P.M.

Topic 1: Call Meeting to Order (5:00 p.m.)

Jess moved the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m.

Present: Elsa Gary, Jess Griffiths, Terri Smith, Sam Osselaer, Kara Beal (virtual), Pam Bingham, Stephanie Valdez, Sarah Pearce, Deputy City Manager, Jess Moran, Recreation, Marketing & IT Division Manager, Brent Tippetts, VCBO

Absent: Molly Guinan, Jocelyn Scudder, Chris Phinney

Topic 2: Public Comment: Any Items Not on the Agenda

No public comment at this time.

Topic 3: Approve Minutes from the January meeting

Pam motioned to approve the December minutes. All in favor.

Topic 4: Staff and Board Communications

Sarah and Stephanie reported no new City updates.

Terri mentioned hearing a radio announcement about artist submissions. Elsa speculated it might be related to the Create PC Winter/Spring Show. Pam reminded everyone to ensure they receive the Arts Council newsletters.

Sarah highlighted that an Arts Master Plan survey for Park City and Summit County is available at pcsarts.org.

The next discussion covered the PAAB attendance policy. Molly, who is participating in the Park City Leadership Program, noted that some program dates overlap with PAAB meetings. The policy allows up to two absences; exceeding this requires board discussion and a decision. Sarah expressed support for Molly's involvement in the Leadership Program. Jess suggested that the board could accommodate Molly's participation, especially since vacancies will be filled within six months. He emphasized the importance of Molly's contributions and noted the board could weigh the impact if absences coincide with voting sessions.

Pam agreed, supporting Molly's contributions and asking about the specific dates of her Leadership meetings and when the board votes. Sarah assured that Molly could still review and score projects despite scheduling conflicts. Sam proposed rescheduling

48 meetings to accommodate Molly, noting it has been done in the past. Pam supported
49 this suggestion.

50

51 Stephanie provided a list of conflicting dates, and it was agreed to present this to the
52 board at the next meeting.

53

54 Pam inquired about upcoming vacancies, and Sarah mentioned a citywide push to fill
55 board positions in late March. Sarah also suggested that staff will bring the board's
56 terms to the next meeting.

57

58 **Topic 5: Budget/Project Updates**

59 Stephanie announced that the library art piece "Surroundings" has been installed. She
60 also shared a brief overview of the board's budget. When Sam asked if the format of the
61 budget presentation was changing, Stephanie clarified that the goal was to provide a
62 quick summary.

63

64 Pam inquired about the Daly West "No Climbing" signs, and Stephanie explained that
65 they were for the sculpture "Remnant" at the rail trail.

66

67 Regarding the utility box wraps, Stephanie mentioned that the provider is monitoring the
68 weather and plans to proceed with the installation if conditions permit.

69

70 Stephanie also followed up with artist Angie Smith about their submission for the Bus
71 Stop Art Project. The artist confirmed that their concept was for a painting, not a
72 photograph, and shared examples of their intended style. Pam confirmed it was indeed
73 a painting. Kara expressed disappointment with the execution, stating it did not live up
74 to the concept. Jess asked whether the board wanted to accept the submission or move
75 on. Pam made a motion to reject the submission and review other artists, which Kara
76 seconded.

77

78 Sarah proposed reviewing the remaining artist submissions while discussing bus stop
79 locations and artwork.

80

81 **Topic 6: Pool Fencing Update**

82 Jess G. introduced Jess Moran and Brent Tippetts from VCBO to provide the board with
83 an update on the pool fencing project.

84

85 Jess M. noted that the projected completion date, initially set for October 1, has been
86 delayed to November 1.

87

88 Brent Tippetts, the architect for the pool project, explained that the fencing will create a
89 clear separation between the pool and the Racquet Club Condo property. He noted
90 there is a reasonable distance between the fence and the nearest condo.

91

92 Jess M. stated that since the last meeting, she and Brent discussed incorporating
93 panels designed by an artist. These panels would serve as both secure fencing and
94 artistic visual elements. However, these panels would not replace the existing fence but
95 would be installed alongside it.

96

97 Brent elaborated that posts would be installed, and depending on the artist's design
98 capabilities, the panels could either be placed between the posts or overlaid on the
99 existing fencing. He emphasized that the design must meet security requirements, such
100 as ensuring openings are no larger than 4 inches.

