MORGAN CITY

Council Meeting

02-23-16

Work Session

6:30 p.m.

NOTICE OF WORK MEETING
OF THE MORGAN CITY COUNCIL

Pursuant to Utah Code, Title 52, Chapter 4, notice is hereby given to members of the Morgan City Council and to the general public that the Morgan City Council will hold a work meeting in open public session on Tuesday, February 23, 2016 at **6:30 p.m.**, in the Council Room of the City Office located at 90 West Young Street.

AGENDA

Items for Discussion

1. Resolution #16-08 – Municipal Wastewater Planning Program
2. Resolution #16-09 – Sanitary Sewer adequacy
3. Council department review
4. Financial statement review
5. Attorney Crane – council training

In the event of an absence of a full quorum, agenda items will be continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting.

Notice is hereby given that by motion of the Morgan City Council, pursuant to Title 52, Chapter 4 of the Utah Code, the City Council may vote to hold a closed session for any of the purposes identified in that Chapter.

In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify Julie A. Bloxham, City Recorder, (801) 829-3461 at least 24 hours before the meeting.

Morgan City invites any person, church or other civic organization to contact the Mayor, to be scheduled for presenting a thought, reading, opening remarks, or invocation in the opening ceremony portion of the public meeting. Written invitations will be made by the Mayor to those who wish to participate.

This meeting may be held electronically to allow a member to participate.

Posted on 02-17-2016
8:00 a.m.
Julie A. Bloxham, Recorder

Work Session
02-09-2016

MINUTES OF WORK SESSION MEETING HELD BY MORGAN CITY COUNCIL IN REGULAR SCHEDULED OPEN PUBLIC SESSION ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2016 AT 5:30 P.M., IN THE COUNCIL ROOM OF THE CITY OFFICE LOCATED AT 90 WEST YOUNG STREET

Present: Mayor, Ray W. Little.

Council Members: Tony London, Fran Hopkin and Bill Cobabe.

Excused: Members: Jeff Wardell and Mike Kendell.

City Staff: Gary Crane, Attorney; Paul Simmons, Lead Electric Lineman; Mark Schmid, Public Works Director; Matt Stuart, Electric Lineman; and Jeremy Webb, Electric Department.

Others present: Doug Hunter; Jackie Coombs; Sally Jensen; Jennifer Vesper; Ethan Vesper; and Mark Thayne.

This meeting was called to order by Mayor, Ray W. Little.

Items for Discussion

Doug Hunter, Jackie Coombs
UAMPS Presentation

Paul Simmons introduced Doug Hunter and Jackie Coombs, from UAMPS, who will be going over the possible sale of the City's power system. Mayor Little stated that Rocky Mountain Power had approached the City and expressed their interest in purchasing our system.

Doug started by saying this discussion has been going on a long time with not only cities in Utah but all across the nation. Doug affirmed that UAMPS is here to support the decision of the City and that UAMPS would be available as a resource and asset in helping the City gather information for their decision.

Doug gave some background and examples of cities here in Utah and their related dealings with obligations and the sale of their power systems. He stated that any municipality selling an asset will be governed by Utah Code; which will require an appraisal of the asset along with the sale being opened to bids, if that route is chosen. Also, to be aware of and take into consideration any contractual obligations/relationships that are in place. Some of these obligations may be assigned over to the buyer but there is the possibility the City would have to find other entities to take over remaining obligations. Doug reiterated this decision needs to be taken very seriously and the importance of "dotting all the I's and crossing all the T's."

The appraisal is an important factor as UAMPS has seen with two other cities, within the past 30 days, going through this same decision have been offered much less for their system then it is worth by Rocky Mountain Power. They recommend the City get someone reputable that can look at the items that will help with the systems appraisal such as net booking, net revenue, and

the City's negotiating price. Doug added he also likes to add in the systems replacement costs along with loss revenue.

There was discussion about how the power system is a very valuable asset and the citizens have paid for it over a long period of time so they have an investment in the system. Secondly, since the City is looking at the system in depth to dig a little deeper and look how the City wants to proceed if we continue to provide the power system.

Doug stated they could give recommendations for independent consultants or national firms to help the City through this process, but any reputable engineering firm would be sufficient.

Tony confirmed that if a consultant would be brought in they would not only be able to give the City a current value of the system but also look at what future upgrades and costs of the system would be.

UAMPS is making a recommendation this year for all cities to adopt the Municipal Tool Box which would provide three fundamental links: 1. Valuation of the City's system; 2. Provide a rate study; and 3. Have a strategic plan which would help cities form alliances to help each other out with lineman, inventory and power supply. They are hoping to have this available for its members by the end of March. It was reiterated that UAMPS is an asset to its members along with being an advocate for the City's best interests.

Tony expressed his concern with where power sources will come from in the future. There was discussion on different systems and what the future looks like including upcoming options, replacements and improvements.

Doug's reassured the members that UAMPS is here to help the City in any way they can.

Valley View Apartments
Final Approval

This development has been approved by the Planning Commission and sent to the Council for consideration of final approval. The members have been given the staff notes and plat map.

Tony gave a summary of the Morgan City Planning Staff Report. The Council, along with Mark Schmid (Public Works Director) and Mark Thayne discussed a few items in the development.

Resolution #16-05
300 East Street Improvement Project
Award Bid

This resolution would approve awarding the bid for the 300 East Street improvement project. This will widen the road next to the old Carrigan Motors business. The lowest bidder for this project was Skyview Excavating & Grading, Inc. in the amount of $122,464.86.

