



Council Meeting

4-14-26

7:00 p.m.

DRAFT

MINUTES OF MORGAN CITY COUNCIL WORK MEETING

March 24, 2026; 6:00 P.M.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS

PRESENT:

Mayor Steve Gale, Tony London, Jeffery Richins,
Laurann Turner, Dave Alexander and Jeff Wardell

STAFF PRESENT:

Ty Bailey, City Manager; Gary Crane, City Attorney;
Jake Young, City Planner; Janet Pace, City Recorder

This meeting was held in the Council Conference Room of the Morgan City Offices, 90 West Young Street, Morgan, Utah. The meeting was streamed live on YouTube and available for viewing on the City's website – <https://www.morganutah.gov/meetings>

This meeting was called to order by Mayor Steve Gale.

General Plan Update – Jake Young

Jake explained that the general plan update has reached an important stage and that the Planning Commission is ready to begin implementing it through ordinance updates, grant applications, and other follow-up work. He said that the Planning Commission had unanimously recommended the plan to the Council, while also acknowledging that some public concerns had been raised.

Tony asked for clarification on the residential land use categories, particularly the meaning of “when context appropriate” as it relates to overlay zones. Jake explained that overlay zones, such as the mixed residential overlay, are special tools that require review by staff and the Planning Commission, with final approval by the Council. He emphasized that these are not automatic and must be evaluated case by case. Gary added that overlay zones give the Council more discretion than a standard subdivision because they are legislative zoning decisions, while typical subdivision approvals are more administrative once zoning is already in place.

Jake then reviewed the differences between residential mix, medium-density residential, and low-density residential. He explained that the updated plan separates attached housing, such as townhomes, into the residential mix category, while medium-density and low-density areas remain focused primarily on single-family development. He noted that although the general plan allows for the possibility of smaller lots in the future, current zoning still controls what is permitted today. He also pointed out that most recent development in Morgan has been on lots around 12,000 square feet rather than larger half-acre or one-acre lots.

Laurann asked additional questions about where townhomes are currently allowed and how the zoning map relates to the general plan. Jake explained that some areas already have zoning that allows townhomes by right, based on decisions made years ago, but said the updated general plan would better define where those housing types should be located in the future. He also discussed public comments received at the Planning Commission hearing, stating that most concerns centered on the Red Rock area and whether that area should be designated low density instead of medium density. Jake said the Planning Commission discussed those concerns at length but ultimately recommended leaving the proposed designation unchanged. He also

addressed a public comment about trails, explaining that the trail map is conceptual and does not place trails on private property, but instead identifies areas where the City may want to work with landowners in the future and pursue grant opportunities.

Laurann asked whether the yellow trail lines shown on the map were dependent on landowner cooperation. Jake confirmed that they were and explained that trails would move forward only if property owners were willing to work with the City. As an example, he noted that the developer of the current townhome project had granted 20-foot trail easements on both sides of the property during the subdivision process, which would allow the City to seek grant funding and eventually construct a trail segment there. Jake said the trail system would likely be built in phases over time, beginning with shorter segments that could later connect into a larger network.

Tony asked whether it would make sense to obtain a formal easement for the existing trail to the M. Jake said that if the landowner were willing, a legal easement would be beneficial because it would preserve access if ownership changed and could allow the City or County to pursue grant funding for trail improvements. Ty noted that the property is in the County, and Gary added that the County could pursue such an easement, though the City could potentially also acquire property or an easement outside city limits. Jake said coordination with the County could be valuable in preserving the trail for future generations.

Jake then briefly returned to the parks and transportation maps. He explained that the park designations identify general areas where future parks would be desirable, particularly in North Morgan, the southwest area, and the dairy property if it is ever developed, but clarified that the City is not taking land for those purposes. He also reviewed the transportation map and said it had been carefully developed by City engineering, planning, and road staff to identify key future road connections. He said that the map is already proving useful in conversations with landowners and developers by helping the City identify where future road connections and possible river crossings should be preserved.

Jake concluded his overview by discussing the downtown portion of the general plan. He said the downtown area is developing well and described the vision as a more connected mixed-use district with opportunities for retail, restaurants, offices, and some residential uses in and around Commercial Street. He also discussed possible future street connections behind existing businesses, including the area near Napa and potentially near 7-Eleven, explaining that some of those concepts are schematic and would depend on future cooperation with property owners. He noted that the goal is to improve access, safety, and connectivity in the downtown area.

Jake also explained that the plan encourages a historic character for downtown development, while still allowing flexibility so that redevelopment remains practical. He said the intent is to preserve the feel of Morgan's historic downtown without requiring exact historic materials or design standards that could discourage development. In response to questions from Laurann, Tony, the Mayor, and Ty, Jake clarified that some of the proposed street connections would occur only if properties redevelop, while others may require more proactive coordination with existing landowners. Dave thanked Jake for his work on the plan, and Jake said that the Planning Commission and City staff had worked hard to refine the update and would next need to focus on related zoning changes and ordinance updates.

U.A.M.P.S. – Update by Ty

Ty explained that UAMPS is organized by individual power projects, including the pool, which allows members with excess power to share resources with one another before turning to the open market. He said UAMPS is proposing to update the pooling agreement so it can better operate within the Energy Day Ahead Market, where power commitments are made one day in advance. Ty explained that this would help reduce market volatility and allow UAMPS to better manage resources for all participating members.

Ty noted that Morgan cannot meet all of its power needs on its own and remains subject to market pricing, so participation in the updated pool would be beneficial. During discussion, the Mayor asked whether the pool could run short, and Ty said it could, but explained that UAMPS also purchases power in advance to help cover demand. Dave asked whether there was any reason not to participate, and Ty said it generally would not make sense to leave the pool because members would then have to cover their own day-ahead power needs independently. He said the updated agreement would help UAMPS better manage those commitments on behalf of its members.

This meeting was adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

Janet Pace, City Recorder

Steve Gale, Mayor

These minutes were approved at the _____ 2026 meeting.

DRAFT

MINUTES OF MORGAN CITY COUNCIL MEETING

March 24, 2026; 7:00 P.M.

