

MORGAN CITY

**Electronic
Council Meeting**

02-09-21

6:00 p.m.



**CITY COUNCIL ELECTRONIC MEETING AGENDA
FEBRUARY 9, 2021 – 6:00 P.M.
MORGAN, UTAH**

PUBLIC INVITED TO ATTEND BY:

Click the link to join the electronic meeting: **Registration Required before 5:00 p.m. on the day of the meeting.**
<https://us02web.zoom.us/join/tZAvdeChrjIoG9LI05Qubt8p4m8U5UzZKo6N>

Or by YouTube recording on morgancityut.org

Pursuant to Utah Code Section 52-4-207(4) and a written declaration by Mayor Ray W. Little, the regularly scheduled public meetings will be held electronically until further notice. No physical meeting location will be available.

Members of the public may participate in the Citizen Comment portion of the agenda by:

Email: dwoods@morgancityut.org

Subject Line: Must include the date of the meeting and designate "Citizen Comment."

Email Body: Must include First and Last Name and Address and a brief statement (reference agenda item # if applicable).

Comments must be received before 5:00 p.m. on the day of the City Council Meeting

WELCOME – CALL MEETING TO ORDER: Mayor Ray W. Little

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND OPENING CEREMONY

CONSENT AGENDA:

1. Discussion and/or Action to Consider Approval of the Following:
 - a. City Council Electronic Meeting Minutes – January 26, 2021; and
 - b. Warrants.

VERBAL PRESENTATIONS:

2. COVID-19 Update – Weber Morgan Health Department
3. Ebert Solutions – Morgan County Economic & Tourism Development

Presentation – James Ebert, Economic and Community Development Director
Anissa L.E. Brown, Tourism and Recreation Development Director

ACTIVE AGENDA:

4. Public Comments (Time has been set aside for the public to express their ideas, concerns, and comments. Comments are limited to 3 minutes per person with a total of 30 minutes for this item. Open Comment Cards are available on the City's website, morgancityut.org, and are to be filled out and submitted to the City Recorder prior to the meeting.)
5. Resolution 21-05 – Support of State of Utah and the Department of Transportation to Fund both the Environmental Study and Interchange on I-84 Connecting Trappers Loop
6. Resolution 21-06 – Approval of the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP) Annual Report – 2020
7. City Reports and Business:
 - a. City Manager
 - Dog Issue in Cemeteries
 - Transfer Station – Free Voucher 2021

b. Mayor and Council

8. Adjournment

The Council at its discretion may rearrange the order of any item(s) on the agenda. In compliance with the American with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodation (including auxiliary communicative aids and service) during the meeting should notify Denise Woods, City Recorder, at (801) 829-3461 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting. This meeting may be held electronically to allow a member to participate.

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.

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.

The undersigned, duly appointed City Recorder does hereby certify that the above notice and agenda was posted within the Morgan City limits on this 5th day of February, 2021 at Morgan City Hall, on the Utah State Public Notice Website, at morgancityut.org, and three public places within the City. The 2021 meeting schedule was also published in the Morgan County News on December 18, 2020.

**MINUTES OF MORGAN CITY
COUNCIL MEETING**

January 26, 2021; 6:01 P.M.

MAYOR AND COUNCILMEMBERS

PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY:

**Mayor Ray W. Little, Tony London, Jeff Wardell,
Eric Turner, Jeffery Richins, and Dave Alexander**

STAFF PRESENT ELECTRONICALLY:

**Ty Bailey, City Manager; Gary Crane, City Attorney;
and Denise Woods**

OTHERS PRESENT:

**Ryan Nye, Olivia Rees, The Morgan News, Julie
Bjornstad, Wasatch Front Regional Council, and
Anissa Brown and James Ebert, Ebert Solutions,**

**Planning Commission Members: Nathan McClellan,
Jim Brown, Wes Woods, Jay Ackett, Dan Dickson,
Justin Rees, Mark Francis, Lance Prescott and Teresa
Shope**

This meeting was held in the Council Conference Room of the Morgan City Offices, 90 West Young Street, Morgan, Utah.