Mark Schmid, Public Works Director, went over the details of what this bid would include.

Resolution #16-06
2016 Street Maintenance Project
Award Bid

This resolution would approve awarding the bid for the 2016 street maintenance project. The members have a copy of the proposed resolution along with the bid information. The lowest bidder was Advanced Paving & Construction, Inc. The amount of their bid is $220,775.50. Mark Schmid discussed the repairs along with the alternate repairs that this bid would include.

Resolution #16-07
Weber River Pathway Reconstruction Project
Award Bid

This project was bid last year but was never completed, so it was put back out again to bid. In comparison last year's bid was actually a little higher than what the bid came in at this year.

This resolution would award the bid for the Weber River Pathway project. This project was originally awarded to Wilkinson's Construction but was never completed. The lowest bid for this project was from Skyview Excavation & Grading, Inc. The amount of the bid is $44,522.

Discussion on Resolution
Status of Sewer Capacity

There has been a lot of discussion the past several months regarding the capacity of the sewer lagoons. There have been some dredging and other improvements done to try to get this system back on line. The question that keeps being asked is what the capacity of the system is and how many more connection should be allowed.

Jamie Grandpre, Senior Wastewater Operator provided handouts and discussed the sampling data collected from 2014 through January 2016 concerning the sewer lagoon's status.

Jamie and the members discussed the ERU summary and the remaining capacity at the sewer lagoons. Jamie stated the City is very close to hitting the 80% designed capacity and once we hit that point we would need to move forward with a plan to start increasing ERU's in the system. Fran asked Jamie to expand on the slated 490 ERU's and where were they accounted for throughout the city.

Mayor Little brought up the question and concern from staff on how a situation should be handled if a new development is looking to come into the City. Bill addressed and discussed that if the City wants to see future development he would like to see concrete recommendations from the staff saying what needs to take place in order to support the future anticipated commitments and growth in Morgan City.

Attorney Crane addressed a statute called a concurrency ordinance, where the city doesn't have to allow new developments to move forward if the City cannot provide the utilities or the developer is not providing the utilities. Attorney Crane stated this should be addressed in a

resolution with a number specified while the City works towards its plan. This way the City would have a standard to follow outlined by the resolution.

Council members discussed impact fees and build out numbers along with subdivision approvals within the City.

Mayor Little asked Attorney Crane about wording for a resolution on potential new developments. Attorney Crane brought up discussion on how fast the City expects to have a solution and also what the limitation may include. It was also brought up the City is still waiting for the study to conclude so we have the information to move forward with a decision.

Attorney Crane stated many other cities are not doing much at the moment as they waiting to see if a bill on this issue will be passed at the Legislature. Attorney Crane expanded there is no science to back up what the government wants to impose and it seems to be more of an "Easterly" problem. He suggested the City wait until the Legislative session is over to see how it goes and how to best proceed.

Attorney Crane brought up a couple more questions asking how much it would cost to expand the system for additional capacity for new developments and how will monies be collected for it. With these two questions answered the City would be able to inform potential developers of the position the City is in.

Mark Schmid voiced his concern on still not having a definite answer to tell developers when they come in. He is asking for direction from the council to pass on to these developers. After more discussion it was decided the City doesn't have enough capacity to support new developments. Attorney Crane will draft a resolution to be adopted at the next meeting.

Industrial Zone Utility Placement
Review Proposal

This item was not discussed during the work session.

Council Department Review

Item not discussed.

Financial Statement Review

Item not discussed.

Attorney Crane
Council Training

Item not discussed.

This meeting was adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

_____
Stephanie Roos, Deputy Recorder

These minutes were approved at the _____meeting.

NOTICE OF MEETING TO BE HELD IN
PUBLIC AND CLOSED SESSION
OF THE MORGAN CITY COUNCIL

Pursuant to Utah Code, Title 52, Chapter 4, notice is hereby given to members of the Morgan City Council and to the general public that the Morgan City Council will hold a meeting in public and closed session on Tuesday, February 23, 2016 at 7:00 p.m., in the Council Room in the City Office at 90 West Young Street.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE, OPENING CEREMONY, APPROVAL OF MINUTES AND WARRANTS:

   1 set of warrants
   February 9, 2016 minutes

2. **PRESENTATIONS:**

3. **CONSENT ITEMS:** (These items will be discussed and voted as one item)

4. **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

5. **NEW BUSINESS:**

Resolution #16-08 – Municipal Wastewater Planning Program

Resolution #16-09 – Sanitary Sewer adequacy

Attorney Crane – training: open & public meetings, conflict of interest

6. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

7. **SPECIAL REPORTS**

8. **CITIZEN COMMENTS:**

9. **ADJOURN**

Notice is hereby given that:

- A work meeting will be held at 6:00 p.m., or at another time as posted to discuss miscellaneous matters.
- In the event of an absence of a full quorum, agenda items will be continued to the next regularly scheduled meeting.
- By motion of the Morgan City Council, pursuant to Title 52, Chapter 4 of the Utah Code, The City Council may vote to hold a closed meeting for any of the purposes identified in that chapter

In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations (including auxiliary communicative aids and services) during this meeting should notify Julie A. Bloxham, City Recorder, (801) 829-3461 at least 24 hours before the meeting.

This meeting may be held electronically to allow a member to participate.