MAYOR AND COUNCIL MEMBERS PRESENT:

Mayor Steve Gale, Tony London, Jeff Wardell,
Jeffery Richins and Laurann McGuire

STAFF PRESENT IN-PERSON:

Ty Bailey, City Manager; Gary Crane, City
Attorney; Jake Young, City Planner and Janet Pace,
City Recorder

STAFF PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY:

Dave Alexander

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ken Tilby, Katie Tilby, Linda Gale, Erine Durrant
Leslie Durrant, Jill Boss, Bret Boss. Kade Sargent,
Kaye Rhodes, Wyatt Pickrell, Avery LaMadeleine,
and Bo Sandoval

This meeting was held in the Council Conference Room of the Morgan City Offices, 90 West Young Street, Morgan, Utah. The meeting was streamed live on YouTube and available for viewing on the City's website – morganutah.gov

This meeting was called to order by Mayor Steve Gale

The pledge of allegiance was led by Council Member Jeffery Richins

The opening ceremony was presented by Council Member Laurann McGuire

APPROVAL OF MEETING AGENDA

MOTION: Council Member Tony London moved to approve the agenda

SECOND: Council Member Jeffery Richins

Vote was 5 ayes; Motion passed unanimously to approve the agenda

MINUTES AND WARRANTS

DISCUSSION: Dave asked about the payment to Alarm Control Company for panic buttons. Ty explained that the purchase included multiple silent panic buttons installed behind the clerk's desks and at the front counter so staff could quickly request help if an incident occurred.

MOTION: Council Member Tony London moved to approve the following:
Minutes of the City Council Meeting – March 10, 2026, and the Work Session Minutes from - March 10, 2026, and the Warrants from (3/8/26, to 3/20/26).

SECOND: Council Member Jeffery Wardell

Vote was 5 ayes; The motion passed unanimously to approve the minutes as written and one set of warrants

CITIZEN COMMENTS

Ernie Durrant addressed the Council regarding concerns with the general plan and housing requirements. He said the Planning Commission had provided helpful information, but he still had questions. Ernie emphasized that Morgan is a rural community rather than an urban one and stated his understanding that rural communities are not subject to all of the same standards and requirements as larger urban areas, particularly regarding low-income housing. He expressed concern over statements suggesting the City could lose funding if it did not comply with certain housing expectations, saying that he viewed those comments as concerning and wanted to ensure the City fully understood its actual obligations.

Brett Boss, 586 Red Rock Way, asked the Council to table the general plan update so residents could meet with the city planner and better understand the proposed land use changes. He expressed concern that inaccurate information had been presented at the Planning Commission meeting regarding existing lot sizes and the density of the neighborhood. Brett stated that, based on his own review, the lots in the area are 12,000 square feet or larger and should be considered low density. Brett emphasized that the difference between low-density and medium-density designations is important because medium density could allow a greater likelihood of overlay zones or higher-density projects. He said residents attended the meeting in good faith and requested additional time to review the issue and discuss it further before the plan is adopted.

Jill Boss, 586 Red Rock Way, addressed the Council regarding the proposed general plan designation for her neighborhood. She said that the area near the M hill is on the outskirts of the City and is unlikely to see expansion beyond its current boundaries. Jill said a low-density designation would better reflect the character of the neighborhood and provide clearer direction for future development. She explained that residents are not opposed to development, but would like future projects to be similar in character to the existing neighborhood or include an appropriate buffer between lower- and higher-density areas. Jill said that identifying the area as low density in the plan would provide clarity for developers.

Katie Tilby, 601 East Ridgeline, addressed the Council regarding the proposed general plan changes. She referenced a question asked at the Planning Commission meeting about whether certain portions of the proposal, such as a rezone, could be tabled separately even if the overall plan received a positive recommendation. Katie said she was unsure whether that was possible but wanted the Council to consider whether some parts could move forward while others that still lacked answers could be delayed. She said that while there were positive aspects to the plan, there were also unresolved concerns, particularly related to traffic. Katie said she was confused that the Planning Commission forwarded the matter with a favorable recommendation despite

those concerns. She added that residents are not opposed to growth, but felt it is reasonable for the City to slow down, take more time, and carefully evaluate these issues before moving forward.

Linda Gale, 699 North 700 East, addressed the Council regarding growth and housing in Morgan. She said that while people often say they want their children to be able to live in the community, she does not believe medium- or high-density housing is the only answer to that concern. She emphasized that Morgan is a rural city and said that distinction should be carefully considered when making future planning decisions. She urged the Council to carefully consider any rezoning that would significantly change existing neighborhoods, especially for long-time residents who would be affected by those changes. Linda encouraged the Council to be thoughtful about growth and avoid allowing development to move too quickly without fully considering its impact on the community.

Kay Rhodes, 505 East Ridgeline, addressed the Council regarding housing and traffic concerns. She said that while housing affordability is a challenge for younger residents, including her own son, she did not believe the City should base planning decisions solely on the idea of creating more housing for young people, as the issue extends beyond Morgan and reflects broader statewide housing costs. Kay also expressed concern about emergency access and traffic as the City continues to grow. Drawing from her experience living near existing development and from concerns about fire and EMS access, she said road width, parked cars, and traffic flow create safety issues for large emergency vehicles. She urged the Council to make sure traffic planning and road access are addressed before decisions are made on future development, especially in areas that also serve as important school and emergency routes.

ACTIVE AGENDA

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND APPROVING THE AMENDED AND RESTATED POWER POOLING AGREEMENT WITH THE UTAH ASSOCIATED MUNICIPAL POWER SYSTEMS FOR THE POOL PROJECT; AUTHORIZING EXECUTION AND DELIVERY THEREOF; AND RELATED MATTERS - RESOLUTION 26-14

Ty explained that the resolution would update Morgan City's longstanding pooling agreement with UAMPS, which had last been revised in 1980. He said the agreement allows participating entities to buy and sell power among themselves through the pool rather than relying entirely on the open market, helping to stabilize costs. Ty explained that the updated agreement would shift from a reactive approach to a day-ahead market structure, allowing UAMPS to participate in the Extended Day Ahead Market and better coordinate power resources for all participating members. He said that this would be especially beneficial for Morgan, since a significant portion of the City's power costs is still subject to market fluctuations.

During discussion, Tony asked how the agreement would affect Morgan given that the City does not currently generate its own power. Ty explained that Morgan's future generator would mainly reduce the City's own load rather than produce excess power for the pool, and that participation in the pool would still remain advantageous. He said that without the pooling arrangement, the

City would be responsible for covering all of its own power needs on a day-ahead basis, which would be far more difficult and would likely require additional staffing and scheduling expertise. Ty also said that the pool helps account for uncertainty in power production from renewable sources such as solar and wind.

Laurann asked whether Ty saw any risks or disadvantages to entering into the updated agreement, and Ty responded that he did not. He said the only possible downside would be if a utility believed it could outperform the market on its own, but that approach would not be practical or beneficial for Morgan. He added that Gary had reviewed the agreement as well.