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

The pledge of allegiance was led by Ty Bailey, City Manager.

The opening ceremony was presented by Councilmember Richins.

MINUTES AND WARRANTS

MOTION: Councilmember Alexander moved to approve the following:
Minutes of the City Council Electronic Meeting – January 12, 2021; and
Warrants.

SECOND: Councilmember London

The vote was unanimous to approve the minutes as written and one set of warrants.

CITIZEN COMMENTS

No requests were received for citizen comments.

NEW BUSINESS

**ANNUAL TRAINING (COMBINED CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION) –
CONFLICT OF INTEREST, SEXUAL HARASSMENT, AND OPEN AND PUBLIC MEETINGS
ACT – GARY CRANE, CITY ATTORNEY**

Gary Crane, City Attorney, provided the required annual training to the City Council and the Planning Commission regarding Conflict of Interest, Sexual Harassment and Open and Public Meetings Act. All members of the City Council and Planning Commission were in attendance.

Councilmember Richins left the meeting at 7:15 p.m.

FINAL APPROVAL – RYNELL BUSINESS PARK AMENDED PLAT NO. 4

Councilmember London explained this item was discussed at the Planning Commission. He stated the proposed plat amendment divided the existing parcel into two separate parcels and the applicant intended to build a three-unit industrial flex building on the smaller of the two lots. The property was located on Industrial Road and consisted of 1.76 acres. The proposed lots consisted of 56,709 square feet and 20,248 square feet, respectively. The M-D zone did not have a minimum lot area size or minimum frontage requirements. He stated the plat amendment complied with the physical development standards as outlined in Chapter 11.02 and 11.06 of the Morgan City Code. The setbacks, maximum lot coverage, landscaping, and height requirements for the proposed building would be addressed with the applicant through the site plan review process. He stated the Planning Commission voted unanimously on January 19, 2021 to recommend the Council approve the plat amendment for Rynell Business Park and Staff supported the recommendation.

MOTION: Councilmember London moved to grant final approval of the Rynell Business Park Amended Plat No. 4.

SECOND: Councilmember Wardell

Discussion on the Motion: None

ROLL CALL VOTE: Dave Alexander – aye
Jeffery Richins – absent
Jeff Wardell – aye
Tony London – aye
Eric Turner – aye

Vote was 4 ayes; Motion passed unanimously to grant final approval of the Rynell Business Park Amended Plat No. 4; Councilmember Richins was absent.

FRAUD RISK ASSESSMENT

Denise Woods, City Recorder, explained the State Auditor's Office required the City to complete a Fraud Risk Assessment Questionnaire each year. Question No. 5 on the assessment asked if all the members of the governing body had completed entity specific online training. The training needed to be completed within four years of term appointment/election date. Instructions were given to the Council members to complete the online training.

EBERT SOLUTIONS – MORGAN COUNTY ECONOMIC & TOURISM DEVELOPMENT

- A. Introduction** – Ty Bailey, introduced James Ebert and Anissa Brown with Ebert Solutions. Morgan County had established a CED Board (County Economic Development Board) and the State had given the Board discretion over an Economic Development Grant. The Board had entered into an economic development contract with Ebert Solutions to assist with economic development throughout the County.
- B. Presentation** – James Ebert, Economic and Community Development Director, and Anissa L.E. Brown, Tourism and Recreation Development Director.

James Ebert expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to speak to the Council. He introduced Anissa Brown who had approximately 20 years of experience in the outdoor recreation market, destination development, and hoteliers. He stated they looked at Morgan County as an entire landmark with Morgan City as a jewel in the middle and there was tremendous value and opportunity within the City. He stated their team would be the community connection point. He stated there would be several phases they would go through and the first two had to do with evaluating the County and figuring out an executable strategy. He stated they wanted to address the anticipated growth and still keep the heritage and the rural open space feel of Morgan. The following were crucial areas:

- Private developments and how they impact the tax structure but have a very little demand on services.
- Commercial growth and retail growth were challenging because a large percentage of your revenues are through sales tax.
- Tourism and outdoor recreations.