Posted on 02-17-2016
8:00 a.m.
Julie A. Bloxham, Recorder

Council Meeting
02-09-2016

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD BY MORGAN CITY COUNCIL IN REGULAR SCHEDULED OPEN PUBLIC SESSION ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 9, 2016 AT 7:00 P.M., IN THE COUNCIL ROOM OF THE CITY OFFICE LOCATED AT 90 WEST YOUNG STREET

Present: Mayor, Ray W. Little.

Council Members: Tony London, Fran Hopkin and Bill Cobabe.

Excused: Members: Jeff Wardell and Mike Kendell; and Gary Crane, Attorney.

City Staff: Mark Schmid, Public Works Director.

Others present: Sally Jensen, Mark Thayne, Jennifer Vesper, and Ethan Vesper.

This meeting was called to order by Mayor, Ray W. Little.

The opening ceremony was presented by Bill Cobabe.

The pledge of allegiance was led by Tony London.

Minutes and Warrants

MOTION: Tony London moved to approve the January 26, 2016 minutes and two sets of warrants.

SECOND: Fran Hopkin. Vote: 3 ayes, Mike and Jeff not present.

New Business

Valley View Apartments
Final Approval

This development has been approved by the Planning Commission and sent to the Council for consideration of final approval. The members have been given the staff notes and plat map.

Tony London briefly discussed the summary of this development.

MOTION: Tony London moved to grant final approval for the Valley View Apartment development with the specific recommendations outlined by the planning commission.

SECOND: Fran Hopkin. Vote: 3 ayes, Mike and Jeff not present.

Resolution #16-05
300 East Street Improvement Project
Award Bid

This resolution will approve awarding the bid for the 300 East Street improvement project. This will widen the road next to the old Carrigan Motors business. The lowest bidder for this project was Skyview Excavating & Grading, Inc. in the amount of $122,464.86.

Mark Schmid confirmed the deadline for this project is June 15, 2016.

MOTION: Bill Cobabe moved to adopt Resolution #16-05, a resolution awarding the bid for the 300 East Street Improvement project to Skyview Excavating & Grading, Inc. in the amount of $122,464.86.

SECOND: Tony London.

ROLL CALL VOTE:
Bill Cobabe – aye
Mike Kendell – not present
Jeff Wardell – not present
Tony London – aye
Fran Hopkin – aye

Resolution #16-06
2016 Street Maintenance Project
Award Bid

This resolution will approve awarding the bid for the 2016 street maintenance project. The members have a copy of the proposed resolution along with the bid information. The lowest bidder was Advanced Paving & Construction, Inc. The amount of their bid is $220,775.50.

MOTION: Tony London moved to adopt Resolution #16-06, a resolution awarding the bid for the 2016 Street Maintenance Project to Advanced Paving & Construction, Inc. in the amount of $220,775.50.

SECOND: Bill Cobabe.

ROLL CALL VOTE:
Bill Cobabe – aye
Mike Kendell – not present
Jeff Wardell – not present
Tony London – aye
Fran Hopkin – aye

Resolution #16-07
Weber River Pathway Reconstruction Project
Award Bid

This resolution will award the bid for the Weber River Pathway project. This project was originally awarded to Wilkinson's Construction but was never completed. The lowest bid for this project was from Skyview Excavation & Grading, Inc. The amount of the bid is $44,522.

Tony London asked about completion timeframe on this project; Mark Schmid stated the deadline is June 1, 2016 and this project should take place May 1st through June 1st.

MOTION: Fran Hopkin moved to adopt Resolution #16-07, a resolution awarding the bid for the Weber River Pathway Reconstruction Project to Skyview Excavation & Grading, Inc., in the amount of $44,522.00.

SECOND: Tony London.

ROLL CALL VOTE:
Bill Cobabe – aye
Mike Kendell – not present
Jeff Wardell – not present
Tony London – aye
Fran Hopkin – aye

Unfinished Business

Industrial Zone Utility Placement Review Proposal

The Planning Commission is looking at the industrial park ordinances in regards to landscaping, etc. There has been a sketch provided by Public Works that shows what the placement of utilities would be within the easement, etc. in industrial zones. This is part of the city standards and does not need a motion – just informal approval of the members.

Mark Schmid, Public Works Director, discussed the requirements and standards for utility placement in industrial zones with the members. They also briefly talked about the landscaping requirements the Planning Commission is working on for the industrial zones.

The members agreed with Mark Schmid to proceed with the 70 ft right of way standard for industrial zones.

This meeting was adjourned at 7:45

_____
Stephanie Roos, Deputy Recorder

These minutes were approved at the _____meeting.

STATE OF UTAH

MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER PLANNING PROGRAM

SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT

FOR

MORGAN

2015

UTAH DEPARTMENT *of* ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

WATER QUALITY

Resolution Number 16-08

MUNICIPAL WASTEWATER PLANNING PROGRAM RESOLUTION

RESOLVED that ***MORGAN*** informs the Water Quality Board the following actions were taken by the ***CITY COUNCIL***

1. Reviewed the attached Municipal Wastewater Planning Program Report for 2015.

2. Have taken all appropriate actions necessary to maintain effluent requirements contained in the UPDES Permit (If Applicable).

Passed by a (majority) (unanimous) vote on

_____
(date)

_____ _____

Mayor/Chairman Attest: Recorder/Clerk

Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP)
Financial Evaluation Section

Owner Name: *MORGAN*

Name and Title of Financial Contact Person:

Jamie Grandpre

Senior Water Wastewater operator

Phone: 801 821 6324

E-mail: jgrandpre@qwestoffice.net

PLEASE SUBMIT TO STATE BY: March 1, 2016

Mail to: MWPP - Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Water Quality
195 North 1950 West
P.O. Box 144870
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4870
Phone : (801) 536-4300

NOTE: This questionnaire has been compiled for your benefit by a state sponsored task force comprised of representatives of local government and service districts. It is designed to assist you in making an evaluation of your wastewater system and financial planning. Please answer questions as accurately as possible to give you the best evaluation of your facility. If you need assistance please call, Marsha Case. Utah Division of Water Quality: (801) 536-4342.