101
102 Jess G. asked whether Racquet Club Condo residents would prefer two-sided artwork,
103 a light-permeable installation, or an overlay. Brent suggested a two-sided design visible
104 from both sides as a possible solution.

105
106 Sam inquired about suitable materials, such as plexiglass, metal, or wood. Jess M.
107 confirmed that any material meeting security and weather durability requirements could
108 be used. She also agreed that two-sided artwork would provide a more aesthetically
109 pleasing option for the homeowners.

110
111 Jess Moran will share the specifications with Stephanie and Chris for inclusion in the
112 RFP.

113
114 Pam asked about the drawings, noting there were sections with fencing and panels.
115 Brent explained that the artwork would "interrupt" the fencing and noted that the posts
116 would be free-standing and independent.

117
118 Brent added that the panels could be inserted between the posts. When Pam asked for
119 clarification on the term "going over" the fence, it was explained that this referred to
120 artwork being placed as an overlay or applied to the existing fence.

121
122 Here's a rephrased version:

123
124 Terri suggested using metal cutouts for the panels. Pam clarified that mosaics would not
125 be included, referencing a previous wall project with bricks. Jess G. explained that the
126 brick wall was for the Community Center.

127
128 Brent emphasized that the layout is flexible and subjective. He noted that the architect
129 would need input from the board on how they want the panels laid out so that the design
130 can accommodate the landscaping.

131
132 Jess G. asked whether the board preferred to select one artist or multiple artists for the
133 project. Sam agreed and posed the question of whether two to three artists should
134 collaborate on all ten panels or if just one artist should handle the project. Sam favored
135 having one artist for continuity and aesthetic cohesion for the residents. Jess Moran
136 agreed but left the decision to the art board.

137
138 Jess Moran inquired about landscaping plans, and Brent mentioned there were minimal
139 landscaping plans with preexisting trees in the area.

140
141 Sarah clarified that one purpose of the panels is to provide privacy for the residents.
142 Jess M. added that while there's no direct view of the pools, having the separation
143 would enhance the experience for residents. Brent noted that the condos are positioned
144 at a 45-degree angle to the pool.

145

146 Jess Moran pointed out that each panel is less than 8 feet wide, which might influence
147 the decision to work with one artist or multiple.

148
149 Sarah suggested the board consider setting parameters for the artists, and Jess G.
150 proposed providing specifications, including materials. Brent acknowledged that
151 parameters could be helpful but expressed caution about being overly restrictive. He
152 noted that working with one artist might simplify maintenance and be preferable. Jess
153 G. and Pam agreed, favoring one artist and the use of laser-cut metal.

154
155 Jess Moran asked Brent to share details about the slide being installed at the pool.
156 Brent explained that the slide would resemble a natural rock or stone, with a mining
157 theme incorporated. Jess Moran suggested adding a reference to the mining theme in
158 the RFP.

159
160 Jess G. recommended prioritizing designs that reflect Park City's mining history. Terri
161 asked if the materials would be limited to metal, and Brent responded that other durable
162 materials could be considered if they have longevity.

163
164 Sam agreed with Jess G. about wording the RFP to give preference to designs inspired
165 by Park City mining history while specifying durable materials, such as metal, but
166 allowing for other options.

167
168 Jess Moran asked Brent about the project timeline. Brent stated that the panels should
169 be delivered by August and installed by November to avoid damage. Jess M. asked if a
170 temporary fence could be installed earlier. Brent confirmed that construction fencing, or
171 regular fencing could be placed temporarily and replaced later with artistic panels, with
172 no significant additional cost.

173
174 Jess G. suggested that Jess Moran provide a list of preferred materials for the project.

175
176 During the discussion on bus stop locations, Sarah Pearce shared that after the
177 previous meeting, she had followed up with Stephen Dennis from Engineering to review
178 the bus shelter locations for this phase.

179
180 Stephanie provided a map illustrating the proposed placement of artwork to help the
181 board visualize the locations. Three bus stops were identified as more prominent: one
182 near the high school and middle school, and one near the MARC. The map included
183 artwork placement along with the associated bus line colors and a variety of selected
184 artists' works.

185
186 In the last meeting, the board selected nine submissions. Stephanie followed up with
187 Angie Smith, who had two selected pieces, and Elizabeth Walsh, whose color scheme
188 was incorporated in up to four pieces. However, the board decided earlier in the
189 January meeting not to proceed with Angie Smith's submissions.