Dave asked several questions about the resolution and agreement. Gary explained that if the City needed to change its designated representatives, that would need to be done by resolution. Dave then asked whether the agreement would create additional work for staff, and Ty said it would not, as it would simply become part of his normal administrative duties. Dave also asked whether Council could receive the annual forecasts and purchase information referenced in the agreement. Ty said he could provide that information as part of his annual updates, likely in November. Tony also asked whether Morgan's power demand is increasing year by year, and Ty confirmed that it is increasing gradually, though not at a rapid pace.

MOTION: Council Member Dave Alexander moved to approve a Resolution Authorizing and Approving the Resolution Authorizing and Approving the Amended and Restated Power Pooling Agreement with the Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems for the Pool Project; Authorizing Execution and Delivery Thereof; and Related Matters - Resolution 26-14

SECOND: Council Member Tony London

Discussion on the Motion: None

ROLL CALL VOTE: Dave Alexander – aye
Jeffery Richins – aye
Jeff Wardell – aye
Tony London – aye
Laurann McGuire – aye

Vote was 5 ayes; Motion Passed Unanimously to Adopt a Resolution Authorizing and Approving the Resolution Authorizing and Approving the Amended and Restated Power Pooling Agreement with the Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems for the Pool Project; Authorizing Execution and Delivery Thereof; and Related Matters - Resolution 26-14

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE MORGAN CITY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE; PROVIDING FOR REPEALER; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE - ORDINANCE 26-03

Jake provided an overview of the 2026 General Plan update, explaining that the process had been underway for two years and included significant public involvement through surveys, workshops, maps, and Planning Commission review. He said the update focused primarily on downtown, parks, trails, land use, and transportation, and emphasized that the next step after adoption would be implementation through code updates, grants, and future projects.

Jake explained that the downtown vision is centered on creating a more walkable, mixed-use area with commercial, residential, and recreational opportunities while maintaining Morgan's historic character. He also reviewed the future land use map and clarified that it is a long-range planning guide rather than zoning. He outlined the major land use categories and explained that low-density residential includes single-family lots of 12,000 square feet and larger, while medium-density and residential mix categories allow for a broader range of housing types if considered in the future.

Jake reviewed the transportation, trails, and parks portions of the general plan update. He explained that the transportation map identifies existing and proposed arterial, collector, and local roads, with dashed lines showing future connections that would be created as areas develop rather than roads the City would construct immediately. He said the purpose of the proposed connections is to improve public safety, reduce dead-end roads, support walking and biking, and improve overall traffic flow. Jake also described the active transportation and trails plan, explaining that the public placed a high priority on expanding trails, improving access along the Weber River, adding bike and pedestrian connections, and creating safer freeway crossings.

Jake also reviewed the parks vision, stating that while Riverside Park and Fox Run Park serve the central part of the City well, additional park space is needed in North Morgan and on the west side of town. He said the City's goal is to increase park acreage per 1,000 residents and provide more active recreation space, including sports fields, playgrounds, and other amenities. He highlighted future concepts such as the fishpond park, possible pickleball courts, trail connections, and additional recreational improvements at existing parks.

During Council discussion, Tony asked whether a proposed mixed residential overlay in either a medium- or low-density area would require a public hearing. Jake confirmed that it would, explaining that any overlay application would go first to the Planning Commission for a public hearing and then to the Council for final action. He emphasized that the general plan is a long-range guide and does not itself rezone property or automatically change City ordinances. Tony and Laurann asked questions about the differences between medium-density and low-density residential designations, particularly regarding minimum lot sizes. Jake explained that while the general plan allows for the possibility of smaller lots in the future, the current zoning ordinance still requires 10,000-square-foot minimum lots, and no immediate zoning change is proposed. He added that overlay zones are available under current ordinance but are not automatic and would still require a full review process.

Laurann asked what approval of the general plan would mean in practice. Jake explained that approval would allow staff and the Planning Commission to begin reviewing ordinances that may need to be updated to better align with the plan, as well as begin pursuing trail funding and other implementation efforts. He emphasized that approval of the general plan would not create

immediate legal changes, and that any ordinance amendments would still need to come back to the Council for legislative action and approval. Jake also clarified that general plans are advisory and do not themselves become law.

Laurann then asked what would happen if the item were tabled. Jake said that tabling would allow additional time for review, discussion, and consideration before returning to the Council at a future meeting. Tony stated that, based on the public comments and the concerns raised about one specific area, he was inclined to table the matter briefly so those residents could meet with staff and discuss their concerns further. The Mayor agreed that tabling the item would not be a sign of weakness and could be beneficial if questions remained unresolved. Dave also expressed support for allowing a couple more weeks for discussion, stating that because the general plan is long-term in nature, postponing consideration until the April 14 Council meeting would be reasonable.

MOTION: Council Member Tony London Moved to Table an Ordinance Adopting the Morgan City General Plan Update; Providing for Repealer; Providing for Severability; and Providing for an Immediate Effective Date. Ordinance 26-03 - To Be Tabled Until April 14, at the Next Scheduled City Council Meeting.

SECOND: Council Member Jeffery Richins

Discussion on the Motion: Before the vote, Tony asked for additional discussion and encouraged residents with concern about the general plan to meet with Jake to review those issues in more detail. Jake agreed and said residents could contact Teresa to help arrange a meeting. Laurann clarified that Teresa would be the point of contact, and Jake confirmed that she would.

Dave suggested that, for efficiency, Brett and Jill could serve as points of contact for the neighborhood and help gather questions or concerns from other residents. The Mayor commented that this type of communication and discussion is an important part of city government.

Jeffery added that Dave and Tony typically attend Planning Commission meetings as part of their council assignments, while the other council members do not attend in order to avoid creating a quorum of the City Council. He said that the rest of the Council relies in part on updates from those members, along with recommendations from the Planning Commission. Dave added that when council members and the Mayor attend Planning Commission meetings, they do so only as observers and not to influence the commission's decisions. The Mayor echoed that point and said he attends primarily to listen and stay informed on issues residents may later ask about.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Dave Alexander – aye
Jeffery Richins – aye
Jeff Wardell – aye
Tony London – aye
Laurann McGuire – aye

Vote was 5 ayes; Motion Passed Unanimously to Table an Ordinance Adopting the Morgan City General Plan Update; Providing for Repealer; Providing for Severability; and Providing for an Immediate Effective Date. Ordinance 26-03 - To Be Tabled Until April 14, at the Next Scheduled City Council Meeting.