I. Definitions: The following terms and definitions may help you complete the worksheets and questionnaire:

User Charge (UC) - A fee established for one or more class(es) of users of the wastewater treatment facilities that generate revenues to pay for costs of the system.

Operation and Maintenance Expense - Expenditures incurred for materials, labor, utilities, and other items necessary for managing and maintaining the facility to achieve or maintain the capacity and performance for which it was designed and constructed.

Repair and Replacement Cost - Expenditures incurred during the useful life of the treatment works for obtaining and installing equipment, accessories, and/or appurtenances necessary to maintain the existing capacity and the performance for which the facility was designed and constructed.

Capital Needs - Cost to construct, upgrade or improve the facility.

Capital Improvement Reserve Account - A reserve established to accumulate funds for construction and/or replacement of treatment facilities, collection lines or other capital improvement needs.

Reserve for Debt Service - A reserve for bond repayment as may be defined in accordance with terms of a bond indenture.

Current Debt Service - Interest and principal costs for debt payable this year.

Repair and Replacement Sinking Fund - A fund to accumulate funds for repairs and maintenance to fixed assets not normally included in operation expenses and for replacement costs (defined above).

Part I: OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE

Complete the following table:

Question	Points Earned	Total
Are revenues sufficient to cover operation, maintenance, and repair & replacement (OM&R) costs ***at this time***?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	0
Are the projected revenues sufficient to cover operation, maintenance, and repair & replacement (OM&R) costs for the ***next five years***?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	25
Does the facility have sufficient staff to ensure proper O&M?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	0
Has a dedicated sinking fund been established to provide for repair & replacement costs?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	25
Is the repair & replacement sinking fund adequate to meet anticipated needs?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	25
	TOTAL PART I =	100

Part II: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS

Complete the following table:

Question	Points Earned	Total
Are present revenues collected sufficient to cover all costs and provide funding for capital improvements?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	25
Are projected funding sources sufficient to cover all projected capital improvement costs for the ***next five years***?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	25
Are projected funding sources sufficient to cover all projected capital improvement costs for the ***next ten years***?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	25
Are projected funding sources sufficient to cover all projected capital improvement costs for the ***next twenty years***?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	25
Has a dedicated sinking fund been established to provide for future capital improvements?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	25
	TOTAL PART II =	125

Part III: GENERAL QUESTIONS

Complete the following table:

Question	Points Earned	Total
Is the wastewater treatment fund a separate enteprise fund/account or district?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	0
Are you collecting ***95%*** or more of your sewer billings?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	0
Is there a review, at least annually, of user fees?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	0
Are bond reserve requirements being met if applicable?	YES = 0 points NO = 25 points	0
	TOTAL PART III =	0

Part IV: PROJECTED NEEDS

Estimate as best you can the following:

Cost of projected capital improvements (in thousands)	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
	58	108	82	55	111

Point Summation

Fill in the values from Parts I through III in the blanks provided in column 1. Add the numbers to determine the MWPP point total that reflects your present financial position for meeting your wastewater needs.

Part	Points
I	100
II	125
III	0
Total	225

Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP)
Collection System Section

Owner Name: MORGAN

Name and Title of Contact Person:

Jamie Grandpre

Senior Water Wastewater Operator

Phone: 801 821 6324

E-mail: jgrandpre@qwestoffice.net

PLEASE SUBMIT TO STATE BY: March 1, 2016

Mail to: MWPP - Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Water Quality
195 North 1950 West
P.O. Box 144870
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4870
Phone : (801) 536-4300

Form completed by

Jamie Grandpre

Part I: SYSTEM AGE

A. What year was your collection system first constructed (approximately)?

Year 1970

B. What is the oldest part of your present system?

Oldest part 45 years

Part II: BYPASSES

A. Please complete the following table:

Question	Number	Points Earned	Total Points
How many days last year was there a bypass, overflow or basement flooding by untreated wastewater in the system due to rain or snowmelt?	0	0 times = 0 points 1 time = 5 points 2 times = 10 points 3 times = 15 points 4 times = 20 points 5 or more = 25 points	0
How many days last year was there a bypass, overflow or basement flooding by untreated wastewater due to **equipment failure?** (except plugged laterals)	0	0 times = 0 points 1 time = 5 points 2 times = 10 points 3 times = 15 points 4 times = 20 points 5 or more = 25 points	0
		TOTAL PART II =	0

B. The Utah Sewer Management Program defines sanitary sewer overflows into two classes. Below include the number of SSOs that occurred in 2015:

Number of Class 1 SSOs in Calendar year 2015 0

Number of Class 2 SSOs in Calendar year 2015 0

Class 1- a Significant SSO means a SSO or backup that is not caused by a private lateral obstruction or problem that:

(a) effects more than five private structures;
(b) affects one or more public, commercial or industrial structure(s);
(c) may result in a public health risk to the general public;
(d) has a spill volume that exceeds 5,000 gallons, excluding those in single private structures; or
(e) discharges to Waters of the state.

Class 2 – a Non-Significant SSO means a SSO or backup that is not caused by a private lateral obstruction or problem that does not meet the Class 1 SSO criteria.