He stated they had been working with Scott Parkinson at the hotel and assisting him with his daily room sales and a process of working on marketing and how to package the rooms with other opportunities within the community. They were also working with individuals on the possibility of some restaurants. The City didn't receive a lot of dollars from the Transient Room Tax (TRT), but they wanted to work to get those dollars up to where it was something the City could put in the budget and rely on. He stated they wanted to help the County and City in their destination management. He said tourism or outdoor recreation opportunities helped build amenities within the community, i.e. walking paths, making areas along the river accessible, etc. They wanted to reconnect the County to the City in a positive manner.

Councilmember London mentioned packaging the hotel with the golf course or running the river for a day or two so people would come to Morgan.

James said usually it was the destination marketing companies (DMC) such as travel agencies, who would work directly with vendors within the community. He said they would be looking at building out infrastructure so people would have places to go fishing or hunting with outfitters, bike paths or mountain biking, and marketing Morgan as a destination for outdoor recreation. They would identify areas where there could be snowmobile pullouts and unload zones and work with landowners to purchase property. He said they wanted to create an experience for people to capture the amazing environment that the County and City had to offer, i.e. have dinner, and then walk along the river.

RESOLUTION 21-05 – MORGAN CITY'S SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGEMENT TO STATE OF UTAH AND THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO FUND BOTH THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY (EIS) AND THE EVENTUAL CONSTRUCTION OF INTERCHANGE ON I-84 CONNECTING TRAPPERS LOOP

Mayor explained this resolution showed support to the County for the Environmental Impact Study (EIS) and construction of the interchange on I-84 connecting to Trappers Loop. Ebert Solution would be working towards this project.

Councilmember Alexander asked if there would be a cost associated with this resolution.

Mayor explained not with this resolution, it was merely in support of the project. He said the funding at this point would come from the state.

Ty stated he attended the CED Board meetings and this project had been on the County's economic development plan for quite some time, but they had not been unanimous on the support for the interchange. In the CED meeting they discussed the benefit of showing a united front from our elected officials. The City's position was it wasn't a City project and probably wouldn't contribute money to the project, but hoped the current commission and our City Council, the only incorporated city in the County, could show a united front through a resolution so James and Anissa could use it as a tool as they worked with UDOT and the State Legislature to do what they could to make the project a reality at some point.

MOTION: Councilmember Turner moved to table Resolution 21-05 to next regular scheduled City Council meeting on February 9, 2021.

SECOND: Councilmember London

Discussion on the Motion: Councilmember London asked if it gave James and Anissa the time necessary to meet with the COG and the County Commissioners.

James said it gave him plenty of time to address the COG and the County Council and bring back support from both of those bodies. He offered to present more information to the City Council at the next meeting regarding the interstate and the absorption rates of the Mountain Green Town Center.

ROLL CALL VOTE: Dave Alexander – aye
Jeffery Richins – absent
Jeff Wardell – aye
Tony London – aye
Eric Turner – aye

Vote was 4 ayes; Motion passed unanimously to table Resolution 21-05 to next regular scheduled City Council meeting on February 9, 2021.

CITY REPORTS AND BUSINESS:

A. CITY MANAGER

WINDSTORM DECLARATION – Ty explained the windstorm had been declared a federal disaster which meant the City qualified for public assistance. He said we would be going through the process to get the City reimbursed for as much of our expenses as possible. He stated the amount would be contingent on whatever the City could document.

LETTER OF THANKS – Ty said the City received a Thank You letter from a citizen. The letter was for a development review meeting we had. The City began having these meetings about a year ago. City staff has a meeting one a month so that people with development ideas or subdivision requests had the opportunity to meet with the City Staff, i.e. City engineer, planner, building official, water supervisor, sewer supervisor, road superintendent, City Manager and Planning and Zoning secretary. The staff reviewed whatever was proposed and had a discussion with the applicant. He expressed his appreciation to the group and the way they handled themselves in helping people understand the process without just shutting them down.

FRAUD RISK ASSESSMENT – This item was discussed earlier in the meeting.