CITY REPORTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS – UPDATES

North Morgan Project:

Jeffery asked for an update on the North Morgan project that Lance had discussed two weeks earlier. Ty responded that the project was underway and should be completed by Friday. Jeffery noted that it appeared to be nearly finished, and Ty confirmed that the entire project was expected to be done by the end of the week.

New Street Signs:

Laurann then asked about the status of the new street signs. Ty said the City had accepted the bid, but he was unsure of the current installation details and would need to follow up. He noted that City staff may have originally planned to handle the installation, though he was not certain whether installation had been included in the bid.

This meeting was adjourned at 8:35 p.m.

Janet Pace, City Recorder

Steve Gale, Mayor

These minutes were approved _____, 2026 meeting.

ORDINANCE 26-03

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING THE MORGAN CITY GENERAL PLAN UPDATE; PROVIDING FOR REPEALER; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND PROVIDING FOR AN IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the Morgan City Planning Commission has reviewed the City’s General Plan Update and has recommended adoption thereof; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commission’s action of recommending approval of the General Plan Update is reasonably and rationally based; and

WHEREAS, due to the growth and planning of Morgan City, the City Council of Morgan City deems it to be in the best interest of the health, safety, and welfare of the citizenry to adopt the General Plan Update.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF MORGAN, UTAH:

SECTION 1 Repealer. If any provisions of the Morgan City General Plan Update heretofore adopted are inconsistent herewith, they are hereby repealed.

SECTION 2. Enactment. That the reviewed General Plan Update, with its accompanying tables, charts, and maps, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, is hereby adopted.

SECTION 3. Severability. If any section, subsection, sentence, clause, or phrase of this ordinance is declared invalid or unconstitutional by a court of competent jurisdiction, said portion shall be severed, and such declaration shall not affect the validity of the remainder of this ordinance.

SECTION 4. Effective Date. This Ordinance, being necessary for the peace, health, and safety of the City, shall become effective immediately upon posting.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Morgan, Utah, this day of April, 2026.

STEVE GALE, Mayor

ATTEST:

JANET PACE, City Recorder

CITY COUNCIL VOTE AS RECORDED:

	Aye	Nay	Excused
Council Member London	___	___	___
Council Member Wardell	___	___	___
Council Member McGuire	___	___	___
Council Member Richins	___	___	___
Council Member Alexander	___	___	___

(In the event of a tie vote of the Council):

Mayor Gale	___	___
------------	-----	-----

ORDINANCE 26-04

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING TITLE 8 OF THE MORGAN CITY CODE TO PROVIDE FOR THE COLLECTION OF DELINQUENT UTILITY CHARGES AND TO AUTHORIZE THE RECORDING OF POLITICAL SUBDIVISION LIENS FOR UNPAID UTILITY SERVICE FEES

WHEREAS, the City provides water, sewer, storm drain, electricity and related utility services to properties within the City; and

WHEREAS, the City currently provides for billing, delinquency, and disconnection of utility services under Title 8 of the Morgan City Code; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to strengthen collection mechanisms to ensure recovery of costs for services rendered; and

WHEREAS, Utah law, including Utah Code §§ 10-6-161 and 10-6-162 and Title 11, Chapter 60, authorizes municipalities to impose a political subdivision lien for unpaid utility service fees;

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Morgan City, Utah:

Section 1. Amendment to Title 8. Utilities

Title 8, Chapter 17 of the Morgan City Code is hereby amended to add a new section:

8.17 LIEN FOR DELINQUENT UTILITY SERVICE CHARGES

A. Purpose and Authority

This section is adopted pursuant to Utah Code §§ 10-6-161 and 10-6-162 and the Political Subdivision Lien Authority Act. The purpose of this section is to provide for the collection of delinquent utility service charges through the imposition of a lien against the property receiving service.

B. Definitions

For purposes of this section:

1. **“Utility services”** means water, sewer, storm drain, electricity and other services provided by the City and billed through the utility system.
2. **“Customer”** means any person or entity receiving utility services.
3. **“Property”** means the real property served by the utility services.
4. **“Delinquent charges”** means unpaid utility service fees, together with any interest, penalties, and administrative costs.

C. Delinquency

1. Utility service charges shall be due and payable as established by City ordinance or resolution.
2. Any charge not paid within thirty (30) days after billing shall be deemed delinquent.
3. Delinquent charges shall constitute a debt owing to the City.

D. Notice of Delinquency

Prior to recording a lien, the City shall provide written notice of delinquency to:

1. The customer of record; and
2. The record owner of the property, if different from the customer.

The notice shall state:

- The amount due;
- The date the charges became delinquent; and
- That failure to pay may result in additional collection actions, including a lien.

E. Notice of Intent to Lien

If the delinquent charges remain unpaid, the City shall provide a second written notice stating:

1. The City's intent to record a political subdivision lien against the property;
2. The total amount due; and
3. The date by which payment must be made to avoid the recording of a lien.

F. Waiting Period

The City shall not record a lien until at least sixty (60) days have elapsed from the date of the initial notice of delinquency.

G. Recording of Lien

1. If the delinquent charges remain unpaid after the notice and waiting period, the City may record a **Notice of Lien** with the Morgan County Recorder.
2. The Notice of Lien shall include:
 - The legal description of the property;
 - The name of the record owner, if known;
 - The amount of delinquent charges; and
 - A statement that the lien is imposed pursuant to this section and applicable Utah law.
3. Upon recording, the lien shall attach to the property and shall constitute a political subdivision lien.

H. Amount of Lien

The lien shall include:

1. Unpaid utility service charges;
2. Interest;
3. Penalties;
4. Administrative costs; and
5. Costs of recording and collection.

I. Effect of Lien

1. The lien shall run with the land and bind subsequent purchasers or encumbrancers upon recording.
2. The lien shall remain in effect until paid in full or otherwise released.

J. Release of Lien

Upon payment in full of all amounts secured by the lien, the City shall record a release of lien with the Morgan County Recorder.

K. Additional Remedies

The remedies provided in this section are cumulative. The City may also:

1. Discontinue utility service in accordance with City policy;
2. Bring a civil action to recover delinquent charges; or
3. Pursue any other remedy authorized by law.

L. Responsibility for Charges

Unless otherwise provided by written agreement with the City, the owner of the property shall be responsible for all utility service charges incurred for the property.

Section 2. Severability

If any provision of this Ordinance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the remaining provisions.

Section 3. Effective Date

This Ordinance shall take effect upon adoption and publication as required by law.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the City Council of Morgan City, Utah, this ____ day of April, 2026.

