



MUNICIPAL PROPERTY SALE

PROJECT NO. 1-PS-2026

Bid Results, Council Recommendations, and Property Maps

Prepared for the Mayor and Town Council

Town of Saratoga, Wyoming

August 2026



Municipal Property Sale Project No. 1-PS-2026

Bid Opening Results, Responsiveness Review, and Award Recommendations

TO:	Mayor and Town Council
FROM:	Emery Penner, Public Works Director
DATE:	August 3, 2026
SUBJECT:	Results and recommended action following the July 21, 2026 sealed bid opening
ACTION REQUESTED:	Award responsive high bids for Properties C, D, I, and J; reject the conditional bid for Property H; and authorize staff to proceed as outlined below.

EXECUTIVE RECOMMENDATION

Accept the apparent high, responsive bids for Properties C, D, I, and J, subject to final verification of the original bid deposits, envelope markings, timely receipt, and Town Attorney review of closing documents. Reject the sole bid for Property H as materially conditional and therefore nonresponsive, return the deposit, and re-advertise all properties not sold. Do not award Property H while making the sale contingent upon alley vacation, access expansion, utility arrangements, or other approvals not included in the advertised sale terms.

1. Purpose and Background

The Town advertised ten municipally owned properties, identified as Properties A through J, through a competitive sealed-bid process. The stated purposes were to return underutilized property to productive private ownership, encourage residential and commercial development, expand the tax base, and recover public funds previously invested in property acquisition. The bid package established individual reserve prices equal to 92 percent of the broker opinions of value, required a separate sealed bid and five-percent deposit for each property, and provided that all properties would be sold "AS IS, WHERE IS, WITH ALL FAULTS."

Bids were due and publicly opened at 2:00 p.m. on July 21, 2026. The opening sheet records eight bid submissions covering five properties. No bids were recorded for Properties A, B, E, F, or G. Multiple bids were received for Properties D and J, while single bids were received for Properties C, H, and I.

2. Bid Results at a Glance

ID	Reserve	Apparent High Bidder	High Bid	Above Reserve	Recommendation
A	\$35,880	No bids	—	—	Do not award; retain or re-advertise
B	\$35,880	No bids	—	—	Do not award; retain or re-advertise
C	\$40,020	Mike Butler	\$41,289	\$1,269 / 3.2%	Award to Butler
D	\$42,320	Dave Rangitsch	\$63,000	\$20,680 / 48.9%	Award to Rangitsch
E	\$34,960	No bids	—	—	Do not award; retain or re-advertise
F	\$34,960	No bids	—	—	Do not award; retain or re-advertise
G	\$34,960	No bids	—	—	Do not award; retain or re-advertise
H	\$92,000	Randy Stevens	\$101,000	\$9,000 / 9.8%	Reject as conditional/nonresponsive
I	\$28,520	Alan Weber	\$31,101	\$2,581 / 9.1%	Award to Weber
J	\$177,560	Mike Butler	\$216,999	\$39,439 / 22.2%	Award to Butler

Financial summary: Recommended awards for C, D, I, and J total \$352,389, which is \$63,969 (22.2%) above the combined reserve prices of \$288,420. Including Property H would increase gross sale proceeds to \$453,389, but staff does not recommend that award in its present form.

3. Detailed Findings by Property

Property C – Lot 13, Block 48, Crawford Addition

- Reserve price: \$40,020; broker opinion of value: \$43,500.
- One bid was received from Mike Butler in the amount of \$41,289, accompanied on the bid form by a stated cashier's-check deposit of \$2,064.45, exactly five percent of the bid.
- The bid exceeds the reserve by \$1,269, or approximately 3.2 percent, but is \$2,211 below the broker opinion of value.
- The submitted form is signed and identifies the property. Subject to verification of the original check, envelope, and receipt time, the bid appears responsive.

Recommendation: Award Property C to Mike Butler for \$41,289 and direct staff to initiate closing.

Property D – Lot 14, Block 48, Crawford Addition

- Reserve price: \$42,320; broker opinion of value: \$46,000.
- Three bids were received: Dave Rangitsch – \$63,000; Mike Butler – \$51,299; Heather Lilly – \$50,000.
- The apparent high bid of \$63,000 exceeds the reserve by \$20,680 (48.9%) and the broker opinion of value by \$17,000 (37.0%).
- Rangitsch's form identifies a cashier's-check deposit of \$3,150, exactly five percent. The bid form is signed and identifies Property D. The date written on the signature page predates the bid opening; that fact alone is not a defect if the sealed bid was timely received and remained unaltered.

