

**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD BY MORGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS  
IN REGULARLY SCHEDULED OPEN PUBLIC SESSION ON  
MONDAY, November 17<sup>th</sup>, 2025, AT 4:00 P.M., IN THE COUNCIL ROOM OF  
THE CITY OFFICE LOCATED AT 90 WEST YOUNG STREET, MORGAN, UTAH**

<b>MEMBERS PRESENT:</b>	Commissioner- Vaughn Nickerson, Raelene Blocker Jeffery Richins, Mayor- Steve Gale, Superintendent- Andy Jensen, School Board Members, Kelly Preece, Angie Trease
<b>GUESTS PRESENT:</b>	Ty Bailey-City Manager Teresa Shope-Acting COG Secretary
<b>EXCUSED MEMBERS:</b>	County Manager- Kate Becker, Public Works Director- Bret Heiner

**This meeting was called to order at 4:00 p.m. by Tony London**

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** **October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025**

**MOTION:** Board Member Kelly Preece moved to approve the minutes of the Morgan Council of Governments meeting held on October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2025, with the correction on attendance. Angie Trease was online.

**SECOND:** Board Member Raelene Block

The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes as written.

**ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION/APPROVAL**

**1. BUILDING PERMIT RUNNING TOTALS FOR CITY AND COUNTY**

The COG reviewed the building permit running totals for the City and the County. Although County numbers were not available, the City figures were provided for review. It was noted that several projects were forthcoming within the City.

Upcoming developments included Valley Vista townhomes with approximately 142 units, none of which had yet been constructed. The Chair asked Ty whether he had any comments regarding current growth.

Ty referenced several areas of development, including the projects near Family Tree, Mahogany, and the rifle range south of that area. Ty also mentioned Morgan Creekside by Island Road was noted as a single-family residential development. Mountain Horizon had 2 5-plex townhomes under construction. A question was raised regarding a 4-plex near North Morgan; staff clarified that the previously approved 4-plex in North Morgan on Jenny Lane involved an applicant who was now considering a 14-plex instead.

The 14-plex project had been rezoned and approved, and the applicant had combined two lots for the project. The Rupp Subdivision was actively under construction, and it was believed that all the lots had been sold. Quail Hollow was also under construction.

It was acknowledged that several developments were in progress and that growth continued steadily. No additional comments were offered by staff or commissioners.

## **2. WFRC COMMITTEE REPORTS**

The COG moved on to the Wasatch Front Regional Council committee reports. Tony asked whether anyone had attended any of the committee meetings, and one member confirmed that they had.

Raelene Blocker noted that she had previously commented on the significant growth occurring along the Wasatch Front and the variety of projects underway there. She observed that there was less activity affecting Morgan County because funding had to be obtained through UDOT. However, Raelene stated that it was encouraging to see ongoing work in transportation and trail development and expressed hope that trail funding might eventually extend to the area.

When asked which committee she served on, Raelene responded that she believed she was assigned to all of them, noting that there were numerous meetings. Tony admitted that he had not attended his assigned committee for some time, although he'd frequently saw the mayor present.

They expressed ongoing frustration that the meetings rarely focused on issues related to Morgan County, acknowledging that the population base on the other side of the mountain understandably received most of the attention. Still, they emphasized the importance of maintaining a presence to ensure that Morgan County was not forgotten.

## **3. RAMP TAX, LOCAL SALES OPTION, CORRIDOR PRESERVATION AND COUNTY MASS TRANSIT TAX UPDATES**

Vaughn Nickerson stated that Kate Becker had meeting conflicts but indicated the numbers had not changed since last meeting.

COG had recommended \$400,000 for corridor preservation to the County Commission, and the Commission initially approved \$250,000 of that amount. After the City received the appraisal for the UDOT property being purchased with those funds, the Commission awarded the remaining \$150,000. The City subsequently received the full \$400,000 from the fund, completing the process. The purchase had been approved at the last Commission meeting.

Tony recalled that the initial appraisal had been approximately \$720,000 and noted that Ty had intervened on the City's behalf. Ty explained that UDOT had mistakenly sent the wrong appraisal—one for an adjacent property that had full utilities and improvements. Because that improved property had been appraised lower than the City's property, Ty questioned the accuracy. UDOT then corrected the error, and the proper appraisal came back at \$440,000, a significant reduction.

When the City originally applied for funding, it had estimated needing between \$250,000 and \$300,000, requesting authorization for up to \$400,000. With the corrected appraisal, the City was able to purchase the property using the full \$400,000 allocation. This acquisition would eventually allow 400 East to be extended once the Clark Dairy property developed. The correction in appraisal value resulted in a savings of approximately \$300,000.