MORGAN CITY COUNCIL

STEVE GALE, Mayor

ATTEST:

JANET PACE, City Recorder

ORDINANCE 26-05

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE FLOODWAYS PROVISION OF THE MORGAN CITY CODE TO PROVIDE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A FISHERY/PARK PROJECT

WHEREAS, the City plans to develop a Fishery Park project that would be located in the Weber Basin Floodway; and

WHEREAS, the current Floodway ordinance does not specifically address the development of such a project; and

WHEREAS, the project would be compatible with both the intent and purposes of the Floodway ordinance in that such a project would not create a hazard in the event of floodwaters in the Floodway; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of Morgan City finds it in the best interest of the health, safety and welfare of the Community to make such an amendment.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it ordained by the City Council of Morgan City, Utah:

Section 1. Amendment to Title 12-02-050 Provisions for Flood Hazard Reduction, of the Morgan City Code.

Section 12-02-050 Provisions for Flood Hazard Reduction, of the Morgan City Code is hereby amended as follows:

12.02.050 PROVISIONS FOR FLOOD HAZARD REDUCTION

A. General Standards: In all areas of special flood hazards the following provisions are required for all new construction and substantial improvements:

1. All new construction or substantial improvements shall be designed (or modified) and adequately anchored to prevent flotation, collapse or lateral movement of the structure resulting from hydrodynamic and hydrostatic loads, including the effects of buoyancy;
2. All new construction or substantial improvements shall be constructed by methods and practices that minimize flood damage;
3. All new construction or substantial improvements shall be constructed with materials resistant to flood damage;
4. All new construction or substantial improvements shall be constructed with electrical, heating, ventilation, plumbing, and air conditioning equipment and other service facilities that are designed and/or located so as to prevent water from entering or accumulating within the components during conditions of flooding.
5. All new and replacement water supply systems shall be designed to minimize or eliminate infiltration of floodwaters into the system;

6. New and replacement sanitary sewage systems shall be designed to minimize or eliminate infiltration of floodwaters into the system and discharge from the systems into floodwaters; and
7. On site waste disposal systems shall be located to avoid impairment to them or contamination from them during flooding.

B. Specific Standards: In all areas of special flood hazards where base flood elevation data has been provided as set forth in: 1) MCC 12.02.030B, 2) MCC 12.02.040B8, or 3) subsection C3 of this section, the following provisions are required:

1. Residential Construction: New construction and substantial improvement of any residential structure shall have the lowest floor (including basement) elevated to a minimum of one foot (1') above the base flood elevation. A registered professional engineer, architect, or land surveyor shall submit a certification to the floodplain administrator that the standard of this subsection as proposed in MCC 12.02.040C1a, is satisfied.

2. Nonresidential Construction: New construction and substantial improvements of any commercial, industrial or other nonresidential structure shall either have the lowest floor (including basement) elevated to a minimum of one foot (1') above the base flood level or together with attendant utility and sanitary facilities, be designed so that below the base flood level the structure is watertight with walls substantially impermeable to the passage of water and with structural components having the capability of resisting hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads and effects of buoyancy. A registered professional engineer or architect shall develop and/or review structural design, specifications, and plans for the construction, and shall certify that the design and methods of construction are in accordance with accepted standards of practice as outlined in this subsection. A record of such certification which includes the specific elevation (in relation to mean sea level) to which such structures are floodproofed shall be maintained by the floodplain administrator.

3. Enclosures: New construction and substantial improvements, with fully enclosed areas below the lowest floor that are usable solely for parking of vehicles, building access or storage in an area other than a basement and which are subject to flooding shall be designed to automatically equalize hydrostatic flood forces on exterior walls by allowing for the entry and exit of floodwaters. Designs for meeting this requirement must either be certified by a registered professional engineer or architect or meet or exceed the following minimum criteria:

- a. A minimum of two (2) openings having a total net area of not less than one square inch for every square foot of enclosed area subject to flooding shall be provided.
- b. The bottom of all openings shall be no higher than one foot (1') above grade.
- c. Openings may be equipped with screens, louvers, valves, or other coverings or devices provided that they permit the automatic entry and exit of floodwaters.

4. Manufactured Homes:

- a. Require that all manufactured homes to be placed within zone A on a community's FHBM or FIRM shall be installed using methods and practices which minimize flood

damage. For the purposes of this requirement, manufactured homes must be elevated and anchored to resist flotation, collapse, or lateral movement. Methods of anchoring may include, but are not limited to, use of over the top or frame ties to ground anchors. This requirement is in addition to applicable state and local anchoring requirements for resisting wind forces.

b. Require that manufactured homes that are placed or substantially improved within zones A1-30, AH, and AE on the community's FIRM on sites: 1) outside of a manufactured home park or subdivision, 2) in a new manufactured home park or subdivision, 3) in an expansion to an existing manufactured home park or subdivision, or 4) in an existing manufactured home park or subdivision on which a manufactured home has incurred "substantial damage" as a result of a flood, be elevated on a permanent foundation such that the lowest floor of the manufactured home is elevated to a minimum of one foot (1') above the base flood elevation and be securely anchored to an adequately anchored foundation system to resist flotation, collapse, and lateral movement.

c. Require that manufactured homes be placed or substantially improved on sites in an existing manufactured home park or subdivision within zones A1-30, AH and AE on the community's FIRM that are not subject to the provisions of this subsection B4 be elevated so that either:

(1) The lowest floor of the manufactured home is a minimum of one foot (1') above the base flood elevation, or

(2) The manufactured home chassis is supported by reinforced piers or other foundation elements of at least equivalent strength that are no less than thirty six inches (36") in height above grade and be securely anchored to an adequately anchored foundation system to resist flotation, collapse, and lateral movement.

5. Recreational Vehicles: Require that recreational vehicles placed on sites within zones A1-30, AH, and AE on the community's FIRM either:

a. Be on the site for fewer than one hundred eighty (180) consecutive days,

b. Be fully licensed and ready for highway use, or

c. Meet the permit requirements of MCC 12.02.040C1, and the elevation and anchoring requirements for "manufactured homes" in subsection B4 of this section. A recreational vehicle is ready for highway use if it is on its wheels or jacking system, is attached to the site only by quick disconnect type utilities and security devices, and has no permanently attached additions.

C. Standards for Subdivision Proposals:

1. All subdivision proposals including the placement of manufactured home parks and subdivisions shall be consistent with MCC 12.02.010B, C, and D.
2. All proposals for the development of subdivisions including the placement of manufactured home parks and subdivisions shall meet development permit requirements of MCC 12.02.030C and MCC 12.02.040C, and the provisions of this section.
3. Base flood elevation data shall be generated for subdivision proposals and other proposed development including the placement of manufactured home parks and subdivisions which are greater than fifty (50) lots or five (5) acres, whichever is lesser, if not otherwise provided pursuant to MCC 12.02.030B or MCC 12.02.040B8.
4. All subdivision proposals including the placement of manufactured home parks and subdivisions shall have adequate drainage provided to reduce exposure to flood hazards.
5. All subdivision proposals including the placement of manufactured home parks and subdivisions shall have public utilities and facilities such as sewer, gas, electrical and water systems located and constructed to minimize or eliminate flood damage.