190
191 Sarah sought the board's opinion on the proposed artwork placements and whether a
192 separate RFP should be issued for the three prominent bus stops or if these stops
193 should be included in this phase of the project.

194

195 Pam inquired about Anjola's film-inspired piece, and Sarah clarified that the board had
196 selected one of her works.

197
198 Sam asked for clarification regarding the bus line color schemes and suggested placing
199 one of Elizabeth Walsh's pieces near the Montage and another at Comstock Dr, while
200 keeping Payday Dr/Creek Dr Blue/Green line. Sarah confirmed that the orange and
201 purple lines serve the Montage route.

202
203 Sarah added that the Park City High School stop is served by the teal, red, yellow, and
204 two Richardson Flat routes, allowing for a potential color scheme.

205
206 Sam also raised the topic of sculptures, noting that the board had previously decided
207 against them. Pam mentioned that the transportation team had not been supportive of
208 sculptures, but Sarah pointed out that new transit staff might be more open to flexibility.
209 Pam suggested incorporating art through other mediums like benches and poles instead
210 of sculptures.

211
212 Stephanie highlighted Rebecca's submissions, noting that while the shapes were
213 consistent, the images varied. The board also reviewed Heather Olson's submission.
214 Stephanie referenced a spreadsheet to track the board's decisions and will follow up on
215 Closed Session Minutes to clarify why some submissions were not approved. An update
216 will be sent to the board.

217
218 The board revisited Anjola's film-inspired submission. Then discussing the possibility of
219 duplicating the artwork at the 3Kings location,. Pam requested a review of the art and
220 expressed no opposition to the film submission. Sarah will consult the City Attorney's Office
221 on the possibility of duplicates.

222
223 Sarah asked Stephen to provide information on Phase II locations, noting that the board
224 does not need to fill all nine locations in this phase. The remaining locations can be
225 addressed later, depending on the board's decisions.

226
227 Sarah summarized the discussion, confirming that the board plans to fill nine locations,
228 selecting four of Elizabeth Walsh's submissions, and consulting the City Attorney's
229 Office on the potential duplication of the 3Kings artwork.

230
231 The final item discussed was a Library Study Room art piece by Mark Maziarz featuring
232 a photograph of Main Street with the Trolley. The artist informed staff that while prints of
233 this photograph exist, the size of this specific piece is unique. Jess G. consulted
234 Adrienne, the Library Director, who expressed interest in retaining the piece but
235 deferred the final decision to the board.

236
237 Sarah relayed advice from the City Attorney's Office, noting that the contract specifies
238 original artwork, and this piece does not fully align with the RFP criteria. Proceeding
239 with the selection could raise fairness concerns, as other artists might have refrained
240 from submitting under the same guidelines.

241
242 Jess G. mentioned that exceptions had been made previously for children's artwork to
243 support their portfolios but emphasized that this case was distinct due to the contract
244 requirements.

245
246 Stephanie referenced the Library Study Room scoring sheet, and Sarah clarified that
247 the board had previously decided not to select more than one piece from the same
248 artist.
249
250 The board then reviewed Elizabeth Walsh's Dusk submission and Matt Elder's Lift Off.
251 Pam expressed a preference for Matt Elder's photograph. Stephanie agreed to follow up
252 to confirm whether copies of the photograph had been sold.
253
254 Sarah noted that after the selection process is finalized, the board would need to seek
255 Council approval for the decision.
256
257 Jess G. motioned to replace Mark Maziarz's piece with Matt Elder's Lift Off as the eighth
258 selected piece for the Library Study Room. Sam seconded the motion. The board voted
259 unanimously in favor.
260
261 Pam added that moving forward, the board should specify in RFPs that submitted
262 artwork must be original. Sarah noted that several submissions were photographs, and
263 Jess mentioned that many photographers are hesitant to number their prints, which
264 could complicate the requirement.
265
266 Jess also pointed out that youth artists often hesitate to submit their work because they
267 prefer to retain it for their portfolios.
268
269 Sarah emphasized that if the board is paying the market rate for artwork, it should
270 typically expect original pieces.
271
272 Jess suggested that this raises an important question for the PAAB: does the board
273 want to prioritize original artwork or allow reproductions in certain cases.
274
275 Jess motioned to adjourn the meeting at 6:33 p.m. Pam seconded.