In light of the previous statement that little had changed, Tony requested a brief review for clarity. It was reported that Kate had reviewed revenues and spending for RAMP tax, local option tax, and conservation and preservation funds through September. RAMP tax revenues were estimated at \$225,000 but were currently at \$84,076, with a projected year-end shortfall of approximately \$35,000. To date, the only expense had been the \$200,000 allocation to recreation programs, with no additional spending planned for the fiscal year.

#### **4. RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

Tony stated that he had asked Teresa to place this item on the agenda for the COG. Tony apologized for his absence, as it seemed he had not attended a COG meeting for some time. The COG had met earlier in the summer and had discussed establishing a recreation advisory committee. Tony asked for an update on where that matter stood, as he was unsure of its current status.

Tony explained that he had spoken with another commissioner with whom oversaw recreation and had received numerous comments from residents asking about the direction of the recreation program, future plans, and overall progress. Tony expressed his belief that a recreation advisory board or committee would be valuable, as it would provide public feedback regarding what was working well, what needed improvement, and the overall direction the program should take. Such a board would allow stakeholders to share their perspectives.

It was an understanding that an advisory board had previously existed but had been disbanded because meetings had become contentious.

Discussion continued with Tony stating when he first joined the city council, the recreation program had been funded through a 44-44-12 cost split: 44% county, 44% school district, and 12% city. The total funding amounted to approximately \$50,000–\$60,000. It was noted that they had questioned how that formula had been established and to this day cannot answer that question. Eventually, Tony and another council member had championed the implementation of a RAMP tax, which now generated couple hundred thousand dollars annually, compared to the previous \$50,000 range.

The county had informed them at the time that if the RAMP tax were adopted, the county would be the tax-collecting entity and would therefore oversee the recreation program. When the funding formula had still been in place, the recreation board consisted of representatives from the city, county, and school district. Once the RAMP tax was implemented, that board ceased to operate.

Vaughn explained that parents had contacted them about the prior county recreation advisory board, which had included parents involved in youth sports. They had been told that those meetings had become hostile, with significant conflict, which may have contributed to the board's dissolution. It appeared there had been two different advisory boards—one focused on financial oversight and one oriented toward programming and parent involvement.

Members who had previously served on the recreation board described their experience, noting that meetings were typically quiet and sparsely attended. However, in recent years, many parents had expressed concerns that the recreation department leadership was not adequately serving the interests of participants. Members agreed that more structured feedback from the community would be beneficial.

It was noted that under the RAMP tax statute, an advisory board is required for expenditure decisions, and that such a board had not been re-established since the tax was enacted. Vaughn recalled that when they attended what they believed would be a normal advisory meeting shortly after the RAMP tax passed, the county attorney informed them that the advisory board no longer had authority, and the meeting was halted. That was the last time the board convened.

Members agreed that reinstating an advisory board would be beneficial, particularly one that included parents and community members. Advisory boards for other areas—such as tourism tax, economic development, and airport operations—have statutory membership requirements, and it would be useful to determine whether the RAMP tax had similar provisions. If state statute did not define membership, county code would control, and the county code could be amended if necessary.

The group also discussed financial transparency. Members noted that in the past, recreation fees and RAMP tax revenues were difficult to track due to complex financial reports. They expressed concern that participation fees had remained in place even though RAMP tax revenues had increased substantially, yet there was limited visibility into how those funds were being used. Members emphasized that because participation fees are public dollars, the public should be able to see where the funds were allocated.

Members also discussed the long-standing Clarkie Lucas Fund, a sizable donation that had historically supported recreation projects. The current status and remaining balance of that fund were unclear.

Members reiterated that the purpose of a recreation advisory board would be to offer recommendations, provide transparency, and ensure informed decision-making regarding taxpayer funds. The board would not hold decision-making authority but would provide oversight and stakeholder input related to facilities, programming, fees, and long-term planning.

The group agreed that the next step was to review state and county code to determine whether an advisory board was required and, if not, how one should be structured. They planned to place the item on a future agenda for discussion once the county had clarified the legal framework.

Members suggested that the advisory board include a representative from each participating entity—city, county, and school district—given that recreation programming affects all three. They also recommended including parents or community participants, and ensuring alignment with school district needs, as the recreation program serves as a feeder to school sports.

A question arose regarding whether the recreation director should present information on fees, revenue, and expenditures to either the COG or the future advisory board. Members expressed interest in a clear, concise financial summary detailing RAMP tax revenue, participation fees, and expenditures.

The group concluded the discussion by agreeing to place an update on the next meeting agenda, request information from the county regarding requirements and current practices and continue working toward re-establishing a recreation advisory board.

## **5. Adjourn**

This meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

---

Teresa Shope, acting COG Secretary

These minutes were approved at the \_\_\_\_\_, 2025 meeting.