C. Please specify whether the SSOs were caused a contract or tributary community, etc. N/A

Part III: NEW DEVELOPMENT

A. Please complete the following table:

Question	Points Earned	Total Points
Has an industry (or other development) moved into the community or expanded production in the past two years, such that either flow or wastewater loadings to the sewerage system were significantly increased (10 - 20%)?	No = 0 points Yes = 10 points	0
Are there any major new developments (industrial, commercial, or residential) anticipated in the next 2- 3 years, such that either flow or BOD_5 loadings to the sewerage system could significantly increase (25%)?	No = 0 points Yes = 10 points	0
	TOTAL PART III =	0

B. Approximate number of new residential sewer connections in the last year

8 new residential connections

C. Approximate number of new commercial/industrial connections in the last year

1 new commercial/industrial connections

D. Approximate number of new population serviced in the last year

20 new people served

Part IV: OPERATOR CERTIFICATION

A. How many collection system operators are currently employed by your facility?

2 collection system operators employed

B. What is/are the name(s) of your DRC operator(s)?

Jamie Grandpre

Chris Hansen

C. You are required to have the collection DRC operator(s) certified at ***Grade I***

What is the current grade of the DRC operator(s)? 4

D. State of Utah Administrative Rules require all operators considered to be in DRC to be appropriately certified. List all the operators in your system by their certification class.

Not Certified	
Small Lagoons	
Collection I	
Collection II	1
Collection III	
Collection IV	1

E. Please complete the following table:

Question	Points Earned	Total Points
Is/are your DRC operator(s) currently certified at the appropriate grade for this facility? (see C)	Yes = 0 points No = 50 points	0
How many continuing education units has each of the DRC operator(s) completed over the last 3 years?	3 or more = 0 points less than 3 = 10 points	0
	TOTAL PART IV =	0

Part V: FACILITY MAINTENANCE

A. Please complete the following table:

Question	Points Earned	Total Points
Do you follow an annual preventative maintenance program?	Yes = 0 points No = 30 points	0
Is it written?	Yes = 0 points No = 20 points	20
Do you have a written emergency response plan?	Yes = 0 points No = 20 points	20
Do you have an updated operations and maintenance manual	Yes = 0 points No = 20 points	20
Do you have a written safety plan?	Yes = 0 points No = 20 points	20
	TOTAL PART V =	80

Part VI: SSMP EVALUATION

A. Has your system completed its Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP)?

Yes _____ NO X

B. If the SSMP has been completed then has the SSMP been public noticed?

No _____ Yes, included date of public notice _____

C. Has the SSMP been approved by the permittee's governing body at a public meeting?

Yes _____ NO X

D. During the annual assessment of the operation and maintenance plan were any adjustments needed based on the performance of the plan?

No _____ If yes, what components of the plan were changed (i.e. line cleaning, CCTV inspections and manhole inspections and/or SSO events)

_____

_____

E. During 2015 was any part of the SSMP audited as part of the five year audit?

No _____

If yes, what part of the SSMP was audited and were changed made to the SSMP as a result of the audit? _____

N/A

F. Has your system completed its *System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan* (SECAP) as defined by the Utah Sewer Management Program?

Yes _____ NO X

The following are required completion dates that the SSMP and SECAP based on population. The SSMP and SECAP must be public noticed and approved by the permittee's governing body in order to be considered complete.

Program	Population				
	< 2,000	2,000 - 3,500	3,501 – 15,000	15,001 – 50,000	> 50,000
SSMP	3-31-16	3-31-16	9-30-15	3-31-15	9-30-14
SECAP	Optional	9-30-17	9-30-16	3-31-16	9-30-15

SSMP Signatory Requirement

I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system, or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.

Jamie E. Grandpre
Signature of Signatory Official

2/17/16
Date

Jamie E. Grandpre
Print Name of Signatory Official

Senior Water Wastewater Operator
Title

The signatory official is the person authorized to sign permit documents, per R317-8-3.4.

Part VII: SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION

This section should be with the system operators.

A. Describe the physical condition of the sewer collection system: (lift stations, etc. included)

Generally in good condition. There are a few low spots in the system that need to be cleaned every year. Having some minor deterioration of our older lift station.

B. What sewerage system improvements does the community have under consideration for the next 10 years?

Currently working on a sewer treatment facility master plan to see what facilities will need to be upgraded to keep up with new regulations.

C. Explain what problems, other than plugging have you experienced over the last year

Having some mechanical issues with our older lift station.

D. Is your community presently involved in formal planning for system expansion/upgrading? If so explain.

Yes. JUB is currently preparing a wastewater facility master plan.

E. Does the municipality/district pay for the continuing education expenses of operators?

ALWAYS X SOMETIMES _____ NO _____

If they do, what percentage is paid?

approximately _____ %

F. Is there a written policy regarding continuing education and training for wastewater operators?

YES _____ NO X

G. Any additional comments? (Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

POINT SUMMATION

Fill in the values from Parts II through V in the blanks provided in column 1. Add the numbers to determine the MWPP point total that your wastewater facility has generated for the past twelve months.