Recommendation: Award Property D to Dave Rangitsch for \$63,000.

Property H – Lots 21–24, Block 11, Riverside Addition

- Reserve price: \$92,000; broker opinion of value: \$100,000.
- One bid was received from Randy Stevens in the amount of \$101,000 with a stated cashier's-check deposit of \$5,050, exactly five percent.
- The bid amount is \$9,000 above reserve and \$1,000 above the broker opinion of value.
- The bid form leaves the legal-description line blank and identifies the bidder/entity as "Trustee" or "Trust," without naming the trust. Those defects should be reviewed, but the more significant issue is the separate signed proposal attached to the bid.
- The attachment states that the purchaser wants the alley expanded north, seeks a 40-foot access arrangement, requests abandonment of an alley serving the subject and adjacent lots, anticipates an easement for existing electrical facilities, and expressly states that without approval of the plan the property is "useless" to the bidder and the bidder would not want to purchase it.
- Those statements create a material condition tied to separate governmental and third-party actions. The condition changes the advertised sale from an unconditional, as-is purchase into a transaction dependent upon alley vacation, access reconfiguration, utility/easement arrangements, and possibly Joint Powers Board considerations. This is evaluated further along in the memo.

Recommendation: Reject the bid as materially conditional and nonresponsive. Return the bid deposit after Council action. Do not attempt to cure the condition after opening by negotiating away or approving the added terms. If Council remains interested in the concept, evaluate it separately and then re-advertise Property H with clear, uniform terms available to all potential bidders.

Property I – Lots 20–24, Block 12, Valley View Addition

- Reserve price: \$28,520; broker opinion of value: \$31,000.
- One bid was received from Alan Weber in the amount of \$31,101 with a stated cashier's-check deposit of \$1,555.05, exactly five percent.
- The bid exceeds reserve by \$2,581 (9.1%) and the broker opinion by \$101.
- The bid form is signed and identifies Property I. Subject to routine verification of the original submission, it appears responsive.

Recommendation: Award Property I to Alan Weber for \$31,101 and direct staff to initiate closing.

Property J – Myrtle Avenue Tract

- Reserve price: \$177,560; broker opinion of value: \$193,000.
- Two bids were received: Mike Butler – \$216,999; Greg Ressler – \$186,100.
- Butler's high bid exceeds reserve by \$39,439 (22.2%) and the broker opinion of value by \$23,999 (12.4%). Ressler's bid exceeds reserve by \$8,540 but is \$30,899 below the apparent high bid.
- Butler's bid identifies a cashier's-check deposit of \$10,849.95, exactly five percent. The form is signed and identifies the tract through the sheriff's deed description.

Recommendation: Award Property J to Mike Butler for \$216,999 and return the unsuccessful bidder's deposit after Council action.

Properties A, B, E, F, and G – No Bids Received

- No bids were recorded at the July 21 opening for these properties.
- The Town is not obligated to immediately re-advertise. The lack of bids may reflect pricing, timing, commercial demand, utility questions, or the desire of purchasers to assemble multiple lots.

Recommendation: Retain these properties temporarily and direct staff to return with a second-round marketing strategy.

4. Legal Analysis – Award or Denial of the Randy Stevens Bid

A. Wyoming law favors the highest responsible bidder or rejection of all bids

Wyoming Statute § 15-1-112(a) requires a municipality selling property valued at \$500 or more through sealed bids to sell to the highest responsible bidder unless the governing body rejects all bids. The governing body determines bidder responsibility. This statutory language is more restrictive than the broad “best interest” discretion stated in portions of the Town’s package. The package cannot enlarge the Town’s authority beyond the statute.

Accordingly, when a valid responsive bid has been submitted by a responsible bidder, Council should not reject that bidder merely because it prefers another purchaser, dislikes a lawful proposed use, or later decides that a different price or arrangement would be better. Council may, however, reject all bids for a property and start over, provided the decision is made in good faith, is supported by the record, and is not a pretext for favoritism.

B. “Responsible bidder” and “responsive bid” are different concepts

Responsibility concerns the bidder’s ability, integrity, legal capacity, and willingness to perform. Responsiveness concerns whether the bid unequivocally offers to purchase on the advertised terms. A bid that adds a material condition is not the same offer requested by the Town and generally cannot be accepted without changing the competition after bids have been exposed.