Bus Stop Art and Library Art



Libby Peterkort



Heather Olson

"Lift Off"
Matt Elder



RFP Pool Fencing Update

Park City Municipal Corporation (“PCMC” or “City”)

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP) (NON-BID) FOR

***Artistic Pool Fencing Panels for the PC MARC Pool
Renovation***



Respondents or their agents are instructed not to contact or seek references from City employees, agents or contractors of the City, selection committee members, the Mayor’s office or staff, members of the City Council and Planning Commission, or attempt to externally manipulate or influence the procurement process in any way, other than through the instructions contained herein, from the date of release of this RFP to the date of execution of the agreement resulting from this solicitation. City, in its sole discretion, may disqualify a Respondent for violation of this provision.

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (NON-BID)

PCMC invites proposals from qualified persons or firms (Respondent) to design artistic fencing panels that offers privacy for neighboring residents while showcasing a welcoming and lively reflection of Park City’s recreational spirit.

PROPOSALS DUE: By Friday, February 28th, 2025 at 5 P.M.
Submit proposals electronically *via email to Stephanie Valdez at stephanie.valdez@parkcity.org*.
The proposals will be opened after the submission deadline.

In the event of difficulty submitting proposals electronically, proposals can be dropped off at the office of the City Recorder, located at 445 Marsac Avenue, Third Floor – Executive Department, Park City, UT 84060. Proposals submitted to the City Recorder must be delivered on a zip drive. No paper copies may be submitted.

RFP AVAILABLE: The RFP will be available on *Monday, February 10th, 2025* on the *PCMC website*. Any modifications to the RFP or responses to questions submitted will be added as an addendum to the RFP posted on *PCMC Website*. It is the responsibility of Respondents to regularly check for addenda.

QUESTIONS: All questions regarding this RFP must be submitted in writing to **Stephanie Valdez at stephanie.valdez@parkcity.org by Friday, February 28th, 2025 at 5 P.M. Please do not submit the same question multiple times.**

PRE-PROPOSAL MEETING: A pre-proposal meeting will be held at 2:00 p.m. on February 20th, 2025, at 445 Marsac Ave Park City, UT 84060 Third Floor, Executive Conference Room. Attendance is *strongly encouraged* for all Respondents. Requests for reasonable accommodation at the pre-proposal meeting shall be made no later than 48 hours in advance to the Project Contact above. Accommodation may include alternative formats, interpreters, and other auxiliary aids.

PROJECT LOCATION: 1200 Little Kate Rd. Park City, UT 84060

PROJECT DESCRIPTION (brief): Artistic fencing panels for the pool renovation at the Park City Municipal Athletic & Recreation Center (PC MARC)

PROJECT DELIVERY DATE: September 26, 2025

PROJECT DEADLINE (if applicable): November 1, 2025 _____

OWNER: Park City Municipal Corporation
P.O. Box 1480
Park City, UT 84060

CONTACT: *Stephanie Valdez, Art Coordinator*
stephanie.valdez@parkcity.org

Proposals will remain valid for 90 days after submission. PCMC reserves the right to reject any or all proposals received for any reason. Furthermore, PCMC reserves the right to change dates or deadlines related to this RFP. PCMC also reserves the right to waive any informality or technicality in proposals received when in the best interest of PCMC.

I. Introduction.

Park City Municipal Corporation invites artists or creative teams to submit proposals for designing and producing artistic panels that will be integrated into the fencing surrounding the pools at the PC MARC as part of an exciting pool renovation project. The City seeks a design that harmoniously blends functionality and creativity, *prioritizing* security while ensuring nearby residents' privacy.

The fencing will serve as a practical barrier that ensures security while doubling as a visually appealing feature, enhancing the aesthetic of the newly renovated pool area. This project offers an opportunity to reflect Park City's outdoor spirit and mining heritage, blending the old and the new to create a secure, welcoming, and inspiring space for everyone to enjoy.

We encourage innovative and creative proposals that embody Park City's unique character. The selected artist or team will be responsible for designing the fencing panels and ensuring they align with the project's overall vision and goals.

II. Scope of Project.

The project involves designing and creating artistic fencing panels to enclose the pools at the PC MARC as part of a comprehensive renovation. The goal is to blend functionality and creativity, with security as the top priority, while ensuring privacy for nearby residents. The design should also feature a visually striking element that reflects Park City's vibrant outdoor culture and its rich mining history.

Project Details:

- The artistic fencing may include up to 10 panels, each showcasing an artistic design. Refer to detailed information in Exhibit "A." PCMC reserves the right to adjust the total number of panels based on the cost of the selected submission.