SEWER LAGOON PROJECT – AERATION TREATMENT SYSTEM

Ty clarified for the Council the amount in the motion for Resolution 20-30 had an exact dollar amount mentioned. The amount of the bid needed to be changed because the bid did not include an amount for bonding, so the amount of the bid increased by \$3,800 and he had approved the change to the Notice of Award. He explained it wouldn't change the bid tabulations or who the project would be awarded to.

Gary explained the Resolution was drafted so the City Manager could negotiate these types of things. He explained it was still under the lowest responsive responsible bid. If the change orders were significant it could be brought back to the Council for approval, but it would be up to the Council.

Discussion on whether or not change orders needed to be brought back to the Council. Ty would continue to keep the Council informed as changes orders happened. The Councilmembers agreed to have Ty keep them informed on significant change orders.

VEHICLE SURPLUS

Ty explained the first truck was listed on KSL yesterday and was sold. It was listed at the top trade-out value and was sold for that amount.

Gary gave a legislative update – H.B. 98 was a bill he was working on particularly hard along with the League. The Bill eliminated building inspection and plan review by the cities and counties and turned it over to the developer. He said at the election of the developer no more building permit fees would be paid if the developer decided he wanted to go ahead and do his own thing. He said it was a bad idea from beginning and end. The bill also restricted any type of restriction the City may impose on design standards so anything like pitch of the roof and product on the outside of homes couldn't be imposed. He said it was a very pressing issue. Another bill was regarding billboards and they wanted to light up every billboard in the state. It didn't matter where the billboard was it would become electronic. He stated one of the difficult things about this bill was when the billboards became electronic they became five to six times as expensive to purchase so if you decided you want to do a redevelopment project on a particular site there was no way you can get the billboard removed because of the fact they turn digital. Other bills he mentioned were: A bill requiring a water board to discuss water issues within a jurisdiction and no longer needed a concealed carry permit over the age of 21.

This meeting was adjourned at 8:32 p.m.

Denise Woods, City Recorder

These minutes were approved at the February 9, 2021 meeting.

RESOLUTION 21-05

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT AND ENCOURAGEMENT TO THE STATE OF UTAH AND THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION TO FUND BOTH THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY (EIS) AND THE EVENTUAL CONSTRUCTION OF AN INTERCHANGE ON I-84 CONNECTING TRAPPERS LOOP.

WHEREAS, transportation infrastructure is a catalyst to commercial and residential growth; and

WHEREAS, Morgan County and its associated towns and cities are heavily reliant on both property taxes and sales tax to provided critical services; and

WHEREAS, sales and tourism taxes paid by visitors offset the tax burden for residents; and

WHEREAS, presently there is a need for a town center to serve the residents of Peterson and Mountain Green; and

WHEREAS, an interchange connecting I-84 to Trappers Loop would increase the viability of a Mountain Green town center and create increased sales tax, property values and transient room taxes; and

WHEREAS, property owners and developers are presently prepared to invest heavily in developing the land adjacent to the proposed interchange; and

WHEREAS, construction of an interchange is a proactive approach to future transportation, economic development and access to opportunity needs which are priorities to Wasatch Front Regional Council and the State of Utah.

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

1. The Morgan City Council supports and encourages both the State of Utah and the Department of Transportation in the process of funding both the Environmental Impact Study and eventual construction of an interchange on I-84 connecting to Trappers Loop.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Morgan, Utah, this 9th day of February, 2021.