D. Standards for Areas of Shallow Flooding (AO/AH Zones): Located within the areas of special flood hazard established in MCC 12.02.030B are areas designated as shallow flooding. These areas have special flood hazards associated with base flood depths of one foot (1') to three feet (3') where a clearly defined channel does not exist and where the path of flooding is unpredictable and where velocity flow may be evident. Such flooding is characterized by ponding or sheet flow; therefore, the following provisions apply:

1. All new construction and substantial improvements of residential structures have the lowest floor (including basement) elevated above the highest adjacent grade at least as high as the depth number specified in feet on the community's FIRM (at least 2 feet if no depth number is specified).
2. All new construction and substantial improvements of nonresidential structures:
 - a. Have the lowest floor (including basement) elevated above the highest adjacent grade at least as high as the depth number specified in feet on the community's FIRM (at least 2 feet if no depth number is specified); or
 - b. Together with attendant utility and sanitary facilities be designed so that below the base flood level the structure is watertight with walls substantially impermeable to the passage of water and with structural components having the capability of resisting hydrostatic and hydrodynamic loads of effects of buoyancy.
3. A registered professional engineer or architect shall submit a certification to the Floodplain Administrator that the standards of this section, as proposed in MCC 12.02.040C1a, are satisfied.
4. Require within Zones AH or AO adequate drainage paths around structures on slopes, to guide floodwaters around and away from proposed structures. (Ord. 10-01, 2-9-2010)

E. Floodways: Located within areas of special flood hazard established in MCC 12.02.030B are areas designated as floodways. Since the floodway is an extremely hazardous area due to the velocity of floodwaters which carry debris, potential projectiles and erosion potential, the following provisions shall apply:

1. Encroachments are prohibited, including fill, new construction, substantial improvements and other development within the adopted regulatory floodway with the exception of transportation elements, park, or trail improvements as deemed ~~necessary~~-appropriate by Morgan City. It must be demonstrated through hydrologic and hydraulic analyses performed in accordance with standard engineering practice that the proposed encroachment would not result in any increase in flood levels within the community during the occurrence of the base flood discharge.

2. If subsection E1 of this section regarding transportation elements, is satisfied, all new construction and substantial improvements shall comply with all applicable flood hazard reduction provisions of this section.

3. Under the provisions of 44 CFR chapter 1, section 65.12, of the national flood insurance regulations, a community may permit encroachments within the adopted regulatory floodway that would result in an increase in base flood elevations, provided that the community first applies for a conditional FIRM and floodway revision through FEMA. Due to the potential impact on other properties, this provision shall never be used unless deemed absolutely necessary by Morgan City. (Ord. 17-11, 9-12-2017)

Section 2. Severability

If any provision of this Ordinance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the remaining provisions.

Section 3. Effective Date

This Ordinance shall take effect upon adoption and publication as required by law.

ADOPTED AND PASSED by the City Council of Morgan City, Utah, this ___ day of April, 2026.

MORGAN CITY COUNCIL

STEVE GALE, Mayor

ATTEST:

JANET PACE, City Recorder

RESOLUTION 26-15

A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND APPROVING THE COMPENSATION SCHEDULE FOR THE EMPLOYEES OF MORGAN CITY CORPORATION.

WHEREAS, the Morgan City Council believes that the employees of Morgan City Corporation should be fairly compensated for their time and services; and

WHEREAS, the Morgan City Council desires to adopt a compensation schedule for the employees of Morgan City Corporation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF MORGAN, UTAH:

1. That the compensation schedule for the employees of Morgan City Corporation, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, be adopted and approved.
2. That the effective date of the compensation schedule is July 1, 2026.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Morgan, Utah, this ____ day of April, 2026.

STEVE GALE, Mayor

ATTEST:

JANET PACE, City Recorder

CITY COUNCIL VOTE AS RECORDED:

	Aye	Nay	Excused
Councilmember London	___	___	___
Councilmember Wardell	___	___	___
Councilmember McGuire	___	___	___
Councilmember Richins	___	___	___
Councilmember Alexander	___	___	___

(In the event of a tie vote of the Council):

Mayor Gale ___ ___

Morgan City Pay Proposed Pay Scale 2026-2027

Classifications:

- City Manager
- Assistant City Manager
- Public Works Director
- Administrative Services Manager (Finance Dir./ HR.)
- Administrative Lead (Recorder)
- Administrative Lead (Treasurer, HR)
- Administrative Lead (planning manager)
- Administrative Lead (Acct. Payable, utility clerk)
- Administrative Lead (Acct. Receivable, Admin. Asst.)
- Office Specialist (deputy/ hr generalist)
- Office Assistant (utility clerk 1+2)
- Office Tech (clerk)
- Planner3
- Planner2
- Planner1
- Planning Tech.
- Building Official
- Plans Examiner
- Building Inspector III
- Building Inspector I and II
- Power Dept. Super
- Foreman
- Journeyman 1
- Journeyman 2
- Apprentice 4
- Apprentice 3
- Apprentice 2
- Apprentice 1
- Water/Sewer Senior (utility director)
- water/sewer 4 (field supervisor)
- water/sewer 3
- water/sewer 2
- water/sewer 1
- Road Department Manager (street super)
- Streets (crew lead)
- Streets 3
- Streets 2
- Streets 1
- Parks and Cemetery (manager)
- Groundsman 4 (Crew Lead)
- Groundsman 3
- Groundsman 2
- Groundsman
- Seasonal
- Building Cleaning
- Crossing Guard
- Elected Officials
- Mayor
- Councilmember
- Planning Comm Chair
- Planning Comm Members