Submissions will be reviewed for consideration based on these factors.

- The dimensions for each panel will be 5'-2" in height and 7'-10" in width.
- Artists/Artists Teams may submit a proposal for up to 10 panels. Designs should maintain a cohesive theme across multiple panels, creating a unified look

that enhances the space while allowing for individual artistic expression. Submissions will be reviewed for consideration based on these factors.

Key elements of the project include:

- **Privacy and Security:** The fencing must serve a critical security purpose by acting as an effective barrier to protect both pool-goers and the surrounding community. To ensure maximum safety, the largest opening in the fencing must not exceed 4 inches, while also providing adequate privacy for those using the pool.
- **Artistic and Creative Design:** The design should capture the essence of Park City's recreational spirit, contributing to a welcoming atmosphere for all visitors. A two-sided design is highly encouraged to maximize visibility and aesthetic appeal from all angles.
- **Seamless Integration:** The fencing should fit into the frame of the posts and rails, ensuring a cohesive and polished look.
- **Park City History and Mining Theme:** Preference will be given to designs that incorporate elements of Park City's rich history, especially its mining heritage.
- **Durability and Maintenance:** Materials used must be weather-resistant, low-maintenance, and suitable for outdoor use to ensure the long-lasting quality of the panels. Suggested materials include metal, colored and tempered glass, or similar durable options.
- **Local Artists:** Preference will be given to proposals submitted by local artists who have a strong connection to Park City.

Collaboration Details:

The selected artist or team will work closely with the City's contracted architect and other project partners to refine and finalize the design. This collaborative approach will help ensure the fencing aligns with the overall renovation plan and meets both aesthetic and practical requirements.

Responsibilities of the artist/team include:

- Collaborating with Park City Municipal Corporation, the contracted architect, and other departments to refine the design and ensure it meets all fencing requirements.
- Providing detailed design plans, including material specifications, dimensions, and installation guidelines.
- Artists are responsible for fabricating and installing the panels with guidance from the architect and City departments.

III. Funding.

The total project maximum funds available are \$75,000.00. Must include design, fabrication, and installation of up to 10 panels.

IV. Contents of Proposal and Evaluation Criteria.

A. Required content and minimum qualifications.

The proposals are limited to 8 pages and must include:

- **Bio** – Provide a brief resume highlighting your experience over the past three years, with a focus on large-scale artworks. Include relevant details about your expertise in creating substantial installations.
- **Proposal** – Provide a detailed project proposal, including a mock-up or rendering of the proposed fencing panels, plan of operation that outlines the step-by-step approach to executing the project. Describe the timeline for installation, functionality, type of materials and maintenance requirements. Include details on the construction schedule, process, and methodology for completing the project.
- **References** – Include a minimum of three references with names, phone numbers, and email addresses.
- **Budget** – Provide a comprehensive budget detailing anticipated costs, including design, labor, travel/transportation, insurance, materials, permits, and other relevant expenses required to execute the project.

If Respondent proposes to use a third party (subcontractor, subconsultant, etc.) for completing all or a portion of the scope of work requirements, state the name and identify the portion of the scope of work to be completed by a third party.

B. Evaluation Criteria

Each member of the selection committee shall use the evaluation criteria and percentage weights below to establish their ranking of the Respondents. The committee shall then use these individual rankings to establish an aggregate ranking of all the acceptable proposals. **Refer to the Public Art Advisory Board’s Mission and Statement [here](#).** The evaluation criteria and basis for the award are attached as Exhibit “B” and incorporated herein.

Artistic Approach and Alignment with Project Goals– (50%):

- The proposal meets project elements outlined in the RFP including privacy & security, artistic & creative design, seamless integration, Park City History & Mining theme, durability, and maintenance.

- Alignment with the PAAB Mission Statement, including the degree to which the Respondent’s approach, design, or work reflects the values and spirit of Park City.

Local Connection— (10%)

- Priority will be given to artists from Park City, followed by those from nearby areas or with a strong connection to Park City, with extra points awarded to those with a local connection, and then to all other applicants following these criteria.

Plan of Operation – (20%)

- The quality of the Respondent’s operation plan and ability to deliver a final product.

Past Performance and Experience – (20%)

- The artist/artist team’s history of successful projects, especially those related to public art or similar initiatives.