RAY W. LITTLE, Mayor

ATTEST:

DENISE WOODS, City Recorder

CITY COUNCIL VOTE AS RECORDED:

	Aye	Nay	Excused
Councilmember London	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Wardell	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Turner	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Richins	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Alexander	_____	_____	_____

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

Mayor Little

RESOLUTION 21-06

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING AND APPROVING THE MUNICIPAL
WASTEWATER PLANNING PROGRAM (MWPP) ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE
YEAR ENDING 2020.**

WHEREAS, Morgan City is a political subdivision of the State of Utah, authorized and organized under the provisions of Utah Law; and

WHEREAS, Morgan City owns or operates a Wastewater Treatment Facility; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Utah Administrative Code Annotated R317, Morgan City is required to submit the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP) Annual Report for the year ending 2020, if financial assistance was received from the Water Quality Board; and

WHEREAS, the MWPP was approved by the Morgan City Council at a public meeting held on February 9, 2021, where the MWPP was listed on the agenda as an item for approval by Resolution 21-06; and

WHEREAS, the City Council of Morgan City has determined that the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP) Annual Report for the year ending 2020, dated February 9, 2021, is hereby adopted and approved.

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

1. That the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP) Annual Report for the year ending 2020, dated February 9, 2021, which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, be adopted and approved.
2. That Morgan City has taken all appropriate actions necessary to maintain effluent requirements contained in the UPDES Permit (if applicable).
3. That a copy of the Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP) Annual Report for the year ending 2020 be available to the public at the City office and posted on the State Website under the agenda for the Council meeting held on Tuesday, February 9, 2021.

PASSED AND ADOPTED by the City Council of Morgan, Utah, this 9th day of February, 2021.

RAY W. LITTLE, Mayor

ATTEST:

DENISE WOODS, City Recorder

CITY COUNCIL VOTE AS RECORDED:

	Aye	Nay	Excused
Councilmember London	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Wardell	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Turner	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Richins	_____	_____	_____
Councilmember Alexander	_____	_____	_____

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

Mayor Little	_____	_____
--------------	-------	-------

Municipal Wastewater Planning Program (MWPP)
Annual Report
for the year ending 2020
MORGAN CITY

Thank you for submitting your response!

Please download a copy of your form by clicking "Download PDF" below.

Below is a summary of your responses

[Download PDF](#)

SUBMIT BY APRIL 15, 2021

Are you the person responsible for completing this report for your organization?

☒ **Yes**

☐ **No**

This is the current information recorded for your facility:

Facility Name:	MORGAN CITY
Contact - First Name:	Kale
Contact - Last Name:	Watkins
Contact - Title	Water and Wastewater Supervisor
Contact - Phone:	801-829-3461

Contact - Email:

kwatkins@morgancityut.org

Is this information above complete and correct?

☒ **Yes**

☐ **No**

Please enter in the correct information

WARNING: If you change Facility Name, you will no longer have access to this form upon clicking Save & Continue. DWQ will resend link with updated Facility Name to person indicated below.

Facility Name

MORGAN CITY

Contact - First Name

Kale

Contact - Last
Name

Watkins

Contact Person's Title

Wastewater Supervisor

Phone

801-829-3461

Email

kwatkins@morgancityut.org

Your wastewater system is described as Collection, Discharging Lagoon & Financial:

Classification: COLLECTION

Grade: II

(if applicable)

Classification: TREATMENT

Grade: II

Is this correct?

WARNING: If you select 'no', you will no longer have access to this form upon clicking Save & Continue. DWQ will update the information and contact you again.

☒ Yes

☐ No

Click on a link below to view examples of sections in the survey:

(Your wastewater system is described as Collection, Discharging Lagoon & Financial)

[MWPP Collection System.pdf](#)

[MWPP Discharging Lagoon.pdf](#)

[MWPP Financial Evaluation.pdf](#)

[MWPP Mechanical Plant.pdf](#)

[MWPP Non-Discharging Lagoon.pdf](#)

Will multiple people be required to fill out this form?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Financial Evaluation Section

Form completed by:

kale watkins

Part I: GENERAL QUESTIONS

Yes

No

Are sewer revenues maintained in a dedicated purpose enterprise/district account?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Are you collecting 95% or more of your anticipated sewer revenue?

Yes

☒

No

☐

Are Debt Service Reserve Fund⁶ requirements being met?

☒☐

What was the annual average User Charge¹⁶ for 2020?

719.04

Do you have a water and/or sewer customer assistance program * (CAP)?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Part II: OPERATING REVENUES AND RESERVES

Are property taxes or other assessments applied to the sewer systems¹⁵?

