

Snyderville Basin Cemetery District

Agenda Packet Briefing Memo

Evaluation of AI Productivity Tools, Website Builder TCO, and RFQ Approach for Web Development Services

Meeting Date	April 1, 2026
Prepared By	Will Seggos, Treasurer
Purpose	Provide a board-ready comparison of AI tools and website development paths for district consideration.
Action Requested	Review, discuss, and give direction on whether to obtain formal quotes and/or issue an RFQ for website development services.

1. Executive Summary

This memo is intended to help the Board compare three leading AI productivity platforms—ChatGPT Business, Claude Team, and Google Gemini—and to compare low-code website builder paths against a more conventional agency procurement approach.

For a public special service district, the decision is not just about which tool is the most capable. It is also about administrative control, pricing clarity, continuity, records handling, security posture, and whether the district can maintain the solution over time.

Based on current public list pricing, Claude Team is the lowest-cost team AI option among the three reviewed; ChatGPT Business is the strongest all-purpose standalone AI workspace; and Google Gemini is the easiest fit if district operations are already centered in Google Workspace. Lovable has the lowest apparent entry cost among the web-builder options reviewed, but its Cloud and AI usage charges are separate from the base subscription. Replit bundles more into one environment but is materially more expensive for a professional-grade build.

2. AI Productivity Tools: Budgetary Comparison

Important note: The figures below are budgetary planning figures based on publicly posted pricing as of March 25, 2026. Final procurement should rely on written quotes, reseller pricing if applicable, and district-approved purchasing procedures.

Tool	Public List Price	5-User Annual Estimate	Collaboration / Admin Notes	Best Fit	Key Watch-Out
ChatGPT Business	\$25/user/month annual or \$30 monthly	\$1,500 annual at 5 users	Dedicated workspace, admin controls, SAML SSO, MFA, and no training on business data by default.	Best all-purpose AI workspace for drafting, summarizing, and analysis.	Needs an adoption policy and clear records-handling rules.
Claude Team	\$20/user/month annual or \$25 monthly	\$1,200 annual at 5 users	Includes Projects, Research, Artifacts, Claude Code, and Cowork; Anthropic describes Cowork as an agentic knowledge-work system for multi-step tasks.	Best value and strongest “AI coworker” framing for document-heavy work.	Some advanced governance features sit higher in the enterprise stack.
Google Gemini	\$22/user/month annual or \$26.40 flexible	\$1,320 annual at 5 users	Best if the district already works in Gmail, Docs, Drive, and the Google admin environment.	Best operational fit for Google-centric workflows.	May be more of a suite decision than a standalone AI decision.

Sources for this section: OpenAI pricing page; Anthropic pricing page and Cowork product page; Google Workspace pricing and billing pages. See Appendix A.

3. Practical Observations for a Public District

- ChatGPT Business appears to be the strongest general-purpose option when the Board wants one tool for agenda drafting, policy drafting, summarization, spreadsheet support, and day-to-day writing assistance.
- Claude Team is especially notable because Anthropic expressly includes Cowork in its Team materials and describes Cowork as a desktop agentic system that can connect to local files and applications and complete multi-step tasks from start to finish.
- Google Gemini may be the least disruptive option if district files, email, and collaboration already live in Google Workspace, because it can fit more naturally inside the district’s existing operating environment.
- Whichever tool is selected, the district should adopt a short acceptable-use policy covering what information may be entered, what humans must review before publication, and how public records and meeting materials are handled.

4. Website Builder Paths: Total Cost of Ownership

Why TCO matters: For a public-facing district website, the subscription price is only one part of the cost. The full cost of ownership includes hosting, database costs, accessibility remediation, maintenance, security review, content migration, staff training, and continuity if district personnel or vendors change.

Option	Base Platform Cost	Hosting / Backend Assumption	Illustrative Annual Cost	Strengths	Watch-Outs
Lovable Pro + Supabase Pro	\$25/month for Lovable Pro	Supabase Pro planning assumption: about \$25/month	Approx. \$600/year before usage overages	Lowest apparent entry cost; simple prototyping path.	Lovable states Cloud and AI costs are separate from the subscription.
Lovable Business + Supabase Pro	\$50/month for Lovable Business	Supabase Pro planning assumption: about \$25/month	Approx. \$900/year before usage overages	Adds business-oriented controls such as SSO and team workspace.	Actual run cost can rise depending on usage and hosting decisions.
Replit Pro	\$95/month billed annually	Hosted within Replit plan assumptions	Approx. \$1,140/year before extra usage	More bundled environment for professional builds.	Higher cost; usage and deployment decisions can still add expense.

Note: Lovable’s documentation states that the subscription does not include Cloud or AI costs, and that every plan includes \$25/month of free Cloud usage and \$1/month of free AI usage per workspace. Replit’s pricing page lists Core at \$20/month billed annually and Pro at \$95/month billed annually. Supabase’s pricing page lists Pro as the primary paid self-serve tier; this memo uses a working planning assumption of approximately \$25/month for comparison purposes. See Appendix A for sources.

5. Recommended RFQ / Procurement Approach for Web Development

If the Board wants a durable, public-facing website with clean ownership, easier continuity, and a conventional support path, a competitive solicitation for an outside web development agency is the most defensible next step.

That approach allows the district to compare firms on qualifications, public-sector experience, accessibility, governance, maintenance, and total cost—not just on subscription pricing.

Utah’s procurement framework is designed to promote transparency, fair treatment, economy, and broad-based competition. The Utah Office of the State Auditor’s guidance notes that special service districts are subject to the Utah Procurement Code, except to the extent the governing body has adopted its own rules consistent with the Code.

Recommended RFQ scope

- Discovery, sitemap, and content architecture
- Website design and mobile responsiveness
- Board packet / notices / minutes posting workflow
- Basic forms (contact, records request, inquiry, plot or service information as needed)
- Accessibility and remediation approach
- Hosting, content management, security, and admin access model

- Content migration and setup
- Training, documentation, and optional maintenance support

Appendix A. Sources Used

- OpenAI, ChatGPT Plans / Pricing (pricing and business plan features).
- Anthropic, Claude Pricing (Team pricing and included features, including Cowork).
- Anthropic, Cowork: Claude Code power for knowledge work.
- Google Workspace Help, Understand Google Workspace bills & charges and Business editions pricing.
- Lovable, Pricing and Lovable Cloud documentation (subscription pricing; Cloud and AI costs separate).
- Replit, Pricing (Core and Pro pricing).
- Supabase, Pricing & Fees (paid hosting/database tier reference).
- Utah Office of the State Auditor, Utah Procurement Code: Brief Explanation.