The selection committee will consider all documents, the presentation/interview if applicable, the response to the RFP, information gained while evaluating responses, and any other relevant information to make its determination. The committee will select the Respondent which, in the committee's sole judgment, is best able to provide Artistic Pool Fencing panel(s) for the PC MARC Pool Renovation.

NOTE: Price may not be the sole deciding factor.

PCMC reserves the right to reject any and all proposals for any reason. Proposals lacking required information will not be considered. The award of a contract is subject to approval by the Park City Council.

V. Government Records Access and Management Act.

PCMC will maintain a nonpublic process for the duration of this solicitation in accordance with Government Records Access and Management Act, Title 63G, Chapter 2 of the Utah Code (“GRAMA”). Pursuant to Utah Code § 63G-2-305(6), all records related to this RFP, including but not limited to proposals, evaluation, and selection procedures, and any records created during the evaluation and selection process will remain nonpublic records. After execution of a contract, all submittals will be treated as public records in accordance with the requirements of GRAMA unless otherwise claimed by the Respondent as exempt from disclosure pursuant to Utah Code § 63G-2-309, as amended. The burden of claiming an exemption shall rest solely with each Respondent. Respondent shall submit any materials for which Respondent claims an exemption from disclosure marked as “Confidential” and accompanied by a statement from Respondent supporting the exemption claim. PCMC shall make reasonable efforts to notify Respondent of any GRAMA requests for documents submitted under an exemption

claim. Respondent waives any claims against PCMC related to disclosure of any materials pursuant to GRAMA. Please note the following:

- a. Respondent must not stamp all materials confidential. Only those materials for which a claim of confidentiality can be made under GRAMA, such as trade secrets, pricing, non-public financial information, etc., should be stamped.
- b. Respondent must submit a letter stating the reasons for the claim of confidentiality for every type of information that is stamped "Confidential." Generally, GRAMA only protects against the disclosure of trade secrets or commercial information that could reasonably be expected to result in unfair competitive injury. Failure to timely submit a written basis for a claim of "Confidential" may result in a waiver of an exemption from disclosure under GRAMA.
- c. For convenience, a Business Confidentiality Request Form ("BCR Form") is attached to this RFP as **Attachment 1**. Respondent must submit a completed BCR Form at the time of submission of any proposal.

VI. Ethics.

By submission of a proposal, Respondent represents and agrees to the following ethical standards:

REPRESENTATION REGARDING ETHICAL STANDARDS: Respondent represents that it has not: (1) provided an illegal gift or payoff to a city officer or employee or former city officer or employee, or his or her relative or business entity; (2) retained any person to solicit or secure this contract upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, or brokerage or contingent fee, other than bona fide employees of bona fide commercial selling agencies for the purpose of securing business; (3) knowingly breached any of the ethical standards set forth in the City's conflict of interest ordinance, Chapter 3.1 of the Park City Code; or (4) knowingly influenced, and hereby promises that it will not knowingly influence, a city officer or employee or former city officer or employee to breach any of the ethical standards set forth in the City's conflict of interest ordinance, Chapter 3.1 of the Park City Code.

VII. Selection Process.

Proposals will be evaluated on the criteria listed in Section IV, Contents of Proposal and Evaluation Criteria, above.

The selection process will proceed on the following anticipated schedule:

- a. Monday, March 10, 2025: A selection committee comprised of qualified persons, which may include City staff or representatives from other public and private stakeholders, will open, review and evaluate all proposals.
- b. Friday, March 14, 2025: The selection committee may conduct interviews with the highest ranked Respondents. If applicable, interview requirements will be provided to those Respondents selected for further consideration.
- c. Friday, March 21, 2025: Final selection of the top-ranked proposal and preparation of contract.
- d. Thursday, March 27, 2025: City Council approval.
- e. Monday, March 31, 2025: Contract execution.

Following completion of the evaluation and establishment of the ranking, negotiations for contract purposes may be initiated with the top ranked Respondent. In the event that an agreement is not reached, PCMC may enter into negotiations with the next highest-ranked Respondent.

