PLAIN CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF REGULAR MEETING
July 16, 2026

The City Council of Plain City convened in a regular meeting at City Hall, 4160 W 2200 N in Plain City, on Thursday, July 16, 2026 also accessible via ZOOM beginning at 6:30 p.m.

Present:	Mayor Phil Meyer, Councilmembers Adam Favero, Rachael Beal, Jed Jenkins, Jan Wilson and Luigi Panunzio
Staff:	Brandan Quinney, Dan Schuler, Diane Hirschi, Stacy Adams, Daniel Martoma
Present:	Lt. Horton, Mike Hansen, Matt McBride, Josh Ableman, Jarod Maw, Gary Westergard, Katie Dahle, Brandon Dahle, Logan Faucett, Cameron Jackson, Quin Stephens, Lynn Jackson, Janet Jackson, Craig Jackson, Konin Jackson, Sean Jones
Zoom:	Mike Phillips, Michael Miller, Sabrina iPhone

Call to Order:	Mayor Meyer
Pledge of Allegiance:	Councilmember Jenkins
Invocation/Moment of Silence/Thought:	Councilmember Beal

Approval of Minutes June 18, 2026

Councilmember Jenkins moved to approve the work meeting and regular meeting minutes from June 18, 2026 as presented. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion. Councilmembers Favero, Beal, Jenkins and Wilson voted aye. The motion carried.

Mayor Meyer shared a sincere thank you to everyone involved in the 4th of July celebrations. He thanked Colette Doxey for her organization and hard work on all the events alongside her staff and family. He thanked Dan Schuler and his staff for logistics and site cleanup. He thanked Diane and staff for many hours spent coordinating entertainers, hospitality and vendors. He thanked the fire chief and his team for their presence during the fireworks. He also commended city residents for no fireworks incidents being reported and using the designated areas for personal fireworks. He thanked Councilmember Favero and his wife for hosting the parade float and volunteered them to do it again next year.

Comments: Public

Dennis Hadley formally presented the Blossom Angus Founders Cup to the Mayor. He spoke about the 'old timers' traditions and that Plain City secured a 12-11 victory over Blossom Angus at the bottom of the 7th inning. The series is now tied to 3 games each over its six-year history.

Mayor Meyer also acknowledged the City received an email letter from Cole West outlining the developers' thoughts regarding the proposed suspension of overlays and rezone applications. The mayor confirmed the letter will be entered into public record as part of the legislative process.

Report from Planning Commission

Commissioner McBride provided a summary of the Planning Commission last meeting on July 9, 2026. They held a public hearing to amend Chapter 9 Development Agreements ordinance which was tabled for further input from public works. They also had a public hearing to suspend overlays and rezones until the completion of the general plan and made a recommendation to the City Council. They set a public hearing on August 13, 2026 to amend Chapter 8 Regulations Applicable to all Zones 10-8-6 (Livestock and Fowl). They had a discussion to amend Chapter 21 Detached Accessory Dwelling Units and approve setback adjustments for detached units. They had a discussion and motion regarding an existing site plan for new sign at Wasatch Peaks Credit Union which the commission denied citing the Kent's shopping center limited to one plaza sign.

Discussion/Motion Final Acceptance - Diamond E Phase 2 Subdivision

Dan reported the conditional period is complete and sidewalk issues have been resolved and ready for final acceptance. **Councilmember Jenkins moved to approve the final acceptance of Diamond E Phase 2. Councilmember Panunzio seconded the motion. Councilmembers Favero, Beal Jenkins, Wilson and Panunzio voted aye. The motion carried.**

Discussion/Motion Final Acceptance - Palmer Heritage Subdivision

Dan reported the sewer project is now stable and the developer has requested release escrow funds. The City will release the escrow funds after first reimbursing the city $7,866 from the remaining contingency funds. **Councilmember Jenkins moved to**

give final acceptance to Palmer Heritage after reimbursing the city $7,866 from escrow. Councilmember Beal seconded the motion. Councilmembers Favero, Beal, Jenkins, Wilson and Favero voted aye.. The motion carried.