Yes

☐

No

☒

Are sewer revenues¹⁴ sufficient to cover operations & maintenance costs⁹, and repair & replacement costs¹² (OM&R) at this time?

Yes

☒

No

☐

replacement costs (OM&R) at this time:

Yes

No

Are projected sewer revenues sufficient to cover OM&R costs for the **next five years**?

☒☐

Does the sewer system have sufficient staff to provide proper OM&R?

☒☐

Has a repair and replacement sinking fund¹³ been established for the sewer system?

☐☒

Is the repair & replacement sinking fund sufficient to meet anticipated needs?

☐☒

Part III: CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS REVENUES AND RESERVES

Yes

No

Are sewer revenues sufficient to cover all costs of current capital improvements³ projects?

☐☒

Has a Capital Improvements Reserve Fund⁴ been established to provide for anticipated capital improvement projects?

☐☒

Are projected Capital Improvements Reserve Funds sufficient for the **next five years**?

☐☒

Are projected Capital Improvements Reserve Funds sufficient for the **next ten years**?

☐☒

Are projected Capital Improvements Reserve Funds sufficient for the **next twenty years**?

☐☒

Part IV: FISCAL SUSTAINABILITY REVIEW

Yes

No

Have you completed a Rate Study¹¹ within the last five years?

☒☐

Do you charge Impact fees⁸²

☒☐

Do you charge impact fees?

☒ Yes

☐ No

2020 Impact Fee (if not a flat fee, use average of all collected fees) =

1576.84

Yes

No

Have you completed an Impact Fee Study in accordance with UCA 11-36a-3 within the last five years?

☒

☐

Do you maintain a Plan of Operations¹⁰?

☒

☐

Have you updated your Capital Facility Plan² within the last five years?

☒

☐

Yes

No

Do you use an Asset Management¹ system for your sewer systems?

☐

☒

Yes

No

Do you know the total replacement cost of your sewer system capital assets?

☒

☐

2020 Replacement Cost =

5,813,134.28

Yes

No

Do you fund sewer system capital improvements annually with sewer revenues at 2% or more of the total replacement cost?

☐
☒

What is the sewer/treatment system annual asset renewal* cost as a percentage of its total replacement cost?

☐
☒

What is the sewer/treatment system annual asset renewal* cost as a percentage of its total replacement cost?

Part V: PROJECTED CAPITAL INVESTMENT COSTS

Cost of projected capital improvements

	Cost	Purpose of Improvements		
	Please enter a valid numerical value	Replace/Restore	New Technology	Increase Capacity
2021	200,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2021 thru 2025	150,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2026 thru 2030	2,500,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2031 thru 2035	2,500,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
2036 thru 2040		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[This is the end of the Financial questions](#)

To the best of my knowledge, the Financial section is completed and

accurate.

☒ Yes

Collections System Section

Form completed by:

[May Receive Continuing Education /units \(CEUs\)](#)

Kale Shayne Watkins

Part I: SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

What is the largest diameter pipe in the collection system (diameter in inches)?

15

What is the average depth of the collection system (in feet)?

8.8

What is the total length of sewer pipe in the system (length in miles)?

25

How many lift/pump stations are in the collection system?

3

What is the largest capacity lift/pump station in the collection system

(design capacity in gallons per minute)?

750

Do seasonal daily peak flows exceed the average peak daily flow by 100 percent or more?

☐ Yes

☒ No

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

1968

In what year was the largest diameter sewer pipe in the collection system constructed, replaced or renewed? (If more than one, cite the oldest)

1968

PART II: DISCHARGES

How many days last year was there a sewage bypass, overflow or basement flooding in the system due to rain or snowmelt?

0

How many days last year was there a sewage bypass, overflow or basement flooding due to equipment failure (except plugged laterals)?

0

The Utah Sewer Management Program defines two classes of sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs):

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

- (a) affects 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.

Below include the number of SSOs that occurred in year: 2020

	Number
Number of Class 1 SSOs in Calendar year	0
Number of Class 2 SSOs in Calendar year	0

Please indicate what caused the SSO(s) in the previous question.