Current Pay

	Median	% diff.	Min.	Max
\$154,148.80	\$188,302.40	-22.46%	\$118,581.84	\$171,943.67
	\$163,987.20		\$104,308.10	\$151,246.75
	\$150,342.40		\$98,818.20	\$143,286.39
	\$150,945.60		\$88,909.60	\$132,141.89
\$71,323.20	\$92,996.80	-30.39%	\$63,682.84	\$92,340.12
\$88,524.80	\$92,955.20	-5.00%	\$63,682.84	\$92,340.12
\$82,784.00	\$79,164.80	4.37%	\$63,682.84	\$92,340.12
\$71,323.20	\$79,164.80	-10.99%	\$63,682.84	\$92,340.12
\$77,064.00	\$79,164.80	-2.73%	\$63,682.84	\$92,340.12
	\$58,968.00		\$52,703.04	\$76,419.41
	\$51,105.60		\$41,723.24	\$60,498.70
	\$49,400.00		\$38,429.30	\$55,722.49
	\$75,961.60		\$63,770.68	\$92,467.48
	\$63,356.80		\$57,973.34	\$84,061.35
	\$56,035.20		\$52,703.04	\$76,419.41
	\$113,921.60		\$84,115.16	\$166,866.98
	\$89,336.00		\$73,015.67	\$105,872.72
	\$80,974.40		\$68,843.10	\$99,822.85
\$77,604.80	\$89,336.00	-4.34%	\$62,584.86	\$90,748.05
	\$72,155.20		\$56,895.13	\$82,497.94
\$146,036.80	\$165,796.80	-13.53%	\$109,798.00	\$159,207.10
	\$133,473.60		\$90,034.36	\$130,549.82
	\$111,051.20		\$85,642.44	\$124,181.54
\$106,204.80	\$111,051.20	-4.56%	\$85,642.44	\$124,181.54
\$81,244.80	\$88,483.20	-8.91%	\$81,250.52	
	\$81,993.60		\$73,564.66	
\$65,873.60	\$75,587.20	-14.75%	\$75,587.20	
	\$70,761.60		\$60,388.90	
\$89,003.20	\$94,556.80	-6.24%	\$73,564.66	\$106,668.76
	\$85,446.40		\$60,388.90	\$87,563.91
	\$65,228.80		\$53,321.48	\$77,316.14
\$59,508.80	\$58,534.20	1.64%	\$47,987.19	\$69,581.43
	\$45,769.00		\$43,189.94	\$62,625.42
\$87,027.20	\$94,556.80	-8.65%	\$71,917.69	\$104,280.65
	\$73,548.80		\$58,708.80	\$85,127.77
\$59,176.00	\$61,963.20	-4.71%	\$52,835.56	\$76,611.56
	\$55,640.00		\$47,552.65	\$68,951.34
	\$49,504.00		\$42,797.37	\$62,056.19
\$80,641.60	\$76,419.20	5.24%	\$59,290.92	\$85,971.83
\$62,337.60	\$63,668.80	-2.14%	\$52,835.56	\$76,611.56
	\$61,318.40		\$46,115.16	\$66,866.98
	\$52,187.20		\$42,797.37	\$62,056.19
	\$45,718.40		\$38,515.60	\$55,847.62
\$16.47	\$14.00	\$16.00	\$16.47	\$25.05
\$34,257.60	\$29,120.00	\$33,280.00	\$34,256.98	\$52,104.00
\$21.47	\$18.15	\$20.74	\$17.07	\$21.55
\$17.77	\$17.97	\$20.53	\$17.07	\$20.80

Tech Net/ Market

	Min. Ave	% diff. (+/-10%)	Max Ave.	% diff. (+/-10%)
	\$139,422.40	-18%	\$203,486.40	-23%
	\$121,139.20	-16%	\$184,891.20	-28%
	\$113,152.00	-15%	\$171,038.40	-25%
	\$111,446.40	-25%	\$170,144.00	-34%
	\$71,510.40	-12%	\$106,787.20	-20%
	\$71,510.40	12%	\$106,787.20	-20%
	\$63,980.80	0%	\$93,204.80	-1%
	\$63,980.80	0%	\$93,204.80	-1%
	\$63,980.80	0%	\$93,204.80	-1%
	\$41,953.60	-1%	\$60,694.40	0%
	\$37,564.80	2%	\$55,161.60	1%
	\$64,000.00	0%	\$93,000.00	-1%
	\$53,664.00	-2%	\$76,440.00	0%
	\$46,342.40	0%	\$69,908.80	-7%
	\$84,635.20	-16%	\$125,216.00	-23%
	\$65,977.60	4%	\$97,718.40	3%
	\$64,667.20	-3%	\$92,352.00	-2%
	\$58,136.00	-2%	\$82,368.00	0%
	\$119,225.60	-9%	\$176,446.40	-14%
	\$92,378.80	3%	\$120,083.60	11%
	\$80,516.80	6%	\$115,294.40	11%
	\$80,516.80	6%	\$115,294.40	11%
	\$88,483.20	-9%		0%
	\$81,993.60	-11%		0%
	\$75,587.20	-15%		0%
	\$70,761.60	-17%		0%
	\$71,074.00	3%	\$107,277.00	-1%
	\$65,977.60	-9%	\$96,553.60	-14%
	\$52,582.40	1%	\$76,960.00	1%
	\$47,985.60	0%	\$69,326.40	1%
	\$45,000.00	-4%	\$60,000.00	6%
	\$71,136.00	1%	\$104,769.60	-1%
	\$72,441.60	2%	\$82,804.80	4%
	\$50,024.00	5%	\$73,923.20	5%
	\$46,904.00	1%	\$68,640.00	1%
	\$44,137.60	-3%	\$64,584.00	-6%
	\$51,880.00	-4%	\$89,585.60	-6%
	\$53,206.40	-1%	\$76,502.40	0%
	\$48,152.00	-4%	\$70,158.40	-7%
	\$43,992.00	-3%	\$64,251.20	-5%
	\$41,454.40	-8%	\$60,236.80	-11%