The Stevens submission is not simply an explanation of intended future development. It states that the purchase is not desired without approval of an alley and access plan. That language makes the obligation to close dependent upon future Town action and potentially upon action by the Joint Powers Board, adjacent owners, and utility interests. This is material because it affects whether the purchaser must close, what property rights would accompany the sale, and the practical value of the parcel to the bidder.

C. Why denial is legally supportable

Denial is supportable if Council expressly finds that the attachment materially conditions the offer and makes it nonresponsive to the advertised as-is sale. The Town may reject the sole bid for Property H; with only one bid received, rejecting that bid is the equivalent of rejecting all bids for the property under § 15-1-112(a). The record should focus on the condition, not on the identity of the bidder or the merits of the proposed development.

Additional grounds requiring clarification or review include the unnamed trust/entity and the blank legal-description line. Those items may be curable irregularities in another context, but they reinforce the need for caution. Staff does not recommend relying solely on those minor defects where the attached contingency is clear and material.

D. Why a conditional award is high risk

Awarding the property subject to alley vacation or access approval would materially alter the advertised terms and provide the bidder with rights or assurances that were not offered to other potential bidders. It would also combine two distinct governmental decisions: sale of municipal land and vacation or reconfiguration of public access. Other buyers may have bid, or bid differently, had the Town advertised that alley vacation and expanded access were available.

A conditional award also creates contract uncertainty. The attachment does not establish a deadline, objective approval criteria, allocation of design and construction costs, responsibility for utility relocation, treatment of objections, or what happens if the alley is not vacated. Accepting that proposal could create an open-ended transaction inconsistent with the package’s 30-day closing requirement.

E. Separate process for any alley-vacation proposal

Any alley abandonment or vacation should proceed independently under the applicable plat, municipal, and Wyoming-law procedures, with legal-description review, utility and access analysis, notice, opportunity for affected parties to be heard, and formal Council findings. The Town should not promise approval through a land-sale award. A later alley-vacation decision must remain discretionary and based on the public interest at that time.

F. Narrow path if Council wishes to preserve the sale

The legally safer course is rejection and re-advertisement. A narrower but riskier alternative would be for the Town Attorney to determine that the attachment is merely a nonbinding statement of future intent and obtain an unequivocal written acknowledgment that the \$101,000 bid is unconditional, that the bidder will close within 30 days regardless of alley or access action, and that no Town approval is promised. Because this acknowledgment would be obtained after opening and could be viewed as a material correction, staff does not recommend this route without a written attorney opinion.

5. Recommended Council Actions

#	Recommended Action
1	Find that the bids recommended for award are responsive and the bidders responsible, subject to final administrative verification.
2	Award Property C to Mike Butler for \$41,289.
3	Award Property D to Dave Rangitsch for \$63,000.
4	Reject the sole bid for Property H because the attached proposal materially conditions the purchase upon approvals and property/access changes not included in the solicitation.
5	Award Property I to Alan Weber for \$31,101.
6	Award Property J to Mike Butler for \$216,999.
7	Authorize the Mayor, Clerk, and Town Attorney to prepare and execute closing documents consistent with the bid package and Council's awards.
9	Return unsuccessful deposits after award decisions and return the Property H deposit following rejection.
10	Retain Properties A, B, E, F, and G and return with a second-round disposition strategy rather than immediately reducing prices.

7. Suggested Council Motions

Item 1. Properties C, D, I, and J: "I move to find the apparent high bidder for each identified property responsible, and award Property C to Mike Butler for \$41,289; Property D to Dave Rangitsch for \$63,000; Property I to Alan Weber for \$31,101; and Property J to Mike Butler for \$216,999, with closing to occur in accordance with the bid package and documents approved by the Town Attorney."

Item 2. Property H: "I move to reject the sole bid submitted for Property H because the attached proposal materially conditions the purchase upon alley vacation, access changes, utility arrangements, and other approvals not included in the advertised sale terms, making the bid nonresponsive; to authorize return of the bid deposit; and to direct staff to evaluate future disposition of Property H separately."

Item 3. Unsold Properties: Retain the properties for the time being and ask staff to return with a new listing strategy and advertising package.