N/A

Please specify whether the SSOs were caused by contract or tributary community, etc.

N/A

Part III: NEW DEVELOPMENT

Did an industry or other development enter the community or expand production in the past two years, such that flow or wastewater loadings to the sewerage system increased by 10% or more?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Are new developments (industrial, commercial, or residential) anticipated in the next 2 - 3 years that will increase flow or BOD5 loadings to the sewerage system by 25% or more?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Number of new commercial/industrial connections in the last year

3

Number of new residential sewer connections added in the last year

41

Equivalent residential connections⁷ served

1305

Part IV: OPERATOR CERTIFICATION

How many collection system operators do you employ?

1

Approximate population served

State of Utah Administrative Rules requires all public system operators considered to be in Direct Responsible Charge (DRC) to be appropriately certified at least at the Facility's Grade.

List the designated Chief Operator/DRC for the Collection System below:

	Name First and Last Name	Grade	Email Please enter full email address
Chief Operator/DRC	kale watkins	II	kwatkins@morgancityut.org

List all other Collection System operators with DRC responsibilities in the field, by certification grade, separate names by commas:

	Name separate by comma
SLS ¹⁷ Grade I:	
Collection Grade I:	
Collection Grade II:	
Collection Grade III:	
Collection Grade IV:	

List all other Collection System operators by certification grade, separate names by commas:

	Name separate by comma
SLS ¹⁷ Grade I:	
Collection Grade I:	

Collection Grade I:	Name
Collection Grade II:	
Collection Grade III:	separate by comma
Collection Grade IV:	
No Current Collection Certification:	

Is/are your collection DRC operator(s) currently certified at the appropriate grade for this facility?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Part V: FACILITY MAINTENANCE

Yes

No

Have you implemented a preventative maintenance program for your collection system?

☒

☐

Have you updated the collection system operations and maintenance manual within the past 5 years?

☒

☐

Do you have a written emergency response plan for sewer systems?

☒

☐

Do you have a written safety plan for sewer systems?

☒

☐

Is the entire collections system TV inspected at least every 5 years?

☒

☐

Is at least 85% of the collections system mapped in GIS?

☒

☐

Part VI: SSMP EVALUATION

Yes

No

yes
Yes

no
No

Has your system completed a Sewer System Management Plan (SSMP)?

☒☐

Has the SSMP been adopted by the permittee's governing body at a public meeting?

☒☐

Has the completed SSMP been public noticed?

☒☐

During the annual assessment of the SSMP, were any adjustments needed based on the performance of the plan?

☐☒

Date of Public Notice

03/02/2016

During 2020, was any part of the SSMP audited as part of the five year audit?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Have you completed a System Evaluation and Capacity Assurance Plan (SECAP) as defined by the Utah Sewer Management Program?

☐ Yes

☒ No

Part VII: NARRATIVE EVALUATION

This section should be completed with the system operators.

Describe the physical condition of the sewerage system: (lift stations, etc. included)

included,

overall good condition, both lift stations are working great. headworks and disinfection are both working properly. the overall collection system is good as well, there are a few lines that are on the capital improvement list. Those will be replaced as more development is added to increase capacity.

What sewerage system capital improvements³ does the utility need to implement in the next 10 years?

Air diffusers in the lagoons which is in progress currently. As well as a few collection lines that will need to be replaced.

What sewerage system problems, other than plugging, have you had over the last year?

BOD has been high in 2020 and has exceeded permit limitations 7 months of the calendar year. And priming pump failed on island lift station which has been figured out due to check valves leaking. check valves are on order currently.

Is your utility currently preparing or updating its capital facilities plan²?

☐ Yes

☒ No

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

☒ **100% Covered**

☐ Partially cover

☐ Does not pay

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

☐ Yes

☒ No

Any additional comments?

NO

This is the end of the Collections System questions

To the best of my knowledge, the Collections System section is completed and accurate.