Part	Points
II	0
III	0
IV	0
V	80
Total	80

Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP)
Discharging Lagoon Facility Section

Owner Name: MORGAN

Name and Title of Contact Person:

Jamie Grandpre

Senior Water Wastewater Operator

Phone: 801 821 6324

E-mail: jgrandpre@qwestoffice.net

PLEASE SUBMIT TO STATE BY: March 1, 2016

Mail to: MWPP - Department of Environmental Quality
Division of Water Quality
195 North 1950 West
P.O. Box 144870
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-4870
Phone : (801) 536-4300

Form completed by

Jamie Grandpre

Part I: INFLUENT INFORMATION

A. Please update (if needed) the average design flow and average design BOD_5 and TSS loading for your facility.

	Average Design Flow (MGD)	Average Design BOD_5 Loading (lbs/day)	Average Design TSS Loading (lbs/day)
Design Criteria	.450	748	
90% of the Design Criteria	.405	673	

B. Please list the average monthly flows in millions of gallons per day (MGD) and BOD_5 and TSS loadings in milligrams per liter (mg/L) ***received*** at your facility during 2015. (Calculate the BOD_5 and TSS loadings in pounds per day (lbs/day).

Month	(1) Average Monthly Flow (MGD)	(2) Average Monthly BOD_5 Concentration (mg/L)	(3) Average BOD_5 Loading (lbs/day) 1	(4) Average Monthly TSS Concentration (mg/L)	(5) Average TSS Loading (lbs/day) 2
January	.156	197	256	184	239
February	.128	190	203	150	160
March	.124	234	242	162	168
April	.125	214	223	288	300
May	.145	186	225	320	387
June	.106	54	48	144	127
July	.222	218	404	76	141
August	.224	204	381	162	303
September	.240	205	410	70	140
October	.151	187	235	150	189
November	.253	177	373	90	190
December	.257	172	369	52	111
Average	.178	187	281	154	205

1 BOD_5 Loading (3) = Average Monthly Flow (1) x Average Monthly BOD_5 Concentration (2) x 8.34
2 TSS Loading (5) = Average Monthly Flow (1) x Average Monthly TSS Concentration (4) x 8.34

C. Refer to the information in A & B to determine a point value for your facility. Please enter the points for each question in the blank provided.

Question	Number	Points Earned	Total Points
How many times did the average monthly flow (Part B., Cdumn 1) to the wastewater facility exceed 90% of design flow?	0	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 10 points 3 - 4 = 20 points 5 or more = 30 points	0
How many times did the average monthly flow (Part B., Column 1) to the wastewater facility exceed the design flow?	0	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 20 points 3 - 4 = 40 points 5 or more = 60 points	0
How many times did the average monthly BOD_5 loading (Part B., Column 3) to the wastewater facility exceed 90% of the design loading?	0	0-1 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 10 points 3 - 4 = 20 points 5 or more = 30 points	0
How many times did the average monthly BOD_5 loading (Part B., Column 3) to the wastewater facility exceed the design loading?	0	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 20 points 3 - 5 = 40 points 5 or more = 60 points	0
		TOTAL PART I =	0

Part II: EFFLUENT INFORMATION

A. Please list the average monthly BOD_5, TSS, Ammonia (NH_3), monthly maximum Cl_2, minimum monthly DO, and 30-day geometric averages for Fecal and Total Coliform or E-Coli, produced by your facility during 2015.

Month	(1) BOD_5 (mg/L)	(2) TSS (mg/L)	(3) Fecal Coliform (#/100 mL)	(4) Total Coliform (#/100 mL)	(5) E-Coli	(6) Cl_2 (mg/L)	(7) DO (mg/L)	(8) NH_3 (mg/L)
	Whole Numbers Only					One Decimal Place Only		
January	10	25	—	—	3	0.1	11.0	24.1
February	9	24	—	—	10	0.1	11.2	25.9
March	17	29	—	—	3	0.1	11.4	26.8
April	11	28	—	—	0	0.1	9.4	24.9
May	14	46	—	—	0	0.1	6.3	0.
June	8	13	—	—	0	0.4	7.1	0.3
July	0	14	—	—	0	0.1	4.7	4.5
August	41	19	—	—	>2400	0	3.0	18.6
September	43	30	—	—	>2400	0	0.3	27.0
October	46	33	—	—	>2400	0	1.6	29.4
November	49	74	—	—	>2400	0	2.9	30.9
December	53	134	—	—	>2400	0	2.6	59.8
Average	25	39	—	—	1001	0.1	6.0	22.7

B. Please list the monthly average permit limits for the facility in the blanks below.

	BOD_5 ($CBOD_5$) (mg/L)	maximum Cl_2 (mg/L)	NH_3 (mg/L)	minimum DO (mg/L)
Monthly Permit Limit	45	Winter .34 Spring .57 Summer 4.7 Fall .15	N/A	5.0
80% of the Permit Limit	36	Winter .27 Spring .46 Summer 3.8 Fall .12	N/A	4.0

C. Refer to the information in A & B and your operating reports to determine a point values for your facility.

Question	Number	Points Earned	Total Points
How many months did the effluent BOD_5 ($CBOD_5$) exceed 80% of monthly permit limit?	5	0 -1 = 0 points 2 = 5 points 3 = 10 points 4 = 15 points 5 or more = 20 points	20
How many months did the effluent BOD_5 ($CBOD_5$) exceed the monthly permit limits?	3	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 10 points 3 or more = 20 points	20
How many months did the effluent TSS exceed 20 mg/L?	9	0 -1 = 0 points 2 = 5 points 3 = 10 points 4 = 15 points 5 or more = 20 points	20
How many months did the effluent TSS exceed 25 mg/L?	7	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 10 points 3 or more = 20 points	20
How many times did the Cl_2 exceed permit limit?	0	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 15 points 3 or more = 30 points	0
How many times did the NH_3 exceed permit limits?	0	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 15 points 3 or more = 30 points	0
How many times did the DO not meet permit limit?	6	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 15 points 3 or more = 30 points	30
How many months did the 30-day fecal coliform exceed 200 #/100 mL?	0	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 10 points 3 or more = 20 points	0
How many months did the 30-day total coliform exceed 2,000 #/100 mL?	0	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 10 points 3 or more = 20 points	0
How many months did the 30-day E-coli exceed 126 #/100 mL?	5	0 = 0 points 1 - 2 = 20 points 3 or more = 40 points	40
		TOTAL PART II =	150

Part III: FACILITY AGE

In what year were the following process units constructed or underwent a major upgrade? To determine a point score subtract the construction or upgrade year from 2015.