VIII. PCMC Standard Agreement Required.

- a. The successful Respondent will be required to enter into PCMC'S standard. A form of the standard agreement is attached to this RFP as **Exhibit "C"** and incorporated herein.
- b. **ANY REQUEST FOR CHANGES RELATED TO INDEMNIFICATION OR INSURANCE PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN PCMC'S STANDARD AGREEMENT MUST BE SUBMITTED NO LATER THAN THE QUESTION SUBMITTAL DEADLINE. ANY REQUESTED CHANGES TO PCMC'S STANDARD INSURANCE AND INDEMNIFICATION PROVISIONS MAY BE APPROVED IN THE SOLE DISCRETION OF PCMC.**

A Respondent must be authorized to do business in Utah at the time of contract execution. If Respondent's address is within the 84060 zip code, a valid PCMC business license is required.

IX. General Provisions.

- a. No Representations or Warranty. It is the responsibility of each Respondent to carefully examine this RFP and evaluate all of the

instructions, circumstances and conditions which may affect any proposal. Failure to examine and review the RFP and other relevant documents or information will not relieve Respondent from complying fully with the requirements of this RFP. Respondent's use of the information contained in the RFP is at Respondent's own risk and no representation or warranty is made by PCMC regarding the materials in the RFP.

- b. Cost of Developing Proposals. All costs related to the preparation of the proposals and any related activities are the sole responsibility of the Respondent. PCMC assumes no liability for any costs incurred by Respondents throughout the entire selection process.
- c. Equal Opportunity. PCMC is committed to ensuring equitable and uniform treatment of all Respondents throughout the advertisement, review, and selection process. The procedures established herein are designed to give all parties reasonable access to the same fundamental information.
- d. Proposal Ownership. All proposals, including attachments, supplementary materials, addenda, etc., will be retained as property of PCMC and will not be returned to the Respondent.
- e. Modification of RFP. PCMC reserves the right to cancel or modify the terms of this RFP and/or the project at any time and for any reason preceding the contract execution. PCMC will provide written notice to Respondents of any cancellation and/or modification.
- f. Financial Responsibility. No proposal will be accepted from, or contract awarded to, any person, firm or corporation that is in arrears to PCMC, upon debt or contract, or that is a defaulter, as surety or otherwise, upon any obligation to the PCMC, or that may be deemed irresponsible or unreliable by PCMC. Respondents may be required to submit satisfactory evidence demonstrating the necessary financial resources to perform and complete the work outlined in this RFP.
- g. Local Businesses. PCMC's policy is to make reasonable attempts to promote local businesses by procuring goods and services from local vendors and service providers, in compliance with Federal, State, and local procurement laws.

- X. **Attachment 1: Business Confidentiality Request form**
 - Exhibit "A"- Site Plan**
 - Exhibit "B"- Content of Proposal and Evaluation Criteria and Basis for Award**
 - Exhibit "C"- Professional Services Agreement**

Attachment 1

BUSINESS CONFIDENTIALITY REQUEST FORM

(Business Confidentiality Claims under Utah's Government Records Access and Management Act ("GRAMA"), Utah Code § 63G-2-309)

I request that the described portion of the record provided to Park City Municipal Corporation be considered confidential and given protected status as defined in GRAMA.

Name: _____

Address: _____

Description of the portion of the record provided to Park City Municipal Corporation that you believe qualifies for protected status under GRAMA (identify these portions with as much specificity as possible) (attach additional sheets if necessary): _____

The claim of business confidentiality is supported by (please check the box/boxes that apply):

- () The described portion of the record is a trade secret as defined in Utah Code § 13-24-2.
- () The described portion of the record is commercial or non-individual financial information the disclosure of which could reasonably be expected to result in unfair competitive injury to the provider of the information or would impair the ability of the governmental entity to obtain the necessary information in the future and the interest of the claimant in prohibiting access to the information is greater than the interest of the public in obtaining access.
- () The described portion of the record would cause commercial injury to, or confer a competitive advantage upon a potential or actual competitor of, a commercial project entity as defined in Utah Code § 11-13-103(4).

REQUIRED: Written statement of reasons supporting a business confidentiality claim as required by Utah Code § 63G-2-305 (1) –(2) (attach additional sheets if necessary):

NOTE: Claimant shall be notified if the portion of the record claimed to be protected is classified as public or if the determination is made that the portion of the record should be disclosed because the interests favoring access outweigh the interests favoring restriction of access. Records claimed to be protected under this business confidentiality claim may not be disclosed until the period in which to bring the appeal expires or the end of the appeals process, including judicial appeal, **unless the claimant, after notice, has waived the claim by not appealing the classification within thirty (30) calendar days.** Utah Code § 63G-2-309(2).

Signature of Claimant: _____

Date: _____