☒ Yes

Discharging Lagoon Facility

Form completed by:

May Receive Continuing Education /units (CEUs)

Kale Shayne Watkins

Part I: INFLUENT INFORMATION

Please provide the average influent flow rate and average influent BOD₅ and TSS loading rates listed below for your facility.

	Average Daily Flow (MGD)	Average Daily BOD ₅ Load (lb/day)	Average Daily TSS Load (lb/day)
Design Basis or Rated Capacity	.45	748	653
2020 Average	.384	600	340
Percent Capacity in			

Use

85
Average Daily Flow
(MGD)

80
Average Daily BOD₅
Load (lb/day)

52
Average Daily TSS
Load (lb/day)

Part II: EFFLUENT INFORMATION

How many Notices of Violation (NOVs) did you receive for this facility in the review year?

2

Part III: DISCHARGES

Answer

How many days in the past year was there a bypass or overflow of wastewater at the facility due to high flows?

0

How many days in the last year was there a bypass or overflow of wastewater at the facility due to equipment failure?

0

Part IV: FACILITY AGE

In what year were the following process units most recently constructed, upgraded or renewed?

Note: If a unit process does not apply to your system enter the Evaluation Year under Construction or Upgrade Year.

	Evaluation Year	Construction or Upgrade Year	Age
Headworks	2020	2018	2
Lagoons (including aeration)	2020	2010	10
Disinfection	2020	2018	2
Land			

Part V: NEW DEVELOPMENT

	Answer
Number of new commercial/industrial connections added in the last year	3
Number of new residential sewer connections added in the last year	41
Equivalent residential connections ⁷ served	1305

Part VI: OPERATOR CERTIFICATION

How many treatment operators do you employ?

1

Utah Administrative Rules require all public system operators considered to be in Direct Responsible Charge (DRC) to be appropriately certified at least at the Facility's Grade.

List the designated Chief Operator/DRC for the Wastewater Treatment System below:

	Name First and Last Name	Grade	Email Please enter full email address
Chief Operator/DRC	Kale Watkins	II	kwatkins@morgancityut.org

List all other Wastewater Treatment System operators with DRC responsibilities in the field, by certification grade, separate names by

commas:

	Name separate by comma
SLS ¹⁷ Grade I:	
Treatment Grade I:	
Treatment Grade II:	Kale Watkins
Treatment Grade III:	
Treatment Grade IV:	

List all other Wastewater Treatment System operators by certification grade, separate names by commas:

	Name separate by comma
SLS ¹⁷ Grade I:	
Treatment Grade I:	
Treatment Grade II:	
Treatment Grade III:	
Treatment Grade IV:	
No Current Treatment Certification:	

Is/are your DRC operator(s) currently certified at the appropriate grade for this facility?

☒ Yes

☐ No

Part VII: FACILITY MAINTENANCE

Yes

No

Have you implemented a preventative maintenance program for your treatment system?

Yes



No



Have you updated the treatment system operations and maintenance manual within the past 5 years?



Identify the types of treatment units at your facility.

☒ **Screening**

☒ **Grit Removal**

☐ Lagoon Variations

☐ Phosphorus Treatment

☒ **Chlorine Disinfection**

☐ UV Disinfection

☐ Land Application/Disposal

[This is the end of the Discharging Lagoon Facility questions](#)

To the best of my knowledge, the Discharging Lagoon Facility section is completed and accurate.

☒ **Yes**

I have reviewed this report and to the best of my knowledge the information provided in this report is correct.


clear

Has this been adopted by the council? If no, what date will it be presented to the council?

☒ Yes

☐ No

What date was this adopted?

Date format ex. mm/dd/yyyy

02/09/2021

Please log in.

Email

kwatkins@morgancityut.org

PIN

....

NOTE: This questionnaire has been compiled for your benefit to assist you in evaluating the technical and financial needs of your wastewater systems. If you received financial assistance from the Water Quality Board, annual submittal of this report is a condition of that assistance. Please answer questions as accurately as possible to give you the best evaluation of your facility. If you need assistance, please send an email to wqinfodata@utah.gov and we will contact you as soon as possible. You may also visit our [Frequently Asked Questions](#) page.