Points = Age = Present Year - Construction or Upgrade Year.

Enter the calculated age below.

If the point total exceeds 20 points, enter only 20 points

Unit Process	Present Year	Construction or Upgrade Year	Age = Points
Headworks	2015	1988 + 2011	4
Lagoons (including aeration)	2015	2001	9
Disinfection	2015	1988	26
		TOTAL PART III (not greater than 20) =	20

Part IV: BYPASSES

Please complete the following table:

Question	Number	Points Earned	Total Points
How many days in the past year was there a bypass or overflow of untreated wastewater due to high flows?	0	0 = 0 points 1 = 5 points 2 = 10 points 3 = 15 points 4 = 20 points 5 or more = 25 points	0
How many days in the last year was there a bypass or overflow of untreated wastewater due to equipment failure?	0	0 = 0 points 1 = 5 points 2 = 10 points 3 = 15 points 4 = 20 points 5 or more = 25 points	0
		TOTAL PART IV =	0

Part V: NEW DEVELOPMENT

A. Please complete the following table:

Question	Points Earned	Total Points
Has an industry (or other development) moved into the community or expanded production in the past two years, such that either flow or wastewater loadings to the sewerage system were significantly increased (10 - 20%)?	No = 0 points Yes = 10 points	0
Are there any major new developments (industrial, commercial, or residential) anticipated in the next 2- 3 years, such that either flow or BOD_5 loadings to the sewerage system could significantly increase (25%)?	No = 0 points Yes = 10 points	0
Have you experienced any upset due to septage haulers?	No = 0 points Yes = 10 points	0
	TOTAL PART VI =	0

B. Approximate number of new residential sewer connections in the last year

8 new residential connections

C. Approximate number of new commercial/industrial connections in the last year

1 new commercial/industrial connections

D. Approximate number of new population serviced in the last year

20 new people served

Part VI: OPERATOR CERTIFICATION

A. How many treatment system operators are currently employed by your facility?

__1__ treatment system operators employed

B. What is/are the name(s) of your DRC operator(s)?

Jamie Grandpre

C. You are required to have the DRC operator(s) certified at ***GRADE II.***

What is the current grade of the DRC operator(s)? __II__

D. State of Utah Administrative Rules require all operators considered to be in DRC to be appropriately certified. List all the operators in your system by their certification class.

Not Certified	
Small Lagoons	
Treatment I	
Treatment II	1
Treatment III	
Treatment IV	

E. Please complete the following table:

Question	Points Earned	Total Points
Is/are your DRC operator(s) currently certified at the appropriate grade for this facility? (see C)	Yes = 0 points No = 50 points	0
How many continuing education units has each of the DRC operator(s) completed over the last 3 years?	3 or more = 0 points less than 3 = 10 points	0
	TOTAL PART VII =	0

Part VII: FACILITY MAINTENANCE

A. Please complete the following table:

Question	Points Earned	Total Points
Do you follow an annual preventative maintenance program?	Yes = 0 points No = 30 points	0
Is it written?	Yes = 0 points No = 20 points	20
Do you have a written emergency response plan?	Yes = 0 points No = 20 points	20
Do you have an updated operations and maintenance manual	Yes = 0 points No = 20 points	20
Do you have a written safety plan?	Yes = 0 points No = 20 points	20
	TOTAL PART VIII =	80

Part VIII: SUBJECTIVE EVALUATION

This section should be completed with the facility operators.

A. Do you consider your wastewater facility to be in good physical and structural condition?

YES X NO _____

If NOT, why?

B. What improvements do you think the plant will need in the next 5 years?

Updates due to new regulations that are Coming.

C. Where there any backups into basements at any point in the collection system in 2015.

YES _____ NO __X__

Why? (do not include backups due to clogged laterals)

_____

_____

_____

D. Does the municipality/district pay for the continuing education expenses of operators?

ALWAYS __X__ SOMETIMES _____ NO _____

If so, what percentage do they pay?

approximately _____ %

E. Is there a written policy regarding continuing education and training for wastewater operators?

YES _____ NO __X__

F. Have you done any major repairs or mechanical equipment replacement in 2015? (do not include construction or upgrade projects)

YES __X__ NO _____

G. What was the approximate cost for those repairs or replacements?

$ 139,950.00

Point Summation

Fill in the values from Parts I through VII in the blanks provided in column 1. Add the numbers to determine the MWPP point total that your wastewater facility has generated for the past twelve months.

Part	Points
I	0
II	150
III	20
IV	0
V	0
VI	0
VII	80
Total	250

H. Any additional comments? (Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Approximately July / August 2015 we started noticing issues with effluent water quality. After some additional testing we determined that pond #1 had went septic and that pond #2 was starting to show signs as well. We constructed pond #6 to be used as a sludge holding pond and had sludge dredged from pond #1 into pond #6. in Nov / Dec of 2015. We will dredge sludge from pond #2 in the spring of 2016.