Discussion/Motion Final Acceptance - Skeen Subdivision
Dan reported outstanding street light fees owed to the city. The City will release the escrow funds after first reimbursing the City $6,204 from the remaining contingency funds. **Councilmember Jenkins moved to give the final acceptance to Skeen Subdivision once the funds for street lights are received. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion. Councilmembers Favero, Beal, Jenkins, Wilson and Panunzio voted aye.. The motion carried.**

Discussion/Motion Ordinance - Suspend New Overlays and Rezones Applications Until General Plan Completion
City Attorney Quinney clarified this suspension would not affect in process or prior submitted applications. Councilmembers and mayor discussed adding a firm time limit to the suspension. Mike Hansen warned that selecting a hard date is troubling if the city misses a quorum or open public input and meetings takes longer stating that the goal is to have the General Plan update completed by the end of the year with code updates a couple months after. **Councilmember Favero made a motion to table to have city attorney draft language adding a 180-day limit. Councilmember Beal seconded the motion. Councilmembers Favero and Beal voted aye. Councilmembers Jenkins, Wilson and Panunzio voted nay. The motion failed.** Council further discussed adding a time limit to suspending overlays and rezone application. City Attorney Quinney stated he would need to draft new language adding the 180-day time limit that would then come back to the City Council for final approval. **Councilmember Jenkins moved to approve Ordinance 2026-09 Suspending New Overlays and Rezone Applications Until General Plan Completion. Councilmember Wilson seconded the motion. Councilmembers Jenkins, Wilson and Panunzio voted aye. Councilmembers Favero and Beal voted nay. The motion carried.**

DRAFT

Motion: Approval of Business Licenses
New Home Occupation

Everest Commercial Roofing & Construction LLC	3544 W 2600 N	Joshua Martin	General & Roofing Contractor
K2 Roofing Group LLC	3544 W 2600 N	Joshua Martin	Roofing Contractor
Liz Taylor Hair Design	4259 W 2200 N	Aliza Taylor	Hair Salon & Nails
Content LLC	3267 W 2950 N	Ellie Clark	Cleaning & Organizing Services

Councilmember Wilson moved to approve the business licenses as presented. Councilmember Panunzio seconded the motion. Councilmembers Favero, Beal, Jenkins, Wilson and Panunzio voted aye. The motion carried.

Motion: Approval of Warrant Register
See warrant register dated 6/18/2026 - 6/30/2026, 7/1/2026 - 7/13/2026 and 7/14/2026 - 7/15/2026.
Councilmember Jenkins moved to approve the warrant register for 6/18/2026 - 6/30/2026, 7/1/2026 - 7/13/2026 and 7/14/2026 - 7/15/2026. Councilmember Favero seconded the motion. Councilmembers Favero, Beal, Jenkins, Panunzio, Wilson and Panunzio voted aye. The motion carried.

Report from City Council
Councilmember Favero stated he also wanted to thank the city, volunteers, staff, police, fire and everyone who made the 4th of July a great celebration. The fire department also responded to a structure fire the night of the concert. City projects on 3600 W, 2200 N and 2600 N are all moving forward. The landfill has hired a new employee, Eric Snell.

Councilmember Beal stated she had a meeting with WWCTC and they received a grant for youth drug prevention and are also asking Cities for $1000 donation which in turn provides classes to the community and wanted to make sure was in the city budget. Mason's Bench will auction off their bench along with Fremont High Schools suicide prevention week in September during home coming and Fremont's Hope Squad. WWCTC will also be hosting a 5-week Guiding Good Choices classes again this October at the Senior Center.

Councilmember Jenkins reported he attended the mosquito abatements board meeting and that despite it being a dry year that Plain City leads the county in calls for mosquito spraying.

Councilmember Wilson stated she visited a few other city festivals and concluded that they could take lessons from Plain City regarding organization.

Councilmember Panunzio apologized for his absence recently citing work duties but heard the celebrations were great.

Mayor Meyer stated the designated areas in the city for the 4th of July worked great and to watch for any new announcements from the Governor and what restrictions there might be for July 24th.

DRAFT

At 7:18p.m. Councilmember Favero moved to adjourn and was seconded by Councilmember Wilson. The vote was unanimous.

____
Mayor

____
City Recorder

Date approved ________________________

Outlook

Public Comment re: Plain City proposed ordinance suspending all rezone and overlay zone approvals

From Quin Stephens <quin@colewest.com>

Date Thu 7/16/2026 2:31 PM

To jedijenkins@gmail.com <jedijenkins@gmail.com>; panunzioluigi@yahoo.com <panunzioluigi@yahoo.com>; beal.plaincity@yahoo.com <beal.plaincity@yahoo.com>; jan.plaincity@gmail.com <jan.plaincity@gmail.com>; afav82423@gmail.com <afav82423@gmail.com>; Phil Meyer <philm@plaincityutah.gov>

Cc Diane Hirschi <dianeh@plaincityutah.gov>; Brandan Quinney <bkaleiq@gmail.com>; Logan Fawcett <logan.fawcett@colewest.com>; Cameron Jackson <cameron@colewest.com>

Dear Mayor Meyer and Members of the Council:

My name is Quin Stephens and I am General Counsel for Cole West, LLC. Cole West is currently under contract to purchase from the Jackson Family 1,540 acres of real property within Plain City. Cole West is writing in advance of the Council's consideration of the proposed ordinance suspending all rezone and overlay zone approvals until the City adopts its new General Plan (the "Proposed Ordinance"), and we ask that this letter be entered into the record as public comment.

Cole West fully recognizes and supports the City's legitimate interest in updating its General Plan to manage growth responsibly. But the Proposed Ordinance, as drafted, conflicts with several controlling provisions of Utah law. If adopted in its current form, and in particular if applied to Cole West's completed application for its proposed Master Development Agreement, it would be vulnerable to invalidation. We set out our objections below so the Council can consider them before it votes, and so they may be corrected.

At the outset, one drafting point frames much of what follows. The Proposed Ordinance recites its authority as "Title 10, Chapter 20, Section 101, Utah Code Annotated." The specific statute authorizing a municipal development moratorium is Utah Code § 10-20-504 (recodified effective 2025 from former § 10-9a-504). Section 101-type general grants of municipal power do not supply the specific authority, findings, or procedure that § 10-20-504 requires. As explained below, the failure to proceed under the correct statute is not a mere technicality, it goes to the ordinance's validity.

I. Cole West's April 2026 application was complete when submitted, and Utah's vesting statute bars applying a later-enacted freeze to it.

Utah has codified a strong statutory vesting rule. Under Utah Code § 10-20-509 (recodified from former § 10-9a-509), an applicant who has submitted a complete land use application, including payment of all application fees, is entitled to substantive review of that application under the land use regulations in effect on the date the application was complete. A land use application is "considered submitted and complete when the applicant provides the application in a form that complies with the requirements of applicable ordinances and pays all applicable fees." The statute thus sets only two criteria: a conforming application form, and payment of the applicable fees.

Both are satisfied here. In April 2026, Cole West submitted its master development agreement to the City and paid the City approximately $20,000 in application fees. The City accepted the submission and accepted the fees. Under § 10-20-509, Cole West's right to have that application reviewed under the ordinances then in effect vested upon submission, months before the Proposed Ordinance was introduced.

The Office of the Property Rights Ombudsman has applied this rule squarely to a moratorium. In Advisory Opinion 233 (*Haviland v. Trenton Town*, Dec. 3, 2020), the Ombudsman explained that once an applicant submits a complete application, "a municipality may not subsequently change the rules that apply to that application — for instance, by passing a moratorium," and that a complete application is entitled to review under the ordinances in effect at submission notwithstanding a later-passed moratorium. That is precisely the protection Cole West invokes here. The governing statute now carries the same rule the Ombudsman applied under the prior numbering.

The Council need not even reach the statute to protect this application, because the Proposed Ordinance exempts it by its own terms. Section 2 provides that the suspension "does not apply to applications that were completed prior to the date that [the] ordinance was enacted." Cole West's application was completed in April 2026. We ask the Council to confirm on the record that Cole West's application falls within the Section 2 carve-out and will be processed on its merits.

II. The City may not use its own delay to defeat the application.

Cole West submitted a complete application in accordance with Chapter 9 of the Plain City Municipal Code and paid substantial fees in April 2026 and has awaited the City's response ever since. It would be neither equitable nor lawful for the City to withhold action on a pending, paid-for application and then enact a freeze that sweeps in the very application it failed to process. Utah's vesting statute exists precisely to prevent an applicant's rights from being defeated by a rule change that post-dates a complete submission. The Utah Supreme Court has long held that "a property owner should be able to plan for developing his property in a manner permitted by existing zoning regulations with some degree of assurance that the basic ground rules will not be changed in midstream." *Western Land Equities, Inc. v. City of Logan*, 617 P.2d 388 (Utah 1980). Allowing the City's own delay to erase Cole West's vested rights would stand that principle on its head.

III. Utah law caps a moratorium at six months and requires a stated effective period; the Proposed Ordinance is open-ended.

A temporary land use regulation under § 10-20-504 may remain in effect for no more than six months (180 days), and the municipality must establish the effective period when it adopts the regulation. The local government must identify the justification, the area affected, and the effective dates, which may not exceed six months. There is no automatic extension.

The Proposed Ordinance satisfies none of this. It contains no effective period and no expiration date. It instead runs indefinitely, "until the General Plan update has been completed," an event with no fixed date and within the City's sole control. An open-ended suspension with no stated term is facially inconsistent with § 10-20-504 and, on that basis alone, is subject to invalidation. Utah municipalities that have properly invoked this statute have expressly adopted a defined term and a specific effective date; the Proposed Ordinance does neither.

IV. The Proposed Ordinance lacks the required finding of a compelling, countervailing public interest.

A municipality may enact a temporary land use regulation only if its legislative body makes a finding of a compelling, countervailing public interest. Utah Code § 10-20-504. That is a demanding standard. As the Ombudsman has explained, a "compelling interest" relates to a substantial risk to the public's health, safety, or welfare, and the phrase is used sparingly in Utah statute and is reserved for circumstances where private property rights are balanced against a true public necessity.

The Proposed Ordinance's whereas clauses recite only generalized concerns: that the City is "comprehensively amending its General Plan," that the current plan "does not adequately meet the current and upcoming needs of this growing community," and that suspension serves "the general welfare." General-welfare and growth-management language does not establish the substantial, specific risk to health, safety, or welfare that § 10-20-504 demands. The contrast with cases that have upheld moratoria is instructive. In *Gardner v. Board of County Commissioners*, 2008 UT 6, the Utah Supreme Court upheld a temporary land use ordinance supported by undisputed, in-depth geological evidence of slope-stability and septic-suitability concerns. Nothing comparable is recited here.

The consequence of an inadequate finding is not merely procedural. In Advisory Opinion 233, the Ombudsman concluded that because the town's moratorium was not supported by evidence establishing a compelling, countervailing public interest, it could not stand, and the applicant was entitled to have his complete applications reviewed under the ordinances in effect before the moratorium. The Ombudsman reached the same result in Advisory Opinion 238, holding a city's moratorium "invalid and without effect" where the city failed to meet the heightened standard for a temporary land use regulation. The Council should assume the same standard would be applied to the Proposed Ordinance.

V. A moratorium likely cannot reach rezones and development agreements at all.

There is a substantial argument that the categories the Proposed Ordinance targets fall outside what a moratorium may reach. A temporary land use regulation operates on administrative development-permit applications; guidance from Utah local-government counsel takes the position that it does not extend to legislative approvals such as rezones, master-planned developments, and development agreements, and that it cannot be applied to applications already deemed complete. (See, e.g., Summit County staff guidance on temporary zoning ordinances.) We identify this as a strong supporting argument rather than settled appellate law, and we flag its source candidly: it derives from local-government legal guidance and the structure of the statute, not from a controlling Utah Supreme Court holding directly on point. But it bears directly on this ordinance, which by its title and terms suspends exactly those legislative approvals, "all rezone and overlay zone approvals," and would reach Cole West's completed development-agreement application. At minimum, this uncertainty counsels against the broad approach the Proposed Ordinance takes.

VI. An indefinite, standardless, blanket suspension raises arbitrary-and-capricious concerns.

Beyond the specific statutory defects, the Proposed Ordinance suspends all rezones and overlay approvals, indefinitely, with no interim review process, no criteria, and no hardship exception. A land use regulation is entitled to deference where it is reasonably debatable that it serves the public interest, but a freeze with no end date, no standards, and no mechanism for relief, applied across the board, including to a project representing roughly half the City's developable land that was already under review, invites a challenge that the measure is arbitrary and not reasonably tailored to the interest the City asserts.

VII. A development agreement, not a General-Plan-only path, best serves the City on land that is half of its developable area.

The legal defects above are reason enough not to adopt the Proposed Ordinance. But there is also a straightforward planning reason to work with Cole West rather than defer everything to a revised General Plan. The property Cole West intends to purchase covers approximately 1,540 acres. Plain City's gross municipal area is approximately 7,507 acres, so PPR accounts for roughly 20% of the City's total municipal boundaries and approximately one-half of its undeveloped land area. Whatever policy the City would express through a revised General Plan for that land, the City can express directly, and with greater precision, through the pending Master Development Agreement. Cole West is a willing party to that agreement. The City is the other party. Together they can fix land uses, densities, phasing, design standards, and public-benefit commitments for the entire property in a single, negotiated, and enforceable instrument, with more control than a General Plan (which is advisory) provides.

The MDA path also delivers benefits the General-Plan path cannot. Under the MDA, Cole West is prepared to commit to public improvements the City would otherwise have to fund, sequence, or leave to chance, including parks, trails, and sewer improvements that serve not just this project but the broader community. Those commitments become binding contractual obligations of the developer, tied to the phasing of the project. A General Plan amendment, standing alone, produces no such commitments. It sets policy; it does not build parks, dedicate trails, or extend sewer capacity.

The alternative is predictable. If the City freezes the MDA process and waits for the General Plan update, this property will not sit idle. It will most likely be developed piecemeal, in a series of smaller, disconnected projects processed under whatever entitlements are available at the time, with no unifying master plan, no coordinated infrastructure, and no negotiated public benefits. That is a worse planning outcome than an integrated MDA, and it is a worse outcome for the City than sitting at the table now and shaping the project through the agreement that is already on file.

VIII. Requested action.

For the reasons above, we respectfully request that the Council:

1. Confirm on the record that Cole West's completed, paid April 2026 master development agreement application is exempt under Section 2 of the Proposed Ordinance and Utah Code § 10-20-509, and that the City will proceed to process it on its merits;

2. Decline to adopt the Proposed Ordinance as drafted; or, if the Council proceeds, amend it to (a) invoke the correct authority (§ 10-20-504), (b) state a defined effective period not to exceed six months, and (c) make specific findings of a compelling, countervailing public interest supported by evidence; and

3. Act on Cole West's pending application, which has awaited a response since April 2026.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss these issues with the City and its legal counsel before the vote, and we are prepared to make ourselves available at the Council's convenience. Our strong preference is to resolve this cooperatively. We ask only that the Council act consistently with Utah law and honor the vested rights Cole West secured when it filed and paid for its application in April.

Respectfully submitted,

Quin Stephens
General Counsel

801.641.0547

colewest.com

__tpx__

PLAIN CITY COUNCIL
MINUTES OF JOINT WORK MEETING
July 16, 2026

The City Council of Plain City convened in a joint work meeting with the Planning Commission at City Hall, 4160 W 2200 N in Plain City, on Thursday, July 16, 2026 also accessible via ZOOM beginning at 7:30 p.m.

Present:	Mayor Phil Meyer, Councilmembers Adam Favero, Rachael Beal, Jed Jenkins, Jan Wilson and Luigi Panunzio
Staff:	Brandan Quinney, Dan Schuler, Diane Hirschi, Stacy Adams, Daniel Martoma
Commissioners:	Matt McBride, Josh Ableman, Jarod Maw, Gary Westergard
Cole West:	Logan Faucett, Cameron Jackson, Quin Stephens
Attendees:	Mike Hansen, Lynn Jackson, Janet Jackson, Craig Jackson, Konin Jackson, Sean Jones
Zoom:	Mike Phillips, Michael Miller

The Mayor, City Council and Planning Commission transitioned into a joint work meeting starting at 7:30 pm. This joint work meeting discussion is one of the largest and most complex future development projects currently facing the city.

Cole West Development Agreement Discussion
Cole West representatives spent the evening discussing a generational project that involves roughly 1,500 acres in the northwest corner of Plain City, specifically on the Jacksons' land. This represents 20% of the City's total land area, meaning the outcome of these talks will define the City's footprint for the next 25 years.

Vested Rights and Legal Framework
City Attorney clarified the legal standing of the current application. Because Cole West submitted their application and paid the necessary fees before recent ordinance changes, they are vested in the city code as it existed at the time of filing. This means the project will proceed under the existing Development Agreement statutes rather than newer zoning overlays.

General Plan Conformity
The Council intends to process the development agreement hand-in-hand with the ongoing General Plan update. The strategy is to ensure the development agreement is in conformity with the future amended plan so that the City's long-term vision and the developer's plans are integrated from the start.

Master Plan Philosophy vs. Piecemeal Development
The developer argued for a systems approach to the 1,500 acres, comparing the master plan to a body's skeleton, nerves, and bone structure. They suggested that planning the whole area at once provides predictability for the developer and City. The Council and Commission expressed trepidation with several members wary of moving away from the traditional zoning that has historically protected the City's character, while the developer sees a master-planned system approach.

Fiscal Sustainability and Infrastructure
The discussion focused heavily on the givers vs. takers in this type of development. The developer claimed that low-density sprawl, specifically 1-acre lots, could bankrupt the city, because the tax revenue doesn't cover the long-term costs of snow plowing, road repairs, and sewer maintenance over such a spread-out area. They argued that their plan's higher-density clusters and commercial tax base are necessary to pay for major infrastructure, like sewer plant upgrades, that the city couldn't afford otherwise.

Council Analysis: Density, Character, and Public Sentiment
It's difficult to ignore the shock factor that comes with a project that could double the City's population. The discussion focused a significant amount of time grappling with the reality that residents move to Plain City specifically for the rural feel and aren't always looking for the maintenance-free life the developer is selling.
Discussion with the developer over the proposed 2.3 units-per-acre average, noted that while 2.3 units sounds low, across 1,500 acres that means 3,500 new homes. The idea that small lots are attainable, citing the recent S-curve project where residents were promised affordability but ended up with small lots with big, expensive houses that locals still couldn't afford.
Discussion highlighted the disconnect in philosophy, noting that while the developer talks about 70-year-olds who don't want to mow, he knows plenty of seniors who will 'go out there and rake their garden until the day they die.' They also voiced a collective fear that if they aren't careful, Plain City will turn into West Haven and the lifestyle residents love will vanish. The developer countered that in 25 years, 2.3 units per acre will actually feel like very low density compared to the rest of the county.

Infrastructure, Amenities, and Public Services
For the City to consider this level of density, they insisted on regional amenities that serve the whole City, not just the new rooftops. This is the strategic trade-off, the developer gets density and the City gets regional infrastructure.

- **Regional Parks vs. Pocket Parks:** The Council rejected the idea of small, scattered pocket parks. The City wants large regional parks with all-abilities amenities, likely located near the sewer ponds, to serve as a community-wide destination.
- **Education and Schools:** Cole West has had detailed conversations with the Weber County School District for a future elementary site and probable LDS Church site.
- **Dixie Creek Trail:** The plan includes a ribbon type trail winding through the development to connect to the existing rail trail.
- **Public Services:** The agreement includes needed public services and possible land donation and necessary upgrades to the sewer treatment plant.

The Council noted that townhome residents are often takers of these services because they lack backyards, making the quality of open space and public parks a non-negotiable requirement.

Future Oversight: Development Agreement Flexibility and Committee Formation
Because this is a likely 25-year project, the developer asked for framework flexibility. They argued they can't predict the market two decades out, even joking about needing flexibility for flying cars and landing pads.
The Council insisted on minimums for lot types. They don't want flexibility to turn the project into a sea of duplexes or high-density housing. They want guarantees that certain percentages of the land remain dedicated to larger, traditional lots to protect the City's north end.

DRAFT

Decisions & Outcomes
To move from conversation to red lines, the mayor authorized a review committee to provide a formal list of grievances and suggestions to the developer.

- **Committee Members:** Brandan Quinney (City Attorney), Mike Hansen (Hansen Planning Group), Daniel Martoma (City Planner), Dan Schuler (Public Works Director), Quin Stephen (Cole West legal counsel)
- **Directive:** The committee is tasked with refining the development agreement to reflect the Council's insistence on lot minimums and infrastructure protections.

At 9:05 p.m. Councilmember Jenkins moved to adjourn and was seconded by Councilmember Favero. The vote was unanimous.

____
Mayor

____
City Recorder

Date approved ____________________

All the capabilities. One subscription.

CivicPlus sells each capability as its own product. Peny includes all of them — for about what a city spends on email alone.

Modeled on a city of **~8,500 residents**

CAPABILITY	CIVICPLUS	PENY
Website	Included · **~$5,200/yr**	✓ Included
Emergency alerts	CivicReady · **+$5,000–$10,000/yr**	✓ Included
Push notifications	CivicSend + SMS · **+$2,400/yr** + SMS fees, or CivicReady	✓ Included
Email newsletters	CivicSend · **+$2,400/yr**	✓ Included
Resident mobile app	Separate product · **+$5,000–$15,000/yr** est.	✓ Included
Facebook auto-posting	CivicSend · **+$2,400/yr**	✓ Included
AI assistant for city admins — build forms, events, webpages, draft posts, edit content	Not available as an integrated platform capability	✓ Included
AI resident assistant	Chatbot · **~$2,750–$6,500/yr**, limited to website Q&A	✓ Included
Unified publishing — post once, publish everywhere	CivicSend · **+$2,400/yr**	✓ Included
Personalized resident experience	Limited	✓ Included
Typical annual investment	**~$20,000–$50,000+/yr**	**~$8,500**

EVERY CAPABILITY, ONE PRICE

$8,500/year

That's **$1 per resident, per year** — website, mobile app, emergency alerts, email, push, social publishing, and AI for staff and residents.

* CivicPlus annual investment estimates count each product only once, even where it appears in multiple capability rows. Figures are modeled on a city of about 8,500 residents and exclude the staff time required to manage separate vendors and tools.