Proposed Range

	Min.	% diff (10%)	% Change (+/- 5%)	Max.	% diff. (10%)	% Change (+/- 5%)
	\$130,000.00	-7%	9%	\$188,500.00	-8%	9%
	\$118,000.00	-3%	12%	\$171,100.00	-8%	12%
	\$110,000.00	-3%	10%	\$159,500.00	-7%	10%
	\$108,000.00	-3%	18%	\$156,600.00	-9%	16%
	\$68,000.00	-5%	6%	\$98,600.00	-8%	6%
	\$68,000.00	-5%	6%	\$98,600.00	-8%	6%
	\$63,682.84	0%	0%	\$92,340.12	-1%	0%
	\$63,682.84	0%	0%	\$92,340.12	-1%	0%
	\$63,682.84	0%	0%	\$92,340.12	-1%	0%
	\$52,703.04	11%	0%	\$76,419.41	6%	0%
	\$44,000.00	5%	5%	\$63,800.00	5%	5%
	\$40,000.00	6%	4%	\$58,000.00	5%	4%
	\$63,770.68	0%	0%	\$92,467.49	-1%	0%
	\$60,000.00	0%	3%	\$87,000.00	-2%	3%
	\$55,000.00	2%	4%	\$79,750.00	4%	4%
	\$47,000.00	1%	2%	\$68,150.00	-3%	2%
	\$80,000.00	-6%	9%	\$116,000.00	-8%	9%
	\$68,843.10	4%	0%	\$99,822.50	2%	0%
	\$62,584.86	-3%	0%	\$90,748.05	-2%	0%
	\$60,000.00	3%	5%	\$87,000.00	5%	5%
	\$115,000.00	-4%	5%	\$166,750.00	-6%	5%
	\$90,000.00	11%	5%	\$140,500.00	12%	5%
	\$90,000.00	11%	5%	\$140,500.00	12%	5%
	\$86,000.00	-3%	6%			
	\$77,000.00	-6%	4%			
	\$70,000.00	-8%	6%			
	\$65,878.80	-7%	8%			
	\$73,564.66	3%	0%	\$106,668.76	-1%	0%
	\$65,000.00	-2%	7%	\$94,250.00	-2%	7%
	\$53,321.48	1%	0%	\$77,316.15	0%	0%
	\$47,987.19	0%	0%	\$69,581.43	0%	0%
	\$43,189.94	-4%	0%	\$62,625.41	4%	0%
	\$71,917.69	1%	0%	\$104,280.65	0%	0%
	\$58,708.80	2%	0%	\$85,127.76	3%	0%
	\$52,835.56	5%	0%	\$76,611.56	4%	0%
	\$48,000.00	2%	1%	\$69,600.00	4%	1%
	\$45,000.00	2%	5%	\$65,250.00	1%	5%
	\$62,000.00	0%	4%	\$99,000.00	0%	4%
	\$54,000.00	1%	2%	\$78,300.00	2%	2%
	\$48,000.00	0%	4%	\$69,600.00	-1%	4%
	\$44,000.00	0%	3%	\$63,800.00	-1%	3%
	\$42,000.00	1%	8%	\$60,900.00	1%	8%
	\$16.47		0%	\$25.05		0%
	\$34,257.60		0%	\$52,104.00		0%
	\$17.07		0%	\$21.55		0%
	\$17.07		0%	\$20.80		0%

948.39
569.14
245.55
\$45 / Meeting Attended

RESOLUTION 26-16

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE CITY TO ENTER INTO A DELAY AGREEMENT WITH LUCERNE MANAGEMENT COMPANY LLC FOR THE DELAYED INSTALLATION OF THE LISTED IMPROVEMENTS ALONG THE FRONTAGE OF PROPERTY FACING 700 EAST LOCATED AT APPROXIMATELY 584 NORTH, MORGAN, UTAH; REFLECTING THE DEDICATION OF THE PROPERTY FOR THE PLACEMENT OF SAID IMPROVEMENTS; AND AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE THE AGREEMENTS.

WHEREAS, Morgan City has received an application for a residential subdivision; and

WHEREAS, the property is zoned Residential Multi-Family (RM-15), and the proposal is consistent with the zoning designation and the General Plan for the development in this vicinity; and

WHEREAS, the owner has divided, developed, or otherwise altered or improved the subject property in such a way that the laws and ordinances of Morgan City require the installation of curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the entire frontage of the subject property (the width, location, and configuration of the sidewalk are within the sole discretion of the City); and

WHEREAS, owner will dedicate the depth of property necessary for the installation of the improvement to meet City's requirements along the frontage of the subject property; and

WHEREAS, the final location for the improvements along 700 East have not been determined, therefore, City Council determines it to be in the best interest of the City and its citizens to enter into this Delay Agreement to facilitate the installation of curb, gutter, and sidewalk, to a time more beneficial to the City and the applicant.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF MORGAN, UTAH:

1. That the City is hereby authorized to enter into a delay agreement entitled Agreement for Delaying the Installation of Development Improvements, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, for delaying the installation of curb, gutter, and sidewalk along the frontage of property located at approximately 700 East 584 North, Morgan, Utah.
2. That the Mayor is hereby authorized to execute the delay agreement and any additional documents to meet the objectives of this resolution.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Morgan, Utah, this ____ day of April 2026.

STEVE GALE, Mayor

ATTEST:

JANET PACE, City Recorder

When Recorded Return To:
Morgan City
90 West Young Street
P.O. Box 1085
Morgan, UT 84050

AGREEMENT FOR DELAYING THE INSTALLATION
OF DEVELOPMENT IMPROVEMENTS

Comes now Morgan City, a municipal corporation within the State of Utah (hereinafter "City"), and Lucerne Management Company LLC, of Morgan, Utah, (hereinafter "Owner"), and for good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, state and agree as follows:

1. That Owner has divided, developed, or otherwise has altered or improved the subject property in such a way that the laws and ordinances of Morgan City require the installation of the named improvements by Owner.
2. That due to existing conditions, such as the absence of the determination of the final design, location, or size of the improvements, or the absence of existing improvements to which these would connect, the Parties agree to delay the installation of these improvements.
3. Owner understands that Owner will be solely responsible for the costs of these improvements at the time they are installed; understands that this agreement runs with the land, thus any subsequent owner or interest holder in the subject property will have this same obligation; and that the timing of the installation, the installer, and the design of the improvements are within the sole discretion of the City.
4. That the City may call for the installation or the Owner's participation in the installation of the improvements, after completing the final design for the location and size of the improvements and will give Owner as much advance notice as is practical.
5. The named improvements are: sidewalk/ trail, curb, gutter, sidewalk and any other improvements along the entire frontage of the subject property (The width, location, and configuration of the sidewalk are within the sole discretion of the City).
6. At the City's discretion, in lieu of putting in improvements, the City may allow Owner to post a bond to cover the costs of the improvement. The dedication of property for the improvements shall still be made at the time of the filing of the plat.
6. Owner will dedicate the depth of property necessary to meet the City's requirements. along the frontage of the subject property at or immediately after the filing of the plat dividing said property.
7. The subject property is: 584 North 700 East

Approximate street address(es): 584 North 700 East; and/or

Tax Identification number(s) 00-0058-7178.

Signed this ____ day of _____, 2026, by the Owner(s):

(print name and title)

STATE OF UTAH)
 : ss.
COUNTY OF MORGAN)

On this _____ day of _____, 2026, personally appeared before me _____, who duly acknowledged to me that he is the _____ of _____, and that the document was signed by him in behalf of said corporation, and _____ acknowledged to me that said corporation executed the same.

NOTARY PUBLIC