RESOLUTION #16-09

A RESOLUTION SETTING FORTH A SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY FOR MORGAN CITY BASED UPON THE ADEQUACY OF SANITARY SEWER FACILITES IN MORGAN CITY

WHEREAS, the Morgan City (hereafter, the City) Sanitary Sewer Department has presented to the City Council, information and data indicating that the current sanitary sewer facilities for the City have a limited capacity, without further expansion, that will allow for only limited development in the future, until new facility improvements are constructed that will accommodate additional development; and

WHEREAS, Morgan City currently has in place an ordinance Section 8-7-1 that states:

8-7-1: SUFFICIENT INFRASTRUCTURE FOR PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:

No development, nor permit for development, shall be granted, approved or issued unless the necessary public facilities in the applicable area have been determined to exist and have adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed development at the adopted level of service standard, and are available or are to be available when the development occurs. The applicable area includes all facilities that directly or indirectly deliver the services to or are impacted by the proposed development. Such a determination is to be made by the city engineer, using the accepted methods and measurements of the profession.

and

WHEREAS, the City has determined that it has limited capacity to service those subdivisions and development that are, by approval or contract, currently in the process of development, but that development beyond those approved projects, will not have adequate sanitary sewer service to allow for future applications to move forward except in very limited circumstances; and

WHEREAS, a list of the projects that are currently in the system either by permit or contract with the City is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference; and

WHEREAS, any development beyond those contained in the attached list will be prohibited from moving forward unless the development is able to provide the necessary increase in sanitary sewer facilities necessary to provide for the development; and

WHEREAS, the City is in the process of producing a new capital facilities plan for sanitary sewer facilities that will provided for the future sanitary sewer needs of the City and will implement that plan, along with a corresponding impact fee plan to provided for future development; and

WHEREAS, the City may consider applications for small development on existing parcels of property outside of the list of existing projects to see if adequate sanitary sewer capacity exists to serve those projects. However, the determination of the City

Sewer Facilities Manager and the City Engineer on the matter of whether capacity exists, shall be final; and

WHEREAS, no further annexation petitions will be considered until such time as facilities are adequate to service the annexed area or if the developer of the annexing area agrees to provided the additional sanitary sewer capacity for the City to provide for the impact of the proposed development; and

WHEREAS, all other provisions of City ordinances and regulations shall continue in full force and effect, including the provision prohibiting development without the ability to hook up to sanitary sewer; and

WHEREAS, it is deemed to be in the best interest of the health and safety of the Citizens of Morgan City to adopt and approve this resolution.

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

1. That, pursuant to Morgan City Ordinance Section 8-7-1, the approval of any further development in Morgan City be restricted to only those developments that have been approved by permit or by existing agreement with the City, prior to the date of this resolution and as indicated on the list of developments which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference (Exhibit "A").

2. That, there may be an exception granted only to existing lots and parcels only where the City Sanitary Sewer Manager and City Engineer agree that capacity exists to service the limited development. Those developments that provide new capacity to meet the needs and requirements of the proposed developments for the provision of sanitary sewer facilities as approved by the City Sanitary Sewer Manager and City Engineer may also be permitted to proceed forward with approval.

3. That any future annexation petition shall be denied until adequate capacity exists to service the proposed project.

4. That staff be instructed to complete the Sanitary Sewer Facilities Study and implement a plan for the expansion and improvement of the City's Sanitary Sewer Facilities expeditiously to be able to accommodate new growth.

5. That the terms of this resolution shall be in full force and effect from the date hereof, until rescinded by the City Council by a like Resolution.

6. The Mayor is authorized to execute this Resolution.

Dated this 23rd day of February, 2016.

_____
Ray W. Little, Mayor

ATTEST:

_____
Julie A. Bloxham, Recorder

CITY SEAL:

Exhibit "A"

ERU List

	Units	ERUS	
180 E 125 N - 2 ea - 12 plex apartments - Jon Cannon	24	14.4	
Quail Hollow - 4 Lots - 2 ea Twin Homes	4	4	
Mahogany Ridge Phase 3 - 14 Lots	14	14	
NAPA - New Store	1	1	
Wildflower - 1 Lot	1	1	
Red Rock - 1 Lot	1	1	
300 E - Jon Cannon	3	3	
200 W - Pentz Sub	2	2	
Deer Hollow - 2 Lots	2	2	
Mahogany Ridge Phase 1 - 1 Lot	1	1	
Wasatch Shadows - 3 Lots	3	3	
493 N 700 E - New Home	1	1	
27 S 300 W - Vacant Lot	1	1	
366 W Island Rd - Vacant Lot	1	1	
Mountain View Estates - 5 Lots	5	5	
125 N Commercial St - Vacant Lot	1	1	
Valley Vista Apartments	180	115	Approx
Current Count - Can be or will be added		**170.4**	

SID - Mahogany Ridge		
Mahogany Future Phases 4 and 5	37	
Quail Hollow Phase 2 and 3	45	
Valley View Estates Future	31	Valley Vista Apartments
Mountain View Estates Phase 1	5	5 lot subdivision - Mountain Vista
Mountain View Estates Future	49	
Commercial Site	12	
Senior Condos	35	
Senior Condos	60	
Future Residential	70	
Future Residential	12	
Valley View Estates Phase 1	23	Valley Vista Apartments

As per the Site Overall and Density Map, Mount Joy LLC

Adjusted ERU Count **490.4**