		Bid Tap Opening * July 21, 2026 2pm		1-PS-26							
Property		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J
Bidder	Bid Bond (y/n)	X	X								
MIKE BUTLER	Y			41,289.00							
DAVE RANGITSCH	Y				63,000.00						
MIKE BUTLER	Y				51,299.00						
HEATHER LILLEY	Y				50,000.00						
RANDY STEVENS	Y								101,000.00		
ALAN WEBER	Y									31,101.00	
GREG J. RESSER	Y										136,100.00
MIKE BUTLER	Y										216,999.00
Witness:		Print:		Sign:							
		1. Emily Ringer		2. Jennifer Anderson							
		2. Jennifer Anderson		Jennifer Anderson							

APPENDIX A

PROPERTY LOCATION MAPS

Properties A through J

The following maps are included as supporting exhibits to the Council memo. They identify the approximate location of each property offered through Municipal Property Sale Project No. 1-PS-2026.

The map outlines are for general orientation only. Recorded legal descriptions, plats, surveys, deeds, and other official records control property boundaries.

MAP SECTION CONTENTS

- Master property index
- Properties A-D: Crawford Addition
- Properties E-G: Bridge Avenue / SRE & I West Addition
- Property H: Riverside Addition
- Property I: Valley View Addition
- Property J: Myrtle Avenue tract

Municipal Property Location Map Booklet

Prepared from Bid Package 1-PS-2026

This booklet consolidates the approximate property-location exhibits for Properties A through J. The red outlines are reproduced from the municipal property sale bid package and are intended only for general orientation. Legal descriptions and recorded documents control property boundaries.

ID	Address	Property / Addition	Zoning
A	1401 S. River St.	Lot 7, Block 48, Crawford Addition	RD7200 Residential
B	1403 S. River St.	Lot 8, Block 48, Crawford Addition	RD7200 Residential
C	1402 S. Veterans St.	Lot 13, Block 48, Crawford Addition	RD7200 Residential
D	205 E. Pine Ave.	Lot 14, Block 48, Crawford Addition	RD7200 Residential
E	805 W. Bridge Ave.	Lot 3, Block 36, SRE & I West Addition	Retail Business
F	807 W. Bridge Ave.	Lot 4, Block 36, SRE & I West Addition	Retail Business
G	809 W. Bridge Ave.	Lot 5, Block 36, SRE & I West Addition	Retail Business
H	604 S. River St.	Lots 21-24, Block 11, Riverside Addition	Highway Business
I	203 S. 2nd St.	Lots 20-24, Block 12, Valley View Addition	RD6000 Residential
J	403 E. Myrtle Ave.	Approx. 2.61-acre tract; Sheriff's Deed Book 848, Page 784	RD7200 Residential

Property A

1401 S. River St.



Lot 7, Block 48, Crawford Addition

Zoning: RD7200 Residential

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.

Property B

1403 S. River St.



Lot 8, Block 48, Crawford Addition

Zoning: RD7200 Residential

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.

Property C

1402 S. Veterans St.



Figure 3 approximate location of Property D

Bidder Notes

Lot 13, Block 48, Crawford Addition

Zoning: RD7200 Residential

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.

Property D

205 E. Pine Ave.

topograph



Approximate location of Property D

Lot 14, Block 48, Crawford Addition

Zoning: RD7200 Residential

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.

Property E

805 W. Bridge Ave.

- regulations.
- Buyers should independently verify zoning requirements, and development standards prior to p

Property Photograph



Lot 3, Block 36, SRE & I West Addition

Zoning: Retail Business

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.

Property F

807 W. Bridge Ave.

Property Photograph



Lot 4, Block 36, SRE & I West Addition

Zoning: Retail Business

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.

Property G

809 W. Bridge Ave.

Property Photograph



Figure 7 approximate location of Property G

Lot 5, Block 36, SRE & I West Addition

Zoning: Retail Business

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.

Property H

604 S. River St.

res, service, logging, mixed-use, or other permitted business uses subject to



Lots 21-24, Block 11, Riverside Addition

Zoning: Highway Business

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.

Property I

203 S. 2nd St.

Property Photograph



Lots 20-24, Block 12, Valley View Addition

Zoning: RD6000 Residential

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.

Property J

403 E. Myrtle Ave.



Approx. 2.61-acre tract; Sheriff's Deed Book 848, Page 784

Zoning: RD7200 Residential

Approximate location shown; not a survey or